Guide to Promotion at WPI: From the Tenured Rank of Associate Professor of Teaching to Full Professor of Teaching[1]

Information for tenured Associate Professors of Teaching, their Mentoring Teams, Nominators and Advocates, and External Reviewers

A publication of the WPI Committee on Appointments and Promotions and the Office of the Provost, with initial development assistance of the WPI ADVANCE Adaptation team.

Last Revised: May 9, 2023

---

[1] Initial draft developed by Jeanine Skorinko (co-chair of COAP 2023) based on WPI ADVANCE grant summer working groups. COAP reviewed and updated in May 2023.

Annual Letter from the Committee on Appointments and Promotions

Dear Associate Professor of Teaching and Promotion Process Stakeholders:

Welcome to the "Guide to Promotion at WPI: From the Tenured Rank of Associate Professor of Teaching to Full Professor of Teaching." This a publication for WPI's tenured associate professors of teaching and to those who play key roles in their professional development from newly tenured to successfully promoted full professors of teaching. Our goal is for all to have equal access to best practices and guidance. We welcome comments about this guide and how it might be improved in the future.

What's in it for you? This guide provides an overview of WPI's process for promotion from associate professor of teaching to full professor of teaching and resources to assist key actors in fulfilling their respective roles. We write foremost to "you," the Associate Professor of Teaching faculty member building toward and ultimately applying for promotion, because almost all the information included here is relevant to your success. We hope, however, that other stakeholders will benefit from seeing things from your perspective. These include those closely connected with the process (Provost, Deans, Department Heads and departmental mentoring teams, Nominators and Advocates, etc.) and faculty more generally. In some places we will speak directly to these different stakeholders, and link to relevant policies and other resources, again in the hope that WPI's promotion process will be thoughtful, transparent, and well understood by all parties.

An Overview: As you'll see in the table of contents, the Guide covers a lot of ground. There is information relevant to all stages of an Associate Professor of Teaching's professional development, including:

1. **Building Toward Promotion Over Time**: Reflecting the growing emphasis at WPI on supporting the professional development and currency of associate professors of teaching, information is provided to help these faculty and their department heads and mentoring teams think about strategies for growth and development, such as crafting a professional development plan, building a portfolio, maintaining a COAP-required CV, etc.
2. **Applying for Promotion**: Information is provided about choosing a Nominator and Advocate, selecting Professional Associates to support your case, crafting your promotion rationale and dossier, etc.
3. **Sample Dossiers and Links to Key Policies and further information** offer examples from successful candidates of teaching and professional growth/currency statements and portfolios and important policies of the WPI Faculty underpinning promotion processes.

Key Deadlines for Promotion Applications

Unless otherwise indicated, all communications to satisfy key deadlines are to be emailed to the Faculty Governance Coordinator, Penny Rock (prock@wpi.edu). Please note that these deadlines are for tenured faculty – different dates apply for non-tenured, secured contract, Teaching and Research associate teaching professors. If you have questions about the promotion process at any time, please reach out to the COAP Chair or any COAP member. ***Note: if there is a general time frame for something***

being due to the Faculty Governance Office (e.g., early June), the specific deadline will be updated each year and communicated by the Faculty Governance Office. The general time frame is to give you a sense of when things are due without committing to a date that needs to be updated (e.g., falls on a weekend).

Late C Term/Early D Term: Open COAP Promotion Information Sessions (slides posted after)

April 15: If Department Head is the Nominator, they need to submit name of promotion candidate to Faculty Governance Office (prock@wpi.edu)

May 1: If someone other than Department Head is the Nominator, they need to submit the name of the promotion candidate to Faculty Governance Office (prock@wpi.edu)

May 1: Candidate submits name of Advocate and list of Professional Associates to Faculty Governance Office (prock@wpi.edu)

Early June (typically June 1): Candidate submits promotion dossier to Faculty Governance Office (prock@wpi.edu)

Early June (typically June 1): Nominator and Advocate submit list of External Reviewers. Nominator and Advocate should have an informal agreement the person will write a letter.

Mid June: Faculty Governance Coordinator sends Professional Associates and External Reviewers a cover letter from COAP, candidate's dossier, and WPI promotion criteria. Also sends survey to former students and alumni.

Aug 15: Letters due from External Reviewers & Professional Associates. Formal Nomination Letter (by Nominator) and Advocate Letter (Optional) also due. All to: Faculty Governance Office (prock@wpi.edu).

Beginning of A term: Candidate submits dossier updates, if any.

A term: Joint Promotion Committee meets for discussion of case and supporting materials and will request Nominator and Advocate secure additional information if needed.

Beginning of B term: Candidate submits further dossier updates, if any.

B term: If needed, Joint Promotion Committee meets for second discussion of case.

A or B term: when all JPC members are ready, a vote is conducted. After the vote, JPC writes a promotion case recommendation letter.

End of B term: Joint Promotion Committee submits final letter Provost. Provost reviews cases and consults with appropriate Deans.

January: Provost may meet with COAP to discuss questions or differences of view.

February: Provost's positive recommendations are reviewed and acted on at Board of Trustees winter meeting. Provost's negative recommendations are not reviewed by the Board of Trustees. Provost notifies candidates of promotion decision following Board meeting.

In all, whether you are an associate professor of teaching at WPI or one of the many people who will play a role in their successful continuing development and promotion, we hope you will find the information here helpful. Our goal is for every one of our WPI faculty colleagues to thrive and advance in rank in an enjoyable, fulfilling, and timely fashion.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP)

Key Contacts

- Faculty Governance Coordinator: Penny Rock (prock@wpi.edu, x5135)
- COAP website: https://www.wpi.edu/offices/faculty-governance/coap

A list of the current COAP member is on the COAP website, including the Chair and Secretary.

Annual Letter from the Provost

Dear Associate Professor of Teaching and Promotion Process Stakeholders:

Welcome to the "Guide to Promotion at WPI: From the Tenured Rank of Associate Professor of Teaching to Full Professor of teaching." I am happy that you are looking to learn more about the promotion process from Associate Professor of Teaching to Full Professor of Teaching. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor of Teaching is an important milestone and signals continued professional growth and currency for a faculty member.

As you begin your journey through this guide, I wanted to remind everyone of WPI's Promotion Criteria. As stated in the Faculty Handbook "the candidate for promotion to full Professor of Teaching should demonstrate continuing high-quality teaching practice with significant impact on students as well as a record of contributions and professional growth and currency that includes creative pedagogical approaches within the context of their discipline or beyond and that demonstrates a positive external impact beyond WPI as appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise." One particularly important aspect of promotion from Associate to Full Professor of Teaching is that there is an expectation of external impact beyond WPI in some way. I also want to reiterate that at WPI we highly value teaching, professional growth, currency, and service activities as each of these activities plays an important role in our culture at WPI. We also recognize the wide variety of methods used in teaching, advising, and mentoring, the diverse forms that currency may take, and the wide range of service activities that candidates may engage in. At WPI, we are also committed to thinking about and measuring external impact through a variety of measures. We also acknowledge and pay attention to the potential effects that different biases may play in a candidate's career and promotion evaluation.

I encourage you to read through this Guide carefully and reach out to members of COAP if you have any questions. If you are considering promotion, I wish the best of luck preparing for this important milestone. If you will be playing a key role in a promotion case, thank you for taking the time to learn more about the promotion process at WPI and for the important role you will play for the candidate.

Sincerely,

Wole Soboyejo
Provost and Senior Vice President

Table of Contents

A. Professional Development from Associate to Full Professor of Teaching

A.1 Why Pursue Promotion to Full Professor of Teaching?

Do you have doubts about whether pursuing full professor of teaching is worth it? Given the work and stress of standing for tenure, you might be thinking about whether full professor of teaching should be your goal and whether you are just as happy and satisfied as an associate professor of teaching. If you are actively doubting the benefit of becoming a full professor of teaching, here are some things to consider:

- In many ways, promotion is an acknowledgement of your natural growth as a professional, rather than a goal in itself. Continuing your career after tenure will involve taking on new and larger tasks, e.g., important committees, continued currency and professional growth, leadership positions in your profession, more departmental responsibilities, mentoring of junior faculty, etc. You will grow in expertise in a variety of ways by simply doing the things that need to be done. Promotion acknowledges this professional growth. Setting promotion as a goal helps you guide your growth in productive ways, but is typically not a separate goal, but rather a natural outcome of the variety of things you take on after tenure.
- WPI has recognized that promotion is a natural milestone in the developmental path of a career as a tenured faculty member. Thus, in most cases, faculty are expected to become a full professor of teaching sometime after tenure. Promotion is no longer considered as a special case.
- Being a full professor of teaching opens up more opportunities. For example, full professors of teaching may be more likely to contribute to WPI in administrative or partially administrative roles, and to take on leadership roles in their profession. This is partially because full professors of teaching are recognized as capable and accomplished and may be encouraged to pursue opportunities where there are great possibilities but not necessarily immediate outcomes.
- Finally, remember that the path to full professor of teaching may take many detours and can proceed at different rates. You may initially not set full professor of teaching as a goal; you may feel a need to rebalance your life after tenure; you may have various family or caregiving obligations that take your attention; you may become dedicated to social justice or personal development activities, etc. None of these preclude becoming a full professor of teaching. The choice is not either/or and the path is yours to define, ideally working with the mentor group you have selected. In this way, promotion differs greatly from the path to tenure.

A.2 Working Toward Promotion Over Time

A.2.1 Creating a Mid-Career Vision and Professional Development Plan

> *If you don't know where you are going, you'll end up somewhere else.* – Yogi Berra

Once you are tenured, there are so many more opportunities for interesting collaborations, more service requests—so many ways to make a contribution! But without a plan that helps you prioritize and say no to some opportunities, you may end up "doing doing doing" without all of that action and effort

adding up to a coherent story that you can tell about your professional growth, currency, and contributions as a teacher/ leader. For this reason, we recommend that Associate Professors of Teaching create a Professional Development Plan (PDP) within a year or two after being awarded tenure, to serve as a roadmap for their next career phase. Specialists in academic careers recommend 5-year plans to maintain vitality, and WPI encourages faculty to craft rolling 5-year PDPs.

Creating and regularly refining a PDP addresses common challenges and barriers for new Associate Professors of Teaching:

- Goal of tenure has been reached – what next?
- Multiple paths to choose from – which to take?
- Less support and attention – no DTC!
- Increase in service responsibilities and overall workload
- Exhaustion: how to balance responsibilities of home, work life, self-care
- Deeper questions of meaning, impact, legacy

Those who use PDPs discover numerous benefits:

- A useful framework for conversations with department heads and mentors
- A mechanism for prioritizing and for accountability-- to say no to requests and opportunities that don't support your vision and goals
- More agency, self-determination, and satisfaction in identifying and pursuing work that's closely aligned with personal and professional values
- More strategic and integrative thinking about choices—for example, particular service committees could contribute insights that also resonate with your currency or teaching.

Creation, implementation, and ongoing refinement of a professional development plan (PDP) is the centerpiece of mentoring for Associate Professors of Teaching at WPI. A goal of the WPI PDP is to empower mid-career faculty to ground their work in their values, fully unleash their creativity and to pursue passions and dream projects across all types of faculty work (teaching, multiple forms of scholarship, currency, leadership, service) in ways that will benefit departments, programs, and the institution and also be promotable.

WPI's PDP template can be found on the WPI ADVANCE Canvas site and is organized in the following manner:

Creating an exciting vision

1. Reflecting on values and passions
2. Envisioning this career phase

Goal setting

3. Identifying opportunities in promotion criteria
4. Considering department and institutional context

5. Setting long-term and short-term goals for scholarship, teaching, leadership/service

Professional development and mentoring

6. Assessing skills needed to reach goals
7. Creating a mentoring and advocacy network

PDP workshops are hosted each January by the Morgan Center to start or refresh your PDP in community with colleagues. Periodic writing retreats throughout the year can also be used well for this type of reflective writing.

A.2.2 Making Use of WPI's NCFDD Membership

It's common for Associate Professors of Teaching to create a PDP they're excited about but then face challenges implementing it—particularly how to prioritize scholarship while avoiding burnout. The National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD) has a "core curriculum" of monthly webinars focusing on key skills such as academic time management (e.g., semester strategic plans and weekly planning meetings), writing productivity, personal wellness, and the art of saying no. The NCFDD also forms online communities for writing accountability (e.g., 14-day writing challenges). These resources and benefits are available to all WPI faculty at no cost. To join, go to the NCFDD home page, click "Become a member," and select WPI from the drop-down menu to register and login.

The Faculty Success Program is NOT free (close to $4,000) but can be an excellent investment to achieve greater writing productivity and work-life balance. This 12-week "virtual bootcamp" provides small accountability groups and a productivity coach. It's generally offered three times per year. Details about program elements, expectations, outcomes data, and testimonials can be found at the FSP link, along with advice on "making the ask" for funds. Questions about the NCFDD programs can be directed to morgan-center@wpi.edu.

A.2.3 Forming and Utilizing Your Mentoring Team

The transition from Assistant to Associate Professor of Teaching is an important time to assess and renew your professional network. In fact, thinking about mentors and advocates is integrated into the PDP process. Effective mentoring relationships are often peer-to-peer rather than hierarchical, and different mentors serve different purposes: intellectual community and readers, skills-building mentors, sponsors and advocates who promote your work and open up opportunities, accountability partners or groups, mentors for emotional support and problem solving, and mentors that guide career advancement. While all of these are important to consider, we'll focus here on mentors for career advancement at WPI, specifically at mid-career.

In 2017 the WPI faculty committed to Associate Professor (including Associate Professors of Teaching and Associate Teaching Professors) mentoring via the model of self-selected "mentoring teams." The role of the mentoring team is to foster continuing professional development and promotion in academic rank. Think of this group as similar to your DTC, but it's self-selected rather than elected so that you can identify people well-suited to your specific goals and directions. It's also fully focused on mentoring and

professional development, without an evaluative role. Associate Professor mentoring and mentoring teams are described in Chapter 4, Section 5 of the reorganized Faculty Handbook. While there are no strict requirements, the Handbook suggests that mentoring teams should consist of three senior colleagues, so the same size as a DTC. Following are some answers to FAQs:

When should I form a mentoring team? Many faculty feel like they need a break from career planning after earning tenure, and that's perfectly understandable. We recommend that you form your team within 1-2 years after earning tenure, when you're creating your mid-career PDP. You are responsible for recruiting your mentoring team. If this feels awkward to you, use the email templates in the WPI ADVANCE resource collection on Canvas. Associate Professors are asked to "register" their team by notifying the Morgan Center (morgan-center@wpi.edu) to make sure you have access to resources and events.

Who should I select? All should be people that you're reasonably comfortable with, who are well-connected on campus (and ideally externally as well), will advocate for you, are interested in your work, and will give you some time. (It won't be burdensome!) Three people are suggested:

1. **Your department head or program director, assuming they're an advocate.** This person already knows your work, it's an important relationship to cultivate, and they are usually knowledgeable about expectations for promotion from recent service on Joint Promotion Committees. If the relationship with your Department Head is difficult, consider another department head, recent department head, recent COAP members, or other full professors.
2. **A senior colleague in your field.** Someone who has experience with your type of teaching, currency, scholarship (if applicable), can give feedback on your professional goals, perhaps attends the same conferences, has general understanding of the developments in the field.
3. **A senior colleague NOT in your field but with some shared interests.** Since all of the COAP members who will eventually make the recommendation about your promotion case will not be in your department, it can be helpful to have this type of outsider's perspective.

Can I choose someone from outside WPI to be on my mentoring team? Yes, perhaps especially as a strategic choice for #2 (above) if no one at WPI aligns with your area. In annual team meetings, they could help your department head and the other team member better understand your work, its quality, and external impact. On the other hand, they will not be experienced with WPI's promotion system and expectations. And remember you can/should *always* have external people in your broader network of mentors.

Does my mentoring team eventually become my Nominator and Advocate? Especially if your mentoring team stays stable during your period as an Associate Professor, they will come to know your work well and may certainly be good choices. You could eventually ask two of the three to serve as the (non-voting) Nominator and Advocate for your promotion case, but you are not obligated to do so.

How often should we meet? The Faculty Handbooks states a minimum expectation of a "formal" meeting of the Associate Professor and all mentoring team members every 1-2 years, combined with more frequent 1-on-1 meetings. We strongly encourage an annual meeting with the full team. Unlike

with DTCs, there is no expectation of a formal "letter" to document the outcomes of these meetings. (Remember that DTCs can make decisions about early termination. Associate Professor mentoring teams do NOT have that type of evaluative role.)

What should we talk about? The centerpiece of your conversations with your mentoring team can be your professional development plan (PDP): long-term vision and short-term goals (1 year), what's on your plate and how you're trying to prioritize, professional development needs, broader mentoring network, strategies for implementing your plan, and building external visibility.

A.2.4 Making Use of Annual Reviews/Profession Development Conversation

Annual reviews with department heads provide an invaluable yet often untapped opportunity to springboard and foster short-term and long-term professional development of Associate Professors of Teaching. Both the Committee on Financial and Administrative Policy (FAP) and initiatives of WPI's ADVANCE Adaptation grant (2018-2021) have made progress in transforming these conversations from a purely evaluative to a professional development model that meshes well with key elements of WPI's template for professional development plans. If your department head is on your mentoring team, you can also think of this as one of your regular 1-on-1 meetings. The conversation model includes the following components:

Reflecting on points of pride in the last year's work. Why is this kind of work important to you, to the department, and/or to WPI?

Looking forward to one or two dream projects or goals to advance or set in motion for the next year. How would those projects advance the department, WPI, you, your field? What are key steps? Resources? How can the department head help catalyze that work?

Prioritizing across opportunities, by analyzing your full portfolio of work across teaching, currency, scholarship, and service, surfacing elements of hidden work, discussing trade-offs, and then prioritizing across activities in the context of your goals. You are also encouraged to discuss what makes you feel valued and types of recognition that mean the most to you.

A.2.5 Building and Documenting External Impact and Visibility

As you know, high-quality teaching and continued professional growth and currency with external impact is a criterion for promotion to Professor of Teaching. You will need to think carefully about how you can increase external recognition and visibility based on your own teaching, currency, and professional growth. The following strategies and suggestions were compiled through interviews with numerous department heads and other experienced mentors and Nominators:

- **Present your work externally**
  - Present at conferences regularly (generally just from submitted abstracts but could also mention to a session chair that you know personally/professionally). Conference exposure is very important for lining up potential external reviewers.

- o Consider conference presentations a means to some other end (like exposure, feedback, opening doors to opportunities to publish) and not an end in themselves since they can be costly in time and money.
- o Present in departmental seminar series at different universities. Your Department Head and colleagues at those universities can probably help get you invited – and they'll pay your way. You can also practice some self-promotion and reach out to contacts at other universities, briefly update them on your work, and offer to give a seminar at their institution.
- **Volunteer for your professional societies**
  - o Attend society committee/business meetings at key conferences. Start early to learn the structure and what's done at the meetings, then start volunteering to do work and/or to fill positions such as secretary, treasurer, vice-chair, student paper/poster competitions. Consider picking one society that you'll get most involved with – if you get involved with too many, you'll spread yourself thin.
  - o Volunteer to co-chair a session at a conference. It's not always clear how to do that but ask around.
  - o If you engage in scholarship, volunteer to be on grant panels. Sometimes you can simply contact the Program Officer, other times you may need an advocate who nominates you.
  - o Some Heads warn people against service-heavy external work, but it can also be a leadership opportunity in your field. Before volunteering for a time-intensive (but highly visible!) role such as Program Chair, talk to mentors and consider how you might document or quantify the impact and outcomes of this work in ways that will be seen clearly as currency/professional growth activity with external impact.
- **Take advantage of external mentoring/coaching/advocacy**
  - o If there are mentoring groups in your professional societies, join one. For example, there is a women's mentoring group in the ASME Biomedical Engineering Division that has networking events where they discuss very useful information e.g., what society awards are available, details on years as member/post PhD to get awards, committee structures, theme chair info (esp. if women), etc.; they also curate a database in Excel with the name of each person, stage of career, number of year post PhD, awards garnered, etc. so that you can identify potential letter writers.
  - o Ask more senior faculty (all gender identities) to be mentors to give field-specific advice. Coaches don't need to be in your field; they basically guide you to listen to your own advice or help you practice and debrief skills like networking or negotiation. Advocates can nominate you for awards, fellowships, recommend you for positions on national committees or panels. Be clear on which role you'd like them to play, and be clear of the expectations (e.g., how many times per year you'll talk, for how long).
  - o Ask your department head to facilitate mentoring relationships, e.g., by funding your mentor's visit to WPI to give a seminar and meet with you for ½ day.
  - o Ask your department head to nominate you for awards, a Fellow position in your professional society, or other forms of recognition.

- **Promote your currency and professional growth**
    - Create an appealing and easily navigable website and keep it up-to-date.
    - Work with Marketing & Communications on press releases about your work
    - Create and execute a strategy for establishing your online presence (e.g., ResearchGate, Mendeley). Gordon Library has a great LibGuide on [Curating Your Online Presence](#) that helps you assess options.
    - If you publish/create a "product" (article, book, module, etc.), send a link or copy to those you cite often and thought leaders.
    - Once you're established in a field, write review articles, and put your currency or scholarship in context.
    - Write a blog or lay piece about your currency/professional growth area in general and put it in context.
    - Faculty with books in progress: put together a 1-2 page book abstract or prospectus and make appointments with book acquisition editors whenever they are exhibiting at conferences: often a good chat (with a good prospectus in hand) is a straighter line to book publication than an unsolicited submission.
- **Track the external impact of your work**
    - Plan ahead of time, and discuss with your mentoring team, the most important indicators and metrics for the external impact of your teaching and currency/professional growth. This might be relatively straightforward if your currency is in something traditional like discovery scholarship (e.g., various citation indexes). But it will take more advance thought and record-keeping for other forms of currency. For example, if you regularly present workshops at education conferences or for the Center for Project-Based Learning, you could keep track of the number of attendees and if possible, get their contact information so that you can follow up to see if /how they applied what they learned in the workshop.
    - Other possible metrics include downloads of open-access publications or teaching materials, hits on blog posts, qualitative and quantitative data about impact or change in communities.
    - Depending on your currency/professional growth, check out the Gordon Library's LibGuide on [Assessing Research Impact](#). It reviews options for citation analytics, resources for gathering "altmetrics", and examples and templates for impact reports. Research librarians are also available for consultations.
- **Cultivate external letter writers**

    The nominator and advocate will reach out and recruit external letter writers and you will **not** have input into this process. But there are some activities you can engage in to help people who might be asked to be an external reviewer start to know who you are and what you do. Just remember that external reviewers will be individuals who are at an arm's length from you, so they can know you, have had conversations with you, but cannot have collaborated with you, mentored you, been on an advisory board for your program/department, etc. These activities include:

- o   program committee members for conferences at which you have presented
- o   editors for journals in which you've published
- o   hosts for external talks
- o   other scholars you cite frequently in your work
- o   people who cite your work, especially those who are in senior or high impact positions at highly regarded institutions

A.2.6 Maintaining your CV(s)

Imagine: It is now time to put your promotion packet. Have you updated your CV recently? Or is your most recent version the one you put together for tenure? It could take several weeks to find and record your many accomplishments over the years since you earned tenure, and it will still not be as good as a CV that has been maintained regularly. While it is a good idea to update your CV as things happen, e.g., a new publication or a reflection on your latest course revisions, not all of us are that organized. At minimum, you should update your CV every year. One good time to do that is as you do your annual report – first update the CV and then create your annual report. Another good time is in May after classes end. Updating your CV serves as a means for reflecting on the past year and your progress toward promotion. It also serves as a basis for planning your next year. As such, an annual meeting with your mentors might also be a good time for updating your CV.

You might keep your CV in COAP format, which avoids the need for conversion at promotion time and ensures you capture all the information COAP wants. On the other hand, you may want to keep it in some other format if you need to distribute it occasionally. If you do that, be sure to track things COAP wants, but are not typically in a professional CV, such as courses taught each term, class sizes, teaching ratings and associated university averages, teaching innovations, etc. All of these can take days to weeks to reconstruct if you do not regularly track them.

The COAP CV template can be downloaded from the COAP website [https://www.wpi.edu/offices/faculty-governance/coap]. Example CVs can be found in the collection of successful promotion dossiers on the WPI ADVANCE Canvas site (https://canvas.wpi.edu/courses/14049).

A.2.7 Building Your Teaching Portfolio

Your mid-career PDP should include goals related to professional growth in teaching. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) asks promotion candidates to submit a teaching portfolio to document high quality teaching. Needless to say, it's a real drag to throw one together in the months or weeks prior to the deadline for submitting your promotion dossier. Building the portfolio gradually over time, in a way that's aligned with your goals for teaching, will be much less stressful and more importantly, you'll reap the benefits of a more reflective teaching practice and likely greater satisfaction with teaching. Note that "teaching" includes course instruction in any modality, project advising, thesis advising, and academic advising.

Ultimately, teaching portfolios submitted for promotion should examine teaching from three lenses: self-assessment, perceptions of students, and peer review. It's worth it to think ahead about types of

evidence you will present that go beyond student ratings: measures of learning through rubrics or inventories, use of research-based teaching practices, classroom observation protocols that align with your goals, and the like. Keep an eye out for resources and programs about teaching portfolios offered by the Morgan Center and aim to work on your portfolio at least once per year.

See the Appendices for a document that provides basic guidance on the contents of teaching portfolios and a holistic rubric that COAP uses to evaluate high quality teaching.

B. Applying for Promotion

This section focuses on information that promotion candidates need to know and act on. Section C provides direct guidance for Nominators and Advocates. That said, we encourage everyone to read everything.

B.1 Overview of Promotion Process and Key Stakeholders

Stakeholders List

- Associate Professors of Teaching
- Associate Professor Mentoring Teams: In years after tenure, advise on mid-career professional development and ultimately help assess readiness for promotion
    - Department Head (recommended but not required)
    - Faculty colleagues chosen by candidate
- Joint Promotion Committee: Reviews promotion case and makes recommendations to Provost
    - Six COAP members (voting), none of whom are in the same department as the candidate. (The COAP Chair assigns one of these members to be the **Tracker** for each case, responsible for monitoring the completion or receipt of required files.)
    - Promotion Nominator (non-voting) chosen by candidate
    - Promotion Advocate (non-voting) chosen by candidate
- Faculty Governance Coordinator: Penny Rock (handles all logistics)
- Promotion Case Contributors
    - Professional Associates (internal and external)
    - External Reviewers
    - Former students: via survey and course evaluations
    - Others unsolicited
    - Provost (also charged with consulting the appropriate Dean and the President)
    - Board of Trustees

B.2 Promotion Timing: When Am I Ready?

The promotion policy states a 5-year guideline for minimum time at the Associate Professor of Teaching rank. The purpose of this guideline is to make clear that considerable professional growth, currency, and new types of contributions are expected for promotion to the most senior rank of Full Professor of Teaching.

The desired pace and trajectory toward promotion will vary. What matters is meeting the criteria, not how long it takes to get there. Timing for promotion should be assessed in consultation with mentors. As described in Section A, all Associate Professors are encouraged to form a mentoring team within 1-2 years after earning tenure and their first promotion. The annual meeting of the mentoring team should assess short-term and long-term goals, professional development, progress toward promotion, and by year five, readiness for promotion. You are also encouraged to consult with others outside your mentoring team, particularly recent COAP members, department heads, Deans, and colleagues at other institutions (including those who might be asked to support your promotion case with a letter), to assess your readiness for promotion. You can also ask colleagues who have been promoted recently in your department to share their dossier, to see how your accomplishments compare. Also note that COAP maintains a collection of successful promotion dossiers available to all WPI faculty and linked at the end of this guide.

The policy does leave open the possibility of going up early for promotion to full Professor of Teaching (i.e., in less than 5 years) in "exceptional circumstances." Such circumstances would include exceptional professional growth and currency and external impact in a short period of time, also accompanied by high quality teaching, professional growth in teaching over that period, and significant service contributions. The nominator should address these exceptional circumstances in their nomination letter.

B.3 Roles of the Nominator and Advocate

WPI's Associate-to-Full Professor of Teaching promotion system is unique in that there is no formal review or recommendation at the departmental level, and no voting members of the Joint Promotion Committee are from the candidate's department. This feature signals institutional values of "no silos" and cross-disciplinary collaboration and appreciation. It also makes it easier to keep expectations and standards more uniform across the university. The purpose of having a Nominator and Advocate is to provide that essential link to the candidate's specific context.

The Nominator is chosen by the candidate and is typically the candidate's Department Head or another tenured full professor or full professor of teaching. The Advocate is also chosen by the candidate to complement the knowledge and expertise of the Nominator regarding the candidate's case. Both become non-voting members of the Joint Promotion Committee. They have access to all material submitted during a promotion review, and they attend all meetings of the joint committee. The main roles of the Nominator and Advocate are to assist other committee members in understanding the candidate's type of currency, disciplinary norms, teaching context, and other contextual factors.

The Nominator has some specific responsibilities:

- Submitting the formal notification of nomination to the Faculty Governance Office by the announced deadline toward the end of the spring semester
- Brainstorming possible external reviewers in consultation with the Advocate
- Contacting potential external reviewers to see if they are willing to write a letter of appraisal
- Preparing a detailed letter of nomination by the end of the summer

- Summarizing the case to COAP

The Advocate has some specific responsibilities:

- Brainstorming possible external reviewers in consultation with the Nominator
- Working with Nominator to contact potential external reviewers
- May submit a letter of support by the end of the summer
- Providing additional information/context for the case to COAP
- Answering questions that may arise during COAP meetings

The Nominator and Advocate share the following responsibilities:

- Guiding the candidate in preparing a strong dossier
- Guiding the candidate in selecting Professional Associates
- Becoming well-acquainted with the candidate's record
- Summarizing the candidate's case to the Joint Promotion Committee (JPC), putting in context the quality and external impact of the candidate's contributions across teaching, currency, professional growth, and service
- Following up on any "homework" after the first JPC meeting in the fall

B.4 Choosing Your Nominator and Advocate

Some department heads or full professors, including full professors of teaching, may reach out to Associate Professors of Teaching with an offer to nominate them for promotion, but it's common for Associate Professors of Teaching to initiate these discussions and to recruit their own Nominator and Advocate. Ideally, some discussion about promotion and progress toward promotion occurs regularly as part of the annual developmental discussion between an Associate Professor of Teaching and their Department Head and/or Mentoring Team.

In most cases, Associate Professors of Teaching select their Department Head as the Nominator since this person usually knows their discipline and their contributions best. However, if you don't have a good relationship with your department head for whatever reason, or if your department head does not have a good understanding or appreciation of your teaching, currency, and professional growth, you can recruit someone else. Although the policy does not state qualifications or eligibility for Nominators, in practice they are usually tenured full professors (this includes full professors of teaching) at WPI. Familiarity with our institutional context is important.

It may be helpful to think of the Nominator and Advocate as a team, with some additional responsibilities for the Nominator as described in the previous section. Once you've decided on a Nominator, consider whether that person has any gaps and recruit an Advocate with complementary expertise. Your Nominator can help brainstorm and assess options. It need not be someone who is already a close colleague. With sufficient advance notice, you can reach out to a prospective Advocate, share your CV and other materials, and ask to meet to discuss whether they'd be willing to serve as the Advocate on your case. Again, the policy does not state any constraints in terms of rank or institution,

but do consider WPI full professors or full professors of teaching first, in your department or other departments. If there are no good options, you can consider former department heads and/or WPI faculty at different ranks who have expertise in your area. People outside WPI can also serve as Advocates. An external person may be helpful if no one at WPI is well-versed in your field and type of currency/professional growth. In this case, it would be good ask that person to be on your mentoring team a few years in advance of the promotion review so that they become familiar with WPI's promotion system and help you assess your readiness. The most important aspects are that the Nominator and Advocate are familiar with the candidate's contributions and can effectively communicate the significance of these contributions in their professional and institutional contexts.

Following are FAQs about Nominators and Advocates.

In what situations might you choose someone other than your department head to be your Nominator?

- If your department head is not a strong supporter
- If your department head is not yet experienced with the WPI Promotion process (e.g., brand new to WPI; Associate Professor).

In what situations might you choose someone from outside WPI to serve as your Advocate?

- If there is no one at WPI who is well-versed in your type of currency/professional growth

Does my mentoring team become my Nominator and Advocate?

- No, at least not automatically. They are good people to consider, but the decisions are separate.

When should I make the decision about my Nominator and Advocate?

- The period between November to February is a good time to finalize the decision about whether to go up for promotion in the upcoming cycle and to find someone who agrees to nominate you. If you're weighing the benefits and drawbacks of potential Nominators, consider having a chat with a recent COAP member. (Annual committee rosters can be found on the faculty governance website.) The choice of Advocate can follow the choice of your Nominator, and your Nominator may have good advice about that. The deadline for choosing your Advocate is May 1.

B.5 External Reviewers and Professional Associates: Roles & Selection

Letters from internal and external peers are weighed heavily by the Joint Promotion Committee and the Provost. These letters are especially important since, by design, COAP members are *not* in the candidate's field. Thus, they rely on the letters, in addition to the Nominator and Advocate, to understand the candidate's field and contributions. Two sets of input are sought: 1) from internal and external *Professional Associates* who are selected by the candidate; and 2) from *External Reviewers* who remain unknown to the candidate.

The key distinction between external Professional Associates and External Reviewers is that External Reviewers must be "arms-length" to the candidate. This means they cannot be co-PIs, co-authors, former advisors, departmental advisory board members, or have similar interests in the case. It is especially important that External Reviewers be recognized as experts in the candidate's area of teaching and/or currency/professional growth because as independent evaluators, their assessment is taken very seriously by COAP.

The purpose of Professional Associates is to provide expert context and details about your teaching, currency, professional growth, leadership, and service contributions that reinforce and extend information you provide in your personal statement, CV, and other documentation. Candidates often select collaborators, on joint teaching projects, currency projects, or joint professional service activities, as Professional Associates so that they can describe your specific roles and contributions in collaborative work.

COAP requests six Professional Associates (5 minimum) and generally recommends a 50/50 mix of internal and external people (i.e., three of each):

- Internal Professional Associates are important because WPI does not have a formal department review for promotion. COAP members want to see how you're integrated into the university and understand your key roles. Internal Professional Associates provide key appraisal of your contributions to the department, program, and institution. Examples include: internal research collaborators, teaching collaborators, and people who can speak knowledgably about your contributions to program development, your impact in a leadership role, or your contributions to a committee. All else equal, choose people who are full Professors or full Professors of Teaching.
- External Professional Associates are usually people you've collaborated with on currency/professional growth, teaching, leadership, service, or people that you know are supportive and positive about your work. Again, peers who have adopted your teaching materials, conference collaborators or others who are knowledgeable about external service to your profession, including your role as a mentor and supporter of junior faculty.

Candidates should consult with their Nominator and Advocate about their planned list of Professional Associates. During this discussion, the Nominator and Advocate may advise that an external person, if they are "arm's length," be left off the list because they could be used as an External Reviewer instead. Since the Nominator and Advocate may not be sufficiently familiar with, or understand the nuances of, the Candidate's research subfields, they might also discuss with the candidate the nature of their subfield(s), typical types of contributions in that subfield, leaders in the subfield, and those to avoid in the subfield so that they can make good choices for external reviewers. The Nominator and the Advocate, in consultation with COAP members, are ultimately responsible for selecting and recruiting External Reviewers, and the identity of those who agree should remain unknown to the candidate.

For both internal and external Professional Associates, *ask* if they will be able to provide a letter. This is usually done in an email message. Professional Associates from WPI might be better at addressing your

contributions to teaching, project advising, collaborations, etc. at WPI. Professional Associates outside of WPI might be better to provide information on your contributions to your specific field of currency/professional growth, impact of your work (especially outside of WPI), contributions on a specific piece of currency, etc. When asking if they would be willing to write a letter to support your promotion, identify specific areas you hope they could address in their letter. Following are some examples:

- Professional Associate from within WPI: … *Would you be able to provide a letter? … If you could specifically comment on our work advising projects in X term of YEAR, I think that would be very helpful to COAP.*
- Professional Associate outside of WPI: …*Would you be able to provide a letter? If you could specifically comment on our collaboration in our recent project, I think it would be very helpful to the promotion committee. The committee would be interested in seeing how my contributions helped the development of this project. In addition, the committee would be interested in how this work has contributed to our field.*

B.6 Preparing Your Promotion Dossier

Putting together a promotion dossier can be a highly satisfying process as you reflect on your accomplishments and communicate your identity as a teacher and your professional growth/currency. It can also be time-consuming and stressful if left until the last minute. We recommend that you begin outlining your package at least 3 months ahead of the June deadline.

Candidates often wonder how much of their career should be addressed in their promotion dossier. While the CV and external impact indicators should cover your whole academic career, the personal statement, scholarly artifacts (if applicable), and teaching portfolio should focus primarily on growth and contributions since tenure.

Prior to submitting your promotion dossier, in addition to reading this portion of the guide it may be helpful to browse through the collection of sample promotion dossiers curated by COAP (currently on the WPI ADVANCE Canvas site). What you'll find is that there's quite a bit of variation, which signals that materials can and should be tailored to your own professional identity and types of work.

The following sections describe the purpose of each component of the dossier and suggestions for content and organization.

B.6.1 COAP-Format Curriculum Vita (CV)

Maintaining this CV was previously discussed in section A.2.6. The purpose of the CV is to show COAP members and other reviewers the entirety of your activities in teaching, currency/professional growth, and various types of leadership and service. It should span your entire academic career, post-graduate school, so it will be a lengthy document. Our main advice is to follow the COAP format, include all requested information, and make it easy to read and navigate through use of formatting. Instructions and a template for the CV can be downloaded from the COAP website [https://www.wpi.edu/offices/faculty-governance/coap].

If you feel there is a type of professional activity that does not fit into the COAP format CV, discuss it with your Nominator and Advocate, and if you don't arrive at a solution, reach out to the COAP Chair for guidance.

B.6.2 Personal Statement

The purpose of the personal statement is to provide a compelling professional self-portrait about your contributions to WPI, your field, and the wider world and to provide clear evidence that you've met the criteria for promotion: high quality teaching, continuing professional growth and currency, and service. The statement should also frame your future plans. **The statement can be up to 10 pages maximum, double spaced.** Remember that other components of the dossier— teaching portfolio, sample scholarly or currency artifacts, impact report/citation index (if applicable)—will add detail. Therefore, the personal statement can be fairly high level. You'll want to think through how all of the documents work together and try to avoid overlap between them.

The personal statement should be organized with section headings. Usually, it begins with an **introductory portion** that briefly summarizes your early career and then turns to telling the story of your career since tenure. Try to weave this story in response to big questions: Who am I as a teacher? What purpose or problems have motivated my work? How has my work made a difference to internal and external communities? If your contributions are highly integrative, you can set that up in the introduction and explain how the rest of the statement will be organized.

The heart of the personal statement is **separate sections on teaching, currency and professional growthp , and service**, aligned with the promotion criteria. The sections on teaching and scholarship are usually approximately equal in length. If you wish, service can be reframed as leadership. Some candidates with significant administrative roles have presented separate sections on leadership and service. In all of these sections, your goal should be to *summarize evidence of quality and internal and external impact in your most important contributions*. You can and should assume that people have read your CV, which mostly characterized *quantity* of work, so you don't need to re-list your activities. However, you'll probably want to briefly synthesize and call attention to some key data in your CV that have been central to your contributions or are particularly noteworthy: e.g., advised XX MQPs, YY IQPs, more than XX conference presentations, etc.

In order to provide evidence of high-quality teaching, it may be helpful to consult the rubric that COAP uses to evaluate high quality teaching. Depending on your type of currency, you may find the matrix for multiple forms of scholarship helpful as well. Both documents can be found in Appendices of this guide. Both of those tools are informed by six standards, which have been identified to evaluate quality across diverse areas of faculty work: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

If a lot of your work has been done collaboratively with others, it's important to explain your role and contributions in the personal statement. (And line up Professional Associates who will be able to reinforce the impact of your individual contributions.)

The personal statement should conclude with a brief section on **future plans**, again in the areas of teaching, currency/professional growth, leadership, and service. Typically, this might be a few paragraphs or half a page. No one is going to hold you to these future plans, but reviewers do want to see that you have ambitions for the next phase of your career—how you want to make a difference--and plans for continued professional growth.

It's worth noting that the personal statement is NOT a place to be modest or humble. If writing that way is difficult for you, try putting yourself in a zone of pride in your accomplishments while providing factual evidence for your statements.

Example personal statements from successful promotion candidates can be found in the collection of dossiers archived on the WPI ADVANCE Canvas site.

B.6.3 Teaching Portfolio

The teaching portfolio expands on the teaching section of your personal statement and is the primary source of evidence for high quality teaching. In addition, it's the place to show your professional growth in teaching—how have your teaching practices and student outcomes changed since tenure, what innovations have you made? As you develop or polish your portfolio for promotion, we recommend that you review the rubric on high quality teaching in the Appendix of this Guide. It suggests what high quality teaching "looks like" in broad terms that can be interpreted in all disciplines and types of teaching.

Your teaching portfolio should *not* be just a collection of syllabi and other artifacts without explanation. It should begin with a reflective statement about your approach to teaching and learning and a presentation of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. **This narrative should be 4-6 pages double spaced maximum.** Throughout this narrative portion you can introduce, or reference teaching artifacts or materials attached to the portfolio. These might include course syllabi, key assignments or assessments, project advising materials, examples of student work, and peer review outcomes. The narrative portion of the portfolio typically concludes with a brief statement of teaching goals for the future. The appendices include a listing of possible contents of the teaching portfolio for more ideas on what you might include. Any attached artifacts should relate, highlight, and/or provide visual evidence for the elements presented in the narrative. In other words, the artifacts should not just be a collection of all teaching materials used. **In total, the teaching portfolio should not exceed 50 pages (including the 4-6 pages double spaced for the narrative).**

The teaching portfolio is an important opportunity to provide context and evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond student ratings and from three lenses: your own assessment and reflection, peer review, in addition to the student voice. Unlike the personal statement where you present evidence of key accomplishments and strengths, the teaching portfolio is a place for balanced, critical reflection on strengths, challenges, and future areas of growth for your teaching and advising. Presenting just a rosy view does not meet the expectation of reflective practice in a teaching portfolio.

You can and should go beyond course instruction to include project advising, academic advising and mentoring, or other teaching roles that have been central to your mid-career. You won't be able to

present *all* of your teaching, so select a combination of activities where you've shown the most professional growth.

B.6.4 Sample Currency Artifacts

CCOAP asks candidates to submit a maximum of three currency artifacts as a sample of your currency contributions. Depending on the currency, the matrix on multiple forms of scholarship (see Appendix) may be helpful as it shows types of artifacts that go beyond peer-reviewed journal articles and include non-academic audiences.

You'll want to select the key threads or streams in your currency since tenure, and those that have had the most external impact and significance in your field. (Remember that these three artifacts will also be sent to your external reviewers!)

To help you select which currency artifacts to include in your packet, we recommend that you talk with other people to help you assess your options together. You could talk with your Nominator and Advocate, other senior mentors in your field, or anyone else you think can help you assess which artifacts to include. General advice is to present your highest quality currency contributions, since external impact of all your work will be evident in the Professional Growth and Currency report.

Most candidates include **a short introduction** (**no more than one page, double spaced total**) to the sample currency artifacts that provides a bit of context for each.

As a reminder, Professional Growth and Currency can take many forms:

- Assessing and improving courses, projects, curricula, and pedagogy, and sharing their own pedagogical and scholarly discoveries as these emerge;
- Questioning existing teaching boundaries and experimenting with ideas that overcome the constraints of current teaching practice;
- Remaining active as scholars through the scholarship of discovery, teaching and learning, integration, application and practice, or engagement;
- Continuing to learn about developments in the field of education to enhance their practice of teaching and educating others of their innovations within and/or outside of WPI;
- Remaining current in their disciplines and incorporating recent developments in the field into their course teaching and project advising;
- Understanding student learning and developing creative new approaches to teaching when needed to improve student learning;

B.6.5 Professional Growth and Currency Impact Report

External impact essentially refers to dissemination and, especially, *use* of your work beyond the WPI community. Your CV already lists all your work. This part of your package goes beyond that. To what extent has your work been noticed, utilized, or adapted in your field, your scholarly community, or in the public sphere? Your report may include other indictors of external impact such as reviews of your work, press and media coverage, downloads of scholarly materials or datasets, citation index, h-index, awards and recognition, or any other indicators that the candidate's currency contributions have had an impact

beyond WPI, including social media impact or altmetrics. You may also present data that you have tracked yourself, such as number of institutions or individuals attending your workshops and using your materials. (This is why planning ahead to collect impact data appropriate to your work is so important – see section A.2.)

There is not one correct way to present a Professional Growth and Currency report (see previous section for the many forms); it really depends on norms in your field, type of currency, and the communities and constituencies with whom you interact. Consult the following for a range of ideas and examples:

- [Impact report examples and templates](#): Libguide section from Gordon Library
- [Assessing research impact](#): full Libguide including discussion of altmetrics
- Multiple forms of scholarship matrix (see Appendix)
- Collection of successful promotion dossiers (WPI ADVANCE Canvas site)

B.7 Updating the Dossier

Promotion dossiers are due in early June (typically June 1). Promotion candidates are encouraged to update their dossier with new accomplishments, any time before COAP makes its decision, sometime in the Fall. Therefore, consider sending updates right before the start of A-term and start of B-term. Updates are most often in the form of a memo, an updated CV (with new entries highlighted), and/or an updated external impact report/citation index.

B.8 Notification of the Decision

Promotion awards are officially approved by the Board of Trustees at their winter meeting, which typically occurs in late February. (Section C.4 describes how the recommendation from COAP is passed along to the Provost, who then makes the final decision that is approved by the Trustees.) The Provost typically calls each promotion nominee the day after the Board meeting to notify them about the decision. A public announcement of promotion awards usually follows within a week. New titles and salary bumps become official on July 1.

B.9 The Aftermath: What if you get turned down?

Getting turned down can seem devastating for some people. If you are not awarded promotion, this does not mean you will never get promoted to Professor of Teaching or that your work is not valued. Rather, the Provost does not believe there is enough evidence in your promotion package now to recommend promotion. However, this is only a temporary setback. Take the opportunity to gather feedback:

- As specified in the Faculty Handbook, if you are not awarded promotion, the Provost will write you a letter that outlines the strengths and weaknesses of your case and provides constructive advice for addressing weaknesses and resubmitting in the future.
- Meet with your Nominator and Advocate. Discuss the Provost's letter with them and your mentoring team and consider advice that they provide. After these meetings you can decide whether you want to reach out to the Provost for more information. When you feel ready, start mapping out a plan for addressing perceived weaknesses in the case.

Overall, don't lose hope! Many applicants get promoted on their second attempt.

If you believe that your negative promotion decision was affected by a violation of academic freedom, improper procedures, or discrimination, you may file a grievance with the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). The FRC has the power to review and require reconsideration of negative decisions based on any of those three grounds. More information can be found in the Faculty Handbook.

C.   Guidance for Nominators and Advocates

C.1 Identifying and Soliciting External Reviewers

Nominators, with input from Advocates, hold the primary responsibility for identifying and soliciting external reviewers. External Reviewers should be recognized as leaders in the candidate's field and type of scholarship. They also need to be an "arm's length" away from the candidate and should not have any other conflict of interest (e.g., Advisory Board Member, current Board of Trustees Member). If the Nominator and/or Advocate are in the same field as the candidate, generating names may be relatively easy. If the candidate is in a different field or pursues a different types of teaching and/or currency/professional growth, identifying reviewers will take more effort. Following are common strategies:

- When discussing the choice of Professional Associates with the candidate, Nominators should get a better sense of the candidate's field, professional networks, and types of impact. If the candidate suggests some external Professional Associates who are really arms-length (e.g., someone who knows the candidate but has not collaborated), Nominators can suggest that some be pursued as External Reviewers instead. However, the candidate should not directly identify External Reviewers or be told their identity.
- Consider scholars who have cited the candidate's work, authors cited by the candidate, Fellows or other types of recognized leaders in the candidate's field, and officers in the candidate's professional association(s).
- For candidates whose teaching and/or currency/professional growth involves engagement with external groups (e.g., giving workshops, doing work with industry or community groups), those clients are in a good position to report on the quality of the work and its significance and impact.
- Use a "snowball" approach: When speaking with or corresponding with potential external reviewers, ask if they have anyone else to recommend.

The official promotion policy in the Faculty Handbook states that the Nominator and Advocate identify potential external reviewers and that the Joint Committee then develops a priority list of reviewers. In practice, however, COAP recognizes that it is in the best interest of the candidate for the Nominator and Advocate to identify the most suitable external reviewers. Therefore, COAP typically delegates this responsibility to the Nominator and Advocate. Nonetheless, Nominators and Advocates should not hesitate to reach out to COAP members if they have questions about their list of potential reviewers.

COAP needs to have 5-6 letters from External Reviewers (minimum is 5), so it's best to recruit 6-8 in case someone does not come through or does not write a substantial evaluative letter. Nominators should

email or call External Reviewers to ask their willingness to review the dossier and write a letter of appraisal. This process typically needs to start by mid-May and be complete by early June (typically list is due June 1). Nominators must confirm willingness *before* providing names to the Faculty Governance Coordinator. Once the Nominator provide the names, the Faculty Governance Coordinator takes responsibility for sending the candidate's dossier and complete instructions from COAP.

Following are additional best practices for Nominators with respect to External Reviewers:

- Some department heads begin soliciting External Reviewers with informal conversations at conferences several months or up to a year in advance of an anticipated promotion nomination. For those that give verbal agreement, the department head follows up with an email or phone communication when the nomination is going forward in May.
- Give directions to External Reviewers to lessen the time it takes for them to write an effective letter: *I'm asking you because you're an expert on a, b, c. If you could focus on that, we'll find others to comment on x, y, z.*
- Follow up with External Reviewers in late July to remind them about the letter. That way if their situation has changed, there is still time to recruit someone else. In addition, this check-in can be used to inquire if there are questions about WPI's promotion criteria.
- Nominators should be prepared to discuss the qualifications of each external reviewer for meetings of the JPC in the fall.

An example email message soliciting an external reviewer can be found in the Appendices. In some cases, more letters from External Reviewers must be sought in the fall if members of the JPC feel there is insufficient information due to missing or cursory letters or if they believe the letter writers know the candidate too well. Nominators can lessen this possibility by using the best practices above.

C.2 Writing the Nomination Letter

The contents of the nominator letter need not be long (usually ~1.5-2 pages) but should summarize the reason that they believe that the candidate deserves to be promoted. The letter is often organized according to the criteria for promotion:

- A description and analysis of the quality of the **nominee's teaching**. The committee already has access to student ratings, alumni evaluations, and the teaching portfolio but welcomes any additional information on the candidate's teaching.
- A description and analysis of the quality of the **nominee's currency and professional growth.**
- A description and analysis of the **nominee's service** to the department or programs, the university, the profession, or the community. The CV should list all activities; however, this does not always provide a complete picture of the nominee's contributions to WPI.
- A description and analysis of the positive **external impact** of the nominee's teaching and/or currency and professional growth contributions.
- **Any additional information** that will be helpful to the Joint Committee in its deliberations.

Since COAP is made up of members from different disciplines, it is important to set the context of the candidate for COAP in all areas (teaching, currency and professional growth, and service) based on the best lens the Nominator has (e.g., department head, collaborator, teaching, currency, professional groth, leader, service). This can be the context for the department, the field (or subfield), the interdisciplinary nature of the work, or whatever context the Nominator is best equipped to provide. For instance, the Nominator could provide information on how the candidate's teaching and teaching strategies relate to the department or field. The Nominator could provide information on types of currency and professional growth artifacts that are important in a field. The Nominator can also provide information about the engagement in service and contributions in service to the department, institution, and profession. It is also important for COAP to understand the nature of the accomplishments and how they vary according to norms that the Nominator can provide context to (e.g., departmental norms, field norms, types of currency and professional growth). A listing of the parameters that are significant in the field but might not be apparent to COAP, such as service on study sections or advisory committees, is very helpful.

C.3 Writing the Advocate Letter

A letter by the Advocate is not required. However, a letter from the Advocate would serve to put their evaluation in the written record where the Dean and Provost may see it. Therefore, if an Advocate would like to provide a letter, COAP will happily receive and review it. The letter by the Advocate need not be long (usually ~1.5-2 pages) but should summarize the reason that they believe that the candidate deserves to be promoted. Since the Nominator will provide a complete overview of the case in their nomination letter, the Advocate may choose to do something similar or focus on the context in which they know the candidate best (e.g., teaching, scholarship, service). If the Advocate is more aware of certain aspects of the candidate's case than the nominator (e.g., area of currency, etc.), this information will be particularly helpful. What will be most important is any additional information that the Advocate believes will be helpful to the Joint Promotion Committee in its deliberations as it is important for COAP to understand the nature of the accomplishments and how they vary according to departmental norms, field norms, and types of currency and professional growth.

C.4 Joint Promotion Committee Meeting 1

During the first meeting of the Joint Promotion Committee in A-term, the Chair will highlight the promotion criteria for the position in the Faculty Handbook, remind the JPC about the issues related to biases and welcome conversation on any perceived biases related to the case, and then invite the Nominator and then the Advocate to briefly summarize the case for promotion. The committee will have read the Nominator's (required) and Advocate's (optional) letters, so there is no need to read it to the committee. Rather, the invitation serves as an opportunity for the Nominator to highlight important aspects of the case and open the wider discussion of the case. The Advocate then can amplify what the Nominator highlighted and to add any additional information they believe is important to the case. Then the committee as a whole will discuss aspects of the case in light of the promotion criteria and ask questions they have about the case. A key goal of this meeting is for the Nominator and Advocate to "translate" the nature and norms of the candidate's discipline/sub-discipline for other members of the joint committee. Members of the committee may comment on strengths and weaknesses, ask

questions, seek clarifications of missing or confusing material, or engage in conversation regarding any perceived biases related to the case. All members of the Joint Committee observe strict rules of confidentiality during all phases of the promotion review.

Following are typical issues that might arise at the first meeting and that Nominators and Advocates should be prepared to translate or explain: indicators of high quality teaching; indicators of currency; professional growth evidence; whether conference and workshop papers are important in the field; the role of undergraduate projects or graduate theses in the department; forms that teaching and/or currency/professional growth artifacts may take besides peer reviewed articles; the role of community engagement; and the independence of external reviewers.

During this discussion, the joint committee examines the strengths and weaknesses highlighted by peer reviewers and identifies contextual factors and any missing or unclear information. Gathering relevant information about contextual, missing or unclear items may reduce the potential for misinterpretation and limit the influence of implicit or explicit bias. One outcome of this meeting may be that COAP needs no more information and everyone is ready to vote. Another outcome of the meeting is that COAP needs more information and a list of action items or "homework" for the Nominator, Advocate, or Candidate. Action items might include requests for additions or clarifications to the CV, updates on the status of projects or contributions, improved organization of material (such as indicators of external impact), or requests for additional letters of reference. Depending on the requests, the Nominator and Advocate can determine who is best equipped to handle it. For some requests, the Nominator will need to contact the candidate, and the candidate should provide whatever was requested to the Executive Assistant, Faculty Governance Office before the beginning of Term B. The exception is that requests for new external letters are handled independently of the candidate, who must not be informed of the name external reviewers or the content of any letters of appraisal.

C.5 Joint Promotion Committee Meeting 2

If necessary, the joint committee meets again during Term B to make a recommendation on a nomination for promotion. The Nominator and Advocate should be prepared to report on any "homework" identified at the first meeting.

C.6 Promotion Committee Vote and Afterwards

When all members of the Joint Promotion Committee agree that there has been sufficient discussion, a vote is taken by the six voting members of the Joint Committee for or against promotion by means of a secret ballot, with the majority ruling. (Thus, four positive votes are needed for a positive recommendation, and four negative votes will result in a negative recommendation.) **The Nominator and Advocate will know the recommendation of the Joint Committee but are not allowed to share this information with the candidate.**

By the end of Term B, the Joint Promotion Committee forwards to the Provost a letter conveying the result of its vote as a unitary recommendation for or against promotion and summarizing the salient reasons for its recommendation. The letter is drafted by the "Tracker," a COAP member who is assigned for each case. The Provost may ask to meet with the Joint Committee to discuss any of its

recommendations, and must meet with the Joint Committee, including the Nominator and Advocate, in the case of potential disagreement. If necessary, this meeting usually takes place in January.

FAQ: Why does COAP provide a unitary recommendation to the Provost rather than reporting an actual vote tally? This practice is shared for all tenure and promotion recommendations that emerge from WPI faculty governance committees. While the advantages and drawbacks are debatable, the main rationale is that there is value in avoiding a "class system" of tenure and promotion (i.e., unanimous votes vs. split votes).

C.7 Checklist for Nominators and Advocates

These are the tasks that Nominators and Advocates will need to do:

- o Notify Faculty Governance Office of the nomination (Nominator) by appropriate deadline (April 15 for Department Heads; May 1st for other Nominators)
- o Provide guidance to candidate in selection of Professional Associates and preparation of dossier (Nominator & Advocate)
- o Identify and Solicit 6-7 External Reviewers by Early June (typically June 1; Nominator & Advocate)
- o Have External Reviewers provide qualifications in letter or be prepared to discuss qualifications at the first JPC Meeting in Term A. (Nominator & Advocate)
- o Friendly reminder to External Reviewers in Mid-Late July that letters are due August 15 (Nominator & Advocate)
- o Write Nomination Letter and submit to Penny Rock by August 15 (Nominator)
- o Optional: Write Advocate Letter and submit to Penny Rock by August 15 (Advocate)
- o Prepare to present the case to COAP at the first JPC meeting in Term A (Nominator & Advocate)
- o Complete homework, if requested, between Term A JPC meeting and Term B JPC meeting

D. Efforts to Value Diversity and Mitigate Bias in Faculty Evaluation

WPI is committed to fair and equitable review of promotion cases. Our policy states that "All reviewers—internal and external peers, members of promotion committees, or academic decision-makers—are reminded that implicit and explicit bias has been shown to occur in every aspect of a faculty career that is evaluated."

To enact this commitment, promotion decision makers at WPI participate in regular training about the ways in which biases and stereotypes influence information in promotion dossiers and evaluations of that information. The training also includes practice applying multiple strategies to mitigate bias. In addition, at the start of each promotion case, the chair of the Joint Promotion Committee articulates the goal to openly discuss ways in which biases might affect that case.

In an attempt to limit biases among external reviewers, the letter they receive from COAP asks them to guard against biases that might influence their evaluation.

E. Appendices

E.1 Multiple Forms of Scholarship Matrix

As stated in the Promotion Criteria: "Candidates for promotion may make contributions to the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and practice, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or the scholarship of engagement. Contributions may be in one area or across multiple areas of the continuum of scholarship. Scholarly contributions to any area or areas are valued equally by WPI."

The following descriptions and examples are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive. Things will vary by discipline, department, or academic division. Therefore, this matrix is meant to be a guide and to help people think more about each area of scholarship, rather than be a checklist.

Scholarship Area	Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
Discovery	Creation of new disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) knowledge through creative/critical thought, research, and testing that is shared with others Example: empirical research	• Publications (articles, books, policy papers, etc; may be based on theses, MQPs, IQPs) • Presentations (conferences, round tables, webinars/virtual) • Inventions and patents • Grant proposals • Creative products (e.g., exhibits and performances) • Original creations in writing or multimedia, artistic works, or new technologies • Publicly available electronic resources (e.g., software, websites, databases, etc.).	• Peer-review and acceptance of artifacts • Journal impact factors (if appropriate) • Citation index (if appropriate) • Research productivity indices • Successfully funded competitive grants • Reviews of published work (e.g., books) • Awards and honors	• Citations of work by others • Designation as an expert: guest lecturer, invited speaker, keynote address, scholarship reviewer (grants, papers, books, conferences), tenure/promotion external reviewer, expert witness • Featured performances at international, national, or regional venues • Number of views, shares, likes for online dissemination of scholarship (e.g., podcasts, videos) • Editorship of high-quality disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals • Leadership in professional organizations and duration of such leadership

Scholarship Area	Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
Integration	Critical evaluation, synthesis, analysis, integration, or interpretation of disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) research or creative work produced by others Example: literature review, meta-analysis	• Reflective essays and reviews • Translations • Popular publications • Syntheses of the literature (e.g., literature reviews, meta-analyses, theory building papers) • Products/artifacts typical of discovery and application and practice	• Reviews in newspapers for a creative work • Book talks at universities and to public audiences • Examples where colleagues from inside or outside WPI have used the scholarship • Evidence typical of discovery, application and practice, teaching and learning, and engagement.	• Evidence that others or the field have been influenced by the outcome (e.g., adoption, changes in perspectives in field; sharing materials) • Public venues to share scholarship with non-specialist/non-academic audiences • Impact/Leadership typical of discovery, application and practice, teaching and learning, and engagement
Application and Practice	Use of a scholar's disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge to address important individual, institutional, and societal problems Example: development of a technology	• Translational research • Commercialization • Start-ups • Technology transfer • Technology development (e.g., assistive, learning) • Applied research supported by industry or government (e.g., policy adaptations, program recommendations, industry/government funding) • Products/artifacts typical of discovery and engagement	• Products shared with stakeholders and open to review and critique by stakeholders and by peers • Evidence typical of discovery, integration, teaching and learning, and engagement	• Consulting related to work • Approaches, methods, and tools, adopted and assessed by an end user(s) with positive results • Impact/Leadership typical of discovery, integration, teaching and learning, and engagement

Scholarship Area	Brief Description	Products/Artifacts (work created by the candidate)	Evidence of Quality (evaluation of work created by the candidate)	Impact & Leadership (influence of work on others or the field)
Teaching and Learning	Development and improvement of pedagogical practices that are shared with others Example: development and assessment of teaching/learning practices	• Assessment and evaluation of teaching and student learning (e.g., teaching portfolio, professional development of other teachers) • Development and dissemination of instructional materials used by others to improve pedagogy and learning (e.g., syllabi, notes, manuals, books etc.) • Products/artifacts typical of discovery, integration, application and practice (e.g., learning technologies)	• Products shared with other teachers at other universities or educational institutions • External reviews of pedagogical practices • Public dissemination (e.g., podcast, summative blogpost, public science communication campaign, etc.) • Evidence typical of discovery, application and practice, and engagement	• Wide Adoption of materials and methods by others (e.g., downloads, likes, shares) • Popular (3rd party) articles • Social media hits and followers • Impact/Leadership typical of discovery, application and practice, and engagement
Engagement	Collaborative partnerships with communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources and/or transformation of communities through shared projects and research Example: Community-based programming (e.g., health assessments)	• Community-based programs that enhance curriculum, teaching and learning • Educational or public outreach programs • Partnerships with communities beyond campus to address critical societal issues, prepare educated citizens, or contribute to the public good • Publication in public scholarship venues (e.g. videos, blogs,	• Works that benefit the external community, are visible and shared with stakeholders, and are open to review and critique by community stakeholders and by peers • Sustained, mutually beneficial relationships with communities and organizations.	• Bringing to light and/or improving economic, social or environmental conditions of a community, region, agency, industry, or other sector • Generation of major gifts to endow a program • Citations or adoption of work by communities • Impact/Leadership typical of discovery, integration, application and practice, and teaching and learning.

		open access journals, digital humanities products, etc.) • Products/artifacts typical of discovery, integration, application and practice, teaching and learning	• Evidence typical of discovery, integration, application and practice, and teaching and learning.	

Note: Prepared by WPI NSF ADVANCE Adaptation Working Summer 2020 and 2019 Groups and other faculty volunteer reviewers.

A Rubric for Evaluating Teaching in Promotion Cases
WPI ADVANCE Working Group 3 – Summer 2020

Statement of need: The promotion policy directs candidates to document high quality teaching by submitting a teaching portfolio. The policy suggests general elements of the portfolio, and more detailed guidance about portfolio contents is being prepared. However, the policy does not directly communicate metrics or indicators by which portfolios would demonstrate high quality teaching. The purpose of this proposed rubric is two-fold: 1) to help candidates show evidence of high quality teaching; and 2) to guide COAP members and the Provost to apply consistent and appropriately high standards for evaluation of teaching.

Rationale and use of rubric: The promotion policy for tenured faculty identifies six standards to evaluate quality across teaching, scholarship, and service: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, Scholarship Assessed, 1997). These standards are integrated in the holistic rubric below, which is adapted from an NSF-sponsored project at the University of Kansas.

The rubric describes indicators of highest quality in each of eight dimensions of teaching. *It is not expected that a successful candidate will achieve this high standard in all dimensions or that all of the examples of strong evidence will be met. Moreover, it must be understood that some faculty members, because of their particular teaching assignments, do not have the opportunity to contribute in some areas such as project-based learning and mentoring and advising.*

The indicators should be evident from multiple sources of information: self   peers   students and alumni

Category or Dimension	Strong Evidence or Indicators of High Quality
Course goals and content *What are students expected to learn? Is content aligned with the curriculum?*	• Course goals or learning outcomes are well-articulated, appropriately challenging, and clearly connected to program or curricular goals • Content is appropriate in range and depth, related to current issues and developments in field • High quality materials, well aligned with course goals
Teaching methods and practices *How is in-class and out-of-class time used? What assessments and learning activities are used to help students learn?*	• Activities are well-planned, integrated, reflect commitment to provide meaningful assignments and assessments • Instructor uses effective, high impact, or innovative methods to foster student learning • In- and out-of-class activities provide opportunities for practice and feedback on important skills and concepts • Students show high levels of engagement

Achievement of learning outcomes *What impact do courses have on learners? What evidence shows level of achievement?*	• Assessments and standards to evaluate student work are authentic, clear, and connected to program or curriculum expectations • Instructor supports learning and success for all students • Quality of learning fosters success in other contexts (e.g., subsequent courses or projects)
Classroom climate and student perceptions *What are students' views of their learning experience? How has student feedback influenced instruction?*	• Evidence that class climate is respectful, motivating, engaging • Student feedback on instructor accessibility and interaction skills is generally positive • Students perceive they are learning important knowledge or skills • Instructor is responsive to student feedback in short-term and long-term
Reflection and commitment to professional growth in teaching *How has the instructor's teaching changed over time? What resources are used to support teaching development?*	• Regularly adjusts teaching based on reflections on student learning • Seeks and makes use of peer review of teaching • Uses pedagogical resources to support teaching development (e.g., evidence-based teaching practices, high impact practices, professional development workshops)
Project-based learning *To what extent has the instructor utilized WPI's signature pedagogy and improved in project advising?*	• Engages in IQP and/or MQP advising, advising of projects in the humanities and arts, or projects embedded in undergraduate or graduate courses and programs (department-dependent) • Makes effort to utilize institutional knowledge and practices that support effective project-based learning • Makes use of student feedback about project advising • Shows development and improvement as a project advisor over time
Mentoring and advising *How effectively has the faculty member worked individually with undergraduate or graduate students?*	(as appropriate to department and discipline) • Shows strong commitment to success, wellness, and personal/professional development of undergraduate academic advisees (e.g., number of advisees, advising/mentoring methods, student testimonials) • Shows strong commitment to success, wellness, and personal/professional development of graduate students and research trainees (e.g., rates/time to degree completion, advising/mentoring methods, student testimonials)
Commitment to diversity and inclusion *How has the candidate made efforts to support the success and inclusion of diverse students (e.g., across race, ethnicity, gender, class, ability)*	• Development of curricula and teaching/mentoring strategies are intentionally designed to enhance diversity and inclusion • Advises disproportionately high number of under-represented students • Engages in training/professional development to enhance intercultural competencies and skills and understanding of structural inequities for historically under-represented and marginalized groups

*This rubric has been reused and adapted under Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License from Follmer Greenhoot, A., Ward, D., & Bernstein, D. (2017). *Benchmarks for Teaching Effectiveness.* University of Kansas.

E.3 COAP-format CV Instructions

COAP recognizes that there are disciplinary differences in CV formatting recommendations. However, **to facilitate the review process for COAP, the Deans, and the Provost, COAP requests that promotion candidates use the following guidelines when putting their CV together for promotion review**. Some of the guidelines are required and others are recommendations that you can choose to follow or not, as indicated below. Additional categories may be added to the CV if those categories are appropriate to the form and impact of the candidate's teaching, scholarly, or service contributions. Please note that the CV is the place where candidates provide detailed information about accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. Candidates are invited and encouraged to use other areas of their promotion dossier to make arguments for the quality and impact of their work.

General Formatting Guidelines

1) Please use single space rather than 1.5 or Double Spacing throughout. (Required)
2) Please list all contributions in Reverse Chronological Order (most recent to furthest in the past). (Required)
    a. This helps those reviewing the CV see the most relevant information for the current promotion first.
3) Please number contributions that come under a heading (e.g., Publications, Presentations, etc.). (Required)
4) Bolding your name (especially in the scholarship subsection) can be helpful to reviewers (Recommended, not required)
5) Please indicate if any co-authors/contributors/presenters are graduate students or undergraduate students using some notation with indication of what your notions mean (e.g., <u>denotes</u> Graduate Student co-author; <u>denotes</u> Undergraduate co-author)
    a. COAP Recommends:
        i. <u>double underline</u>= Graduate Student
        ii. <u>single underline</u> = Undergraduate Student
6) You are welcome to include information on your CV that will help individuals not in your field understand your contributions (e.g., journal impact factor, journal ranking, conference acceptance rates, course evaluation numbers). You may also provide some of this information in a separate document (e.g., Citation Index, Teaching Evaluation Summary). (Recommended, but not required)
7) If an area of the required formatting is not applicable to you/your discipline, you can indicate that by putting "N/A" under that section. COAP recognizes that not every area listed will be applicable to every candidate (e.g., HUA Sufficiency's, Patents, Theses, etc.).

<div align="center"><strong style="color:red">CV Order (Required)</div>

Professional Experience

1. Education (in reverse chronological order)

2. Teaching experience at WPI or other universities (in reverse chronological order)

- o Please make sure it is clear when the last promotion occurred (if applicable)
3. Work experience other than teaching (in reverse chronological order)

Teaching

4. Teaching innovations at WPI

- o You are welcome to include a short paragraph addressing teaching innovations (Recommended, but not required)

5. Courses taught at WPI (organized in a table)

- o Please organize by course, listing the terms or semesters in which each course was offered.
- o Please provide: Title of the Course, Term Taught, Enrollment, and summary evaluations for Q1 and Q2 on the WPI course report. (Required)

6. Projects, Theses and Dissertations

- o Please list and number each Humanities Project/Sufficiency, IQP, MQP, Thesis, and/or Dissertation (Required)
- o Please organize this section based on the type of project (Required)
    - ▪ e.g., Use a subheading called "Major Qualifying Project (MQP)" and list all the MQPs under this subheading).
- o Please indicate if you advised, co-advised, or consulted each project listed (Required)
    - ▪ You could also organize by the role played
        - • e.g., using subheaders: MQPs Advised; MQPs Co-Advised; MQPs Consulted).
- o Please list all student names, co-advisor names, and sponsor (if applicable) for each project (Required)
    - ▪ For example: Student, A., Student, B., & Student C. (Academic Year of Project). *Title of Project*. Co-Advisors: Faculty A. Sponsor: X.
- o Since your CV will go out to outside of WPI, you may wish to define IQP and MQP on your CV. Here are a few examples of how you could explain these projects on your CV:
    - ▪ MQPs: These projects are required of all graduating undergraduates and are equivalent to a senior honors thesis at other institutions. The projects take two-thirds to the entire school year to complete and are equivalent to three or four courses (credit wise).
    - ▪ IQPs: This society-oriented project is a degree requirement for undergraduates and typically completed in the junior year. It can be completed off-campus or on-campus. It is equivalent to three or four courses (credit-wise).

7. Independent studies conducted at WPI

- o Please provide: Term ISP was conducted, Title of ISP, Names of Students Involved.
- o Please indicate if the ISP served as a Minor Capstone (if applicable)
- o Please organize in a meaningful way (e.g., Academic Year, Title of ISP, Minor Capstones,

etc.).

8. Academic advising at WPI

- Please list the number of academic advisees each year at WPI.
- You do **not** need to list the names of each advisee.

9. Honors, awards and recognition related to teaching

- Please list any honors, awards, or recognitions you have received related to teaching.

Scholarship/Currency

Please note: COAP recognizes multiple forms of scholarship. COAP also recognizes that some areas listed under scholarship may be more or less applicable to different fields and types of scholarship. COAP has tried to be as inclusive as possible. If some area does not apply to you, please indicate that with an "N/A". If something important is missing, please add that category and feel free to reach out to a member of COAP for clarification.

10. List of publications or scholarly contributions (includes exhibits, performances)

- You may divide the list into appropriate groups, such as: Books, Book Chapters, Journal Articles, Conference Proceedings, Reviews, Translations, Other Publications, etc. (Recommended)
- Please arrange these groups in the CV by **listing the most important categories of scholarly publication or dissemination in the candidate's field first**, followed by other categories in *descending order of importance* for this field, discipline, or area of expertise. (Required)
- Numbering each contribution and bolding your name is helpful for reviewers (Recommended)
- Please include the full reference, all author names and in the original order. (Required)
  - E.g., Author, A., Author B., & Author C., (YEAR). Title of Publication. Book/Journal/Conference, volume, page numbers.
- Please make sure your subheadings indicate what is peer-reviewed and what is not peer-reviewed. (Required)
  - E.g., Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceedings, Invited Talked (Not Peer-Reviewed)
- If authorship works in a particular way in your field, you may want to note that at the beginning of the section.
  - e.g., First authorship indicates the lead author on the entire project.
- For any publications, if you'd like to include information on the quality of the venue (e.g., journal impact factor), you can.
  - If not provided in the CV, the it needs to be provided somewhere else in your dossier.

11. Presentations at conferences, seminars, colloquia, and public audiences

- You may divide the list into appropriate groups, such as: Oral Presentations, Poster Presentations, Book Talks, Community Outreach, etc.

- Numbering each contribution and bolding your name is helpful for reviewers (Recommended)
- Please include the full reference, all presenter names and in the original order. (Required)
  - Be sure to indicate if any co-authors are graduate or undergraduate students
  - E.g., Presenter, A., Presenter B., & Presenter C., (YEAR). Title of Presentation. Conference/Organization, Location.
- Use subheadings to clarify which presentations are peer-reviewed and which are not. (Required)
- If available and applicable, you are welcome to provide acceptance rates for conferences (Recommended if readily available).

12. Public Scholarship Artifacts

- Please provide any scholarly works that are available online, to non-academic audiences, in specific communities, or in more popular press areas.
- This may be especially pertinent for scholarship of integration, application and practice, teaching and learning, and/or engagement.
- This can include things like: popular publications (e.g., op eds), dissemination of instructional materials, dissemination of teaching and learning assessment tools, software, websites, blogs, databases, podcasts, videos, digital humanities projects, Educational, Community, or Public Outreach Programs etc.).
- You may divide the list into appropriate groups as needed
- You may provide indicators of impact such as number of views, shares, likes, etc.

13. Scholarship in progress, including manuscripts submitted, in press, or in preparation

14. Fellowships and grants—Awarded, Pending, & Denied

- Please provide information on all fellowships and grants that are awarded, currently pending, or applied for but not received.
- Please indicate your role (PI, co-PI, Senior Personnel, Consultant, etc.) and include the name of all other PIs and Co-PIs (including where they are).
- Please indicate the sponsor, dates, and amounts of award or request.
  - For multiple PI/co-PI awards indicate level of contribution to the proposal and level of effort under the award

15. Post-doctoral advising, including dates of supervision and current position of advisees, if known

16. Patents awarded or pending

17. Consulting and/or Sustained Partnerships

- Provide any information on any consulting projects related to scholarship
- Provide any information on sustained partnerships with key stakeholders (e.g., communities).

18. Other Items

- Includes: start-ups, software packages developed, policy adaptations, approaches,

methods, and/or tools adopted and/or assessed by others, generation of major gifts to endow programs, etc.

19. Honors, awards and recognition related to scholarship/creativity

Service

* If you hold a leadership role in any of these categories, please indicate what that role was (e.g., Committee Chair and dates.. If you did significant work in any service area clarify what that work entailed (e.g., led committee, wrote motion, etc.).

20. Service to WPI

    o   Use subheadings to identify the type of WPI service
        o   E.g., Administrative Leadership, Campus-Wide, Department
    o   Include dates served and indicate any leadership roles (e.g., Chair, Secretary, etc.)
    o   Example activities: Faculty Search Committees, Staff Search Committees, Administrator Search Committees, Ad hoc task forces, University Committees, Departmental/Program Committees, Special Events (panels, workshops, open houses, etc.), Insight Advising; WPI Faculty Mentoring Programs, Advisor to student clubs, Greek life, academic groups, Accreditation activities, Professional Association Letter Writing, Student Recommendation/Reference Letter Writers.

21. Service to Profession

    o   Use Subheadings to identify the type of Professional Service
        o   E.g., Memberships and offices held in professional societies, letter writing (e.g., External Reviewer), Ad hoc taskforces/committees in professional societies, etc.
    o   Include dates served and any leadership roles

22. Conference organization, editorial and referee services

    o   Use subheadings to identify activity
    o   Example Activities: Journal/Conference/Grant Reviewer, Organizer of conference, workshop, symposia, panels, Chair/Discussant for Conference Session, Editor or Editorial Board positions,
    o   Please clarify role for conference organization positions as chairing a session may mean different things (e.g., showing up versus running session).

23. Non-academic contributions to student welfare

    o   Example Activities: career guidance, graduate school guidance, informal mentoring/social support for students, student recruitment, advisor to student organization
    o   Please clarify role in activity.

24. Significant civic, cultural, religious, and similar contributions

    o   Example Activities: volunteer work for community, pro bono consulting, volunteer services to community
    o   Please clarify role in activity.

25. Honors, awards and recognition for service

Other

26. Other jobs and experiences

    o   If there are any other jobs or experiences that you believe are important to note, you can put those here.

E.3 COAP-format CV Template

CV TEMPLATE

First Name Last Name

(CV in required format for WPI promotion)

100 Institute Road

SSPS Department, WPI

Worcester, MA 01609

508-831-XXX

xxxx@wpi.edu

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1. **Education**
   Degree School, Field, Year

   Dissertation/Thesis: *Title*

   Advisor: First Name Last Name

   Degree School, Field, Year

   Dissertation/Thesis: *Title*

   Advisor: First Name Last Name

2. **Teaching Experience**
   Rank/Position, Worcester Polytechnic Institute   YEAR-Present

   Example:

   Assistant Professor of XXX, Worcester Polytechnic Institute   YEAR-YEAR

   *See Section 5 for Courses

3. **Work Experience Other than Teaching**
   Activity   *Employer,* City, State YEAR-YEAR

TEACHING

4. **Teaching Innovations (See also Teaching Portfolio)**
   - Innovation   YEAR
     You can provide a brief (paragraph) narrative of teaching innovations here if you'd like. You can elaborate on this in your teaching portfolio.

5. **Courses Taught at WPI**

Course Number	Course Name	Term/Semester Taught	Enrollment (# Students)	Evaluation (# respondents)	Q1 Mean	Q2 Mean
XXX XXXX	XXXXXXX	Fall XXXX	~XX	XX	X.X	X.X
		C XXXX	~XX	XX	X.X	X.X
AAA AAAA	AAAAA	A XXXX	~AA	XX	A.A	A.A
		D XXXX	~AA	XX	A.A	A.A

6. **Projects, Theses, and Dissertations Advised**

Major Qualifying Projects (MQPs)

   These projects are required of all graduating undergraduates and are equivalent to a senior honors thesis at other institutions. The projects take two-thirds to the entire school year to complete and are equivalent to three or four courses (credit wise).

   1. Student Last Name, First Initial. (Academic Year). Title. Role (Advised/Co-Advised).

   2. Student, K. & Student, J. (2022-2023). *Title.* Co-advised with First Name Last Name.

   3. Student, L. (2021-2022). *Title.* Co-advised with First Name Last Name (Institution).
         *Winner of Provost's MQP Award in XXX Department

   4. Student, L. (2021-2022). *Title* Advised.

Interactive Qualifying Projects (IQPs)

   This society-oriented project is a degree requirement for undergraduates and typically completed in

the junior year. It can be completed off-campus or on-campus. It is equivalent to three or four courses (credit-wise).

1. Student Last Name, First Initial. (Academic Year). Title. Role (Advised/Co-Advised).

2. Student, K. & Student, J. (2022-2023). *Title.* Co-advised with First Name Last Name.

3. Student, K. & Student, J. (2022-2023). *Title.* Advised

4. Student, X., Student, Y., Student Z., Student, A. (YEAR). *Titles* Co-Advised with First Name Last Name. XXXX Project Center.

Dissertations

1. Student Last Name, First Initial. (Academic Year). Title. Role (Advised/Committee Member/Quals).
2. Student, M. (YEAR). Title. Ph.D Candidate in Discipline. Committee Member.
3. Student, A. (year). Title. M.S. (other Masers these degree) in discipline. Indicate advisor or Committee member.

7. **Independent Studies Conducted at WPI**

ISP Number	ISP Name	Term/Semester	Enrollment (# Students)	Additional Notes
XXX XXXX	XXXXXXX	D XXXX	1	Minor Capstone
XXX XXXX	XXXXXXX	D XXXX	1	
XXX XXXX	XXXXXXX	D XXXX	1	

8. **Academic Advising at WPI**
    YEAR   Number Field Majors and Minors

    2021-2022   XX Field Majors and Minors

9. **Honors, Awards, and Other Recognition Related to Teaching**

Teaching Awards

1. Name of Award (YEAR).

Teaching Award Nominations

1. Nominated for Name of Award (YEAR).

Teaching Honors

1. Teaching Honor

Invited Presentations Related to Teaching or Advising

1. Last Name, First Initial. (Month YEAR). *Title*. Location Given.

2. Last Name, First Initial. & Last Name, First Initial. (Month YEAR). *Title*. Location Given.

SCHOLARSHIP/CURRENCY

10. **Publications: Peer-Reviewed** (*Denotes authors contributed equally; <u>double underline</u>= Graduate Student Co-Author; <u>single underline</u> = Undergraduate Student Co-Author)

   Note: This section is for accepted, in press, or published articles, not preprints (they come later).

Journal Articles

1. **Last Name 1, First Initial 1**., <u>Last Name 2, First Initial</u>. (YEAR). Title of article. *Title of Journal*. Volume, Number, pages. DOI (if available).

2. <u>Last Name 1, First Initial 1</u>., **Last Name 2, First Initial**. (YEAR). Title of article. *Title of Journal*. Volume, Number, pages. DOI (if available).

3. *Last Name 1, First Initial 1., ***Last Name 2, First Initial**. (YEAR). Title of article. *Title of Journal*. Volume, Number, pages. DOI (if available).

Book Chapters

1. **Last Name 1, First Initial 1**., Last Name 2, First Initial. (YEAR). Title of chapter. In X. X. Last name, Last Name, X, (Eds). *Title of Book*. City, State/Country: Publisher.

Conference Proceedings

1. **Last Name 1, First Initial 1.,** <u>Last Name 2, First Initial</u>. (YEAR). Title of article. In *Title of Conference*. DOI (if available).

Op-Ed

1. Last Name, First Initial., Last Name 2, First Initials, & **Last, First Initial.** (Month XX, YEAR). Title of op-ed. *Title of Journal. Website URL (if available)*

11. Presentations at Conferences, Seminars, and Colloquia (*Denotes authors contributed equally; <u>double underline</u>= Graduate Student Co-Author; <u>single underline</u> = Undergraduate Student Co-Author)

Conference Presentations: Peer-Reviewed

Symposium Chaired or Co-Chaired

    1. **Last, First Initial.** (Month Year). Title of symposium. Symposium presented at the YEAR *Title of Conference*, Location.

Oral Presentations

    1. **Last Name, First Initials.** & <u>Last Name2, First Initial2</u>. (Month Year). Title of presentation. Presented at the YEAR *Title of Conference*, Location.

Poster Presentations

    1. **Last Name, First Initials &** <u>Last Name2, First Initial2</u> (Month Year). Title of presentation. Presented at the YEAR *Title of Conference*, Location.

Invited Presentations Related to Scholarship

    1.   **Last, First Initials.** (Month YEAR). *Title of Presentation*.

12. Public Scholarship Artifacts
    List scholarly works available online and to non-academic audiences

13. Scholarship in Progress (*Denotes authors contributed equally; <u>double underline</u>= Graduate Student Co-Author; <u>single underline</u> = Undergraduate Student Co-Author)

Manuscripts Currently Invited to Revise and Resubmit

    1. <u>Last, First Initials</u>., Last, First Initials., <u>Last, X. X</u>., & **Last, A. B. M.** (revise and resubmit). Title of article/chapter.

Manuscripts Currently Under Review and Preprints

    1. <u>Last, First Initials</u>., Last, First Initials., <u>Last, X. X</u>., & **Last, A. B. M.** (revise and resubmit). Title of article/chapter.

Manuscripts In Preparation

    1. <u>Last, First Initials</u>., Last, First Initials., <u>Last, X. X</u>., & **Last, A. B. M.** (revise and resubmit). Title of article/chapter.

14. Fellowships and Grants—Awarded, Pending, and Denied (*Denotes authors contributed equally; <u>double underline</u>= Graduate Student Co-Author; <u>single underline</u> = Undergraduate Student Co-Author)

Awarded Grants as PI or Co-PI

1. Funding Agency (Year-Year). *Title of Grant*. **X. Last** (PI, Institutions) & Y. Last (Co-PI, Institution). $X,XXX.

Awarded Grants as Research Faculty, Consultant, Advisory Board, or Other Role

1. Funding Agency (Year-Year). *Title of Grant*. X. Last (PI, Institution), Y. Last2 (Co-PI, Institution), & Z. Last (Co-PI, Institution). $XXX,XXX.
   a. **A. Last (Advisory Board)**.

2. Funding Agency (Year-Year). *Title of Grant*. A. Last (PI, Institution), B. Last (Co-PI, Institution), C. Last (Co-PI, Institution), D. Last (Co-PI, Institution), E. Last (Co-PI, Institution), F. Last (Sr. Pers.), & **G. Last** (Sr. Pers.), $X,XXX.

Pending Grants

1. Funding Agency (Year-Year). *Title of Grant*. **X. Last** (PI, Institutions) & Y. Last (Co-PI, Institution). Submitted Month Year. $X,XXX.

Grants In Preparation

1. Funding Agency (Year-Year). *Title of Grant*. **X. Last** (PI, Institutions) & Y. Last (Co-PI, Institution). $X,XXX.

Submitted but Not Funded Grants

1. Funding Agency (Year-Year). *Title of Grant*. **X. Last** (PI, Institutions) & Y. Last (Co-PI, Institution). $X,XXX.

15. Post-doctoral advising

1. Last Name, First Name (Dates of Supervision). Current position (if known)

16. Patents

List both awarded patents and provisional patent applications.

17. Consulting

XXX Consultant. Self-Employed. Worcester, MA.   YEAR-present

YYY Consultant. Organization Work For. City, State.   2016-Present

18. Other Items

Include items such as start-ups, software packages developed, policy adaptations, approaches, methods, and/or tools adopted and/or assessed by others, generation of major gifts to endow programs, etc.

19. Honors, Awards, and Recognition Related to Scholarship/Creativity
Awards

Awarded Title of Award (YEAR)
Nominated for the Title of Award (YEAR)

Press Coverage of Scholarship

1. Last, B. (Month XX, Year). Title of Article. *Title of Media Outlet.* Website (if available)

SERVICE

20. WPI Administrative Leadership & Committee Assignments (Department or Campus-Wide)

WPI Administrative Leadership

Title of Service	Year-Year
Name of Committee	Year-Year

Campus-Wide Service

Title of Service	Year-Year
Title of Committee	Year-Year

   *Co-Chair XXXX-XXXX

Department Service

Title of Service	Year-Year
Title of Committee	Year-Year

   *Co-Chair XXXX-XXXX

21. Profession Service

    Title of Service   Year-Year

    Name of Organization   Year-Year

    Role (Year-Year)

Professional Society Memberships and Offices

    Professional Society Name (Year-Year); indicate if you serve in any society office.

21. Conference Organization, Editorial, & Referee Services
    Conference Organization

    Fall YEAR   Hosted Name of Organization Conference (Location)

    Spring YEAR   Organized XXX Session at Name of Conference (Location)

    Editorial Positions

    Year-Year   Name of Journal Editorial Board.

    Journal Manuscript Reviewer

    Year-Year   Journal1, Journal2, Journal3

    Grant Proposal Reviewer

    YEAR   Funding Agency

    Conference Reviewer

    YEAR   Name of Conference

22. Non-Academic Contributions to Student Welfare
    Title of Service   Year-Year

    Title of Service   Year-Year

23. Significant Civic, Cultural, Religious, and Similar Contributions
    Title of Service   Year-Year
      Short description if needed.

24.   Honors, Awards, & Recognition for Service

OTHER

25. **Other Jobs & Experiences**

If there are any other jobs or experiences that you believe are important to note, you can put those here.

E.5 For Nominators and Advocates: Example email soliciting an External Reviewer

Dear XXXX,

I am reaching out because you have been identified as an expert in your field, and I was hoping you would be willing to serve as an external reviewer for the promotion case of Dr. XXX XXXX. Dr. XXX XXX is under review for promotion from Associate to Full Professor of Teaching at Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Based on your area of expertise, your insights would be particularly helpful for this case.

I appreciate your consideration of this request to serve as an External Reviewer. I also understand that serving as an External Reviewer involves a great deal of your time, and that you may not be able to invest that time at the current time. If you have mentored or collaborated with Dr. XXX XXX then you are not eligible to serve as an External Reviewer, and I ask that you let me know so we can find someone else. If you are unavailable at the current time, but know someone else who may be a good fit, I'd appreciate if you could send me that name and contact information.

Reviews are due on August 15, XXXX.

Please let me know if you are willing to serve as an external reviewer by XXX. If you are able, then you will receive an official letter from our Faculty Governance Office. It will provide you with specific instructions for the review, along with the candidate's dossier. It will also be helpful if you can provide some information either in your letter or as an appendix of your qualification so that our promotions committee can see those qualifications.

Thank you in advance for considering this request. I look forward to hearing from you by XXXX.

Sincerely,

E.6 Letter sent to External Reviewers by COAP

NOTE: THIS LETTER IS A TEMPLATE FROM PREVIOUS YEARS. THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE GETS UPDATED.

Dear Professor,

Thank you for agreeing to assist WPI's Committee on Appointments and Promotions in reviewing a candidate for promotion. **Professor _____** has been nominated for promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching. Since the purpose of the review is to maintain outstanding faculty at WPI, the committee would appreciate your assessment of the degree to which the candidate has met WPI's promotion criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor.

For promotion to Professor of Teaching, WPI expects high quality teaching, continued professional growth and currency, and service. For promotion to Full Professor of Teaching, WPI also expects that a candidate has established a record of teaching contributions and currency that demonstrates a positive external impact beyond WPI. In addition, WPI expects candidates to engage in service in the department, the institution, the profession, and/or their local/regional communities. At the end of this letter is a copy of the criteria for promotion to Full Professor of Teaching. In addition to WPI's criteria, we are also providing you with the candidate's curriculum vitae, personal statement, currency artifacts, rubric to evaluate teaching portfolios, multiple forms of scholarship matrix (if applicable), and a matrix of service indicators.

As you conduct your review, please take into account the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the candidate's teaching, currency/professional growth and/or service from 2020-2022.

The committee is not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, but rather to share your opinions about the degree to which the candidate has met WPI's promotion criteria. Since all members of the committee will have reviewed the candidate's dossier, we are looking for more than a summary of the dossier. Specifically, we believe that you can help us understand the quality and external impact of the candidate's professional contributions, particularly in the area of teaching and/or currency/professional growth. In other words, what the committee is particularly interested in hearing from you is an assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions to their disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) field.

In your letter, please also describe any professional relationship you have had (or now have) with the candidate. We would also appreciate a short one-page version of your current C.V., or a 1-2 paragraph bio-sketch so we can better understand your areas of expertise.

The committee appreciates your participation and looks forward to receiving your letter by **August 15, XXXX**, Please email your letter and one-page CV/short bio-sketch to Penny J. Rock, Faculty Governance Executive Assistant, at prock@wpi.edu. The candidate is not aware of your participation in the review process and the information you provide will never be shared with the candidate.

Yours sincerely,

Chair, Committee on Appointments and Promotions

E.7 Letter sent to Professional Associates by COAP

NOTE: THIS LETTER IS A TEMPLATE FROM PREVIOUS YEARS. THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE GETs UPDATED.

Dear Professor,

Thank you for agreeing to assist WPI's Committee on Appointments and Promotions. Professor _____ has been nominated for promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching. Since the purpose of the review is to maintain outstanding faculty at WPI, the Committee would appreciate your assessment of the degree to which the candidate has met WPI's promotion criteria for the rank of Professor of Teaching based on your professional interactions with the candidate.

For promotion to Professor of Teaching, WPI expects high quality teaching, continued professional growth and currency, and service. For promotion to Full Professor of Teaching, WPI also expects that a candidate has established a record of teaching contributions and currency that demonstrates a positive external impact beyond WPI. In addition, WPI expects candidates to engage in service in the department, the institution, the profession, and/or their local/regional communities. At the end of this letter is a copy of the criteria for promotion to Full Professor of Teaching. In addition to WPI's criteria, we are also providing you with the candidate's curriculum vitae, personal statement, currency artifacts, rubric to evaluate teaching portfolios, multiple forms of scholarship matrix (if applicable), and a matrix of service indicators.

As you conduct your review, please take into account the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the candidate's teaching, currency/professional growth and/or service from 2020-2022.

The committee is not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, but rather to share your opinions about the degree to which the candidate has met WPI's promotion criteria based on your professional interactions with the candidate. Since the committee will review the candidate's dossier, we are looking for more than a summary of the dossier. Rather, the committee is particularly interested in hearing from about the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions to areas of teaching, currency/professional growth, and/or service based on the efforts or activities in which you were personally involved. You do not need to comment on all areas of the criteria (teaching, currency and professional growth, and service). Instead, we welcome comments on whatever areas are most relevant to your review based on your professional interactions with the candidate as this will provide context and will be very helpful to the committee. Please describe the professional relationship that you have had (or now have) with the candidate in your letter. It will also be helpful for the committee if you include a one-page version of your curriculum vitae or a 1-2 paragraph bio-sketch.

Although the candidate, having selected you as a Professional Associate, is aware of your involvement of the review process, the information you provide will never be shared with the candidate. Thus, the information you provide is confidential.

The committee appreciates your participation and looks forward to receiving your letter by **August 15, XXXX**. Please email your letter and one-page CV/short bio-sketch to Penny J. Rock, Faculty Governance Executive Assistant, at prock@wpi.edu.

Yours sincerely,

Chair, Committee on Appointments and Promotions

E.8 Survey sent by Faculty Governance Coordinator to former students

Promotion review for: **XXXX**
XXXX WPI Faculty Web page can be found here: **XXX**

We would like your input on **XXXX**, who is a candidate for promotion. One of the criteria for promotion at WPI is high-quality teaching.

According to WPI's records, **XXXX** taught or advised one of your courses or projects. We would appreciate hearing your views of the candidate's teaching or advising via this survey. Written comments are particularly helpful. We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion. Rather, we are asking you to share your opinions about the candidate's strengths and weaknesses based on your experiences with them (either in the classroom or through project advising).

The information you provide is anonymous and will be kept strictly confidential. Your name is not linked with your response and **XXXXXX** will never see the information you provide or know you responded.

Please complete the survey by August 1, XXXX

1. Please indicate which course or project you took with Prof. XX

2. My overall rating of their teaching/advising is: (1 = Poor/Low Rating; 5 = Excellent/Very High Rating)

3. In addition to your overall rating, we would like to learn about your perceptions of the overall classroom/advising climate (e.g., respectful, motivating, engaging) and the accessibility of the faculty member during your time working with them.

4. How would you rate the classroom/advising climate and accessibility of the faculty member? (1 = Poor/Low Rating; 5 = Excellent/Very High Rating)

5. Now we would like you to think about your learning experience with this faculty member in terms of what you learned, the importance of that knowledge/skills and how the faculty member engaged you in that learning (e.g., methods and assessments used).

6. What was your learning experience like with the faculty member? (1 = Poor/Low Rating; 5 = Excellent/Very High Rating)

7. Based on your experiences with this faculty member, what were their greatest strengths in the classroom or in project advising? (open-ended)

8. Based on your experiences with this faculty member, what were their greatest weaknesses in the classroom or in project advising? (open-ended)

9. What did you learn from this faculty member that has been the most useful or memorable for you? (open-ended)

Thank you for taking the time to provide your insights. Your input will be very helpful to us. We also want to remind you that your responses are completely anonymous and cannot be linked to your name

and that the candidate will never see your responses or know that you have responded. Thank you again for your time and insights!

Guide to Sample Promotion Dossiers

Since the sample dossiers are large, we will not paste them into this guide. If you would like view them, please view them on the WPI ADVANCE Canvas page: https://canvas.wpi.edu/courses/14049/pages/promotions-to-full-professor?module_item_id=361208

The examples were selected and solicited by two members of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) serving on the WPI ADVANCE TTT working group in Summer 2019. Do not share these examples with anyone outside WPI without direct permission from the relevant Professor.

The set of dossiers was chosen specifically to show a range of scholarly contributions across the domains of discovery, application and practice, teaching and learning, integration, and engagement. The policy language is included, with passages highlighted to show language important to COAP and how the scholarly contributions of particular candidates aligned with the expectations.

Important notes:

- Guidance and expectations for promotion may change over time. All candidates are encouraged to attend annual meetings presented by COAP to stay up-to-date on the most current guidance and to solicit feedback from their nominator and advocate as they are preparing their promotion package.

- All policy language is taken from the Faculty Handbook, which is linked at the bottom of the [Faculty Governance website](#).

B. Criteria for Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty

ii. Criteria for Promotion to (full) Professor of Teaching

Professors of Teaching make a variety of contributions as educators, innovators, and leaders that advance WPI's educational mission and visibility.

The specific categories of performance in the (full) Professor of Teaching rank and track are teaching practice; continuing professional growth and currency; and service. The candidate for promotion to full Professor of Teaching should demonstrate continuing high-quality teaching practice with significant impact on students as well as a record of contributions and professional growth and currency that includes creative pedagogical approaches within the context of their discipline or beyond and that demonstrates a positive external impact beyond WPI as appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise. The standards for promotion to full Professor of Teaching are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching, with the expectation of continued contributions that demonstrate a positive external impact beyond WPI since becoming an Associate Professor of Teaching. Contributions to WPI may demonstrate an external impact if they are disseminated and/or recognized externally. In

most cases, the high-quality and positive external impact of contributions must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable experts external to WPI.

The definitions of the primary areas of teaching practice, continuing professional growth and currency, and service along with guidelines for documenting these are detailed in the Tenure Criteria for the Associate and (full) Professor of Teaching (see Tenure, Section 3.b) and in the Guidance for Documenting and Assessing Activities Toward Tenure for Professors of Teaching (see Tenure, Section 3.c).

Regardless of rank, the Professor of Teaching track emphasizes the professional growth and currency of each faculty member, especially when it advances the candidate's teaching and/or discipline more broadly and contributes to WPI's educational mission and visibility. Professional growth and currency include but are not limited to experimenting and exploring for the purpose of innovative teaching (as described in Tenure, Section 3.b under the tenure criteria for the Associate and (full) Professor of Teaching) and/or remaining continually active as scholars through the scholarship of discovery, teaching and learning, integration, application and practice, or engagement (as defined in the broad Definition of Scholarship Used for Promotion to (full) Professor, Section 2.a.ii).

Because service and citizenship are an integral part of being a tenured faculty member at WPI, a candidate for promotion must also have established a significant record of performance in service and citizenship contributions to the program/department/school, the WPI community, the field/profession, and/or the local/regional community. WPI values both individual and collaborative work within and across the domains of teaching practice, professional growth and currency, and service.

While it is expected that these criteria describe the great majority of cases, there may be exceptional candidates whose unique contributions, while not conforming to these guidelines, are deserving of promotion.

	Example Dossiers
Scholarship of Discovery The creation or discovery of new knowledge involves creative and critical thought, research skills, the rigorous testing of researchable questions suggested by theory and practice, or active experimentation and exploration with the goal of adding to knowledge in a substantive way. The scholarship of discovery is usually **demonstrated through publication in peer -reviewed journals and books, presentations at scholarly conferences, inventions and patents, or original creation in writing or multimedia, artistic works, or new technologies**.	Dr. Agu – research grants and papers. Dr. Pins – research grants and papers.
Scholarship of Integration The scholarship of integration includes the critical evaluation, synthesis, analysis, integration, or	Dr. deWinter – Integration of humanities and interactive media and game development.

interpretation of research or creative work produced by others. It may be **disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary in nature**. When disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge is synthesized, interpreted, or connected, this integrative scholarly contribution brings new insight. **Integrative or interdisciplinary work might include articles, policy papers, reflective essays and reviews, translations, popular publications, synthesis of the literature on a topic, or textbooks. The scholarship of integration may be shared through any form such as those typical of discovery, application, teaching, or engagement.**	
Scholarship of Application and Practice Scholarship of application involves the use of a scholar's disciplinary knowledge to address important individual, institutional, and societal problems. The scholarship of application and practice might apply the knowledge, techniques, or technologies of the arts and sciences, business or engineering to the benefit of individuals and groups. **This may include translational research, commercialization, start-ups, technology transfer, assistive technologies, learning technologies, or applied research supported by industrial or corporate partners or by government agencies.** Contributions to the scholarship of application and practice are shared with stakeholders and open to review and critique by stakeholders and by peers.	Dr. Agu – research has resulted in applications that are used by people.
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning The scholarship of teaching and learning is **the development and improvement of pedagogical practices that are shared with others.** Effective teachers engage in scholarly teaching activity when they undertake assessment and evaluation to promote improvement in their own teaching and in student learning. Scholarly teaching activity becomes the scholarship of teaching and learning when **faculty members make their teaching public, so that it can be reviewed, critiqued and built on by others, through publications, presentations or other forms of dissemination**.	Dr. Vaz – He or Center has been hired by 111 different colleges, universities, and higher education organizations to consult on matters related to undergraduate education, including curriculum reform, global learning, integrative learning, and institutional change.

Dr. Wobbe – Book on GPS (first year experience), conference papers and advising other institutions on the experience and practice. |
| **Scholarship of Engagement** The scholarship of engagement involves **collaborative partnerships with communities (local, regional, state, national, or global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources**. Examples of | Dr. Vaz – project center has outreach and broad impact on other universities and teachers. |

the scholarship of engagement might include, but are not limited to: **community-based programs that enhance WPI's curriculum, teaching and learning; educational or public outreach programs; other partnerships with communities beyond the campus to address critical societal issues, prepare educated citizens, or contribute to the public good**. Contributions in the scholarship of engagement are of **benefit to the external community, visible and shared with stakeholders, and open to review and critique by community stakeholders and by peers**.	

E.10 Service Matrix

Evidence of Citizenship and Service Contributions (C&SC)

Below is a table that represents different areas in which faculty can show evidence of engaged citizenship and contribute to service. It provides examples of what these contributions might look like. It also provides suggestions for how to identify or measure the impact of these contributions. The table is meant to be a starting point and guide for faculty.

The Committee of Appointments and Promotions (COAP) recognizes that citizenship and service may come in one or more of these contribution areas. COAP also recognizes that there is a difference between the quantity of contributions and the quality of contributions. While COAP anticipates many candidates for promotion will have service contributions in more than one area, it does not expect faculty to contribute to all contribution areas. COAP also recognizes that citizenship and service contributions (including impact) may come in different forms than those listed below.

COAP recommends that faculty discuss with their Department Head and/or Program Director and any department promotion committee and/or mentoring teams their service contributions, including the quantity, quality, and impact of these contributions in relation to promotion and professional goals and growth.

C&S Contribution Area	Examples of Citizenship and Service Contributions	Impacts/Measures of Citizenship and Service Contributions
To Home Department, Program, and/or School	• New Faculty Search Committees • Staff Search Committees • Ad hoc Department/Program/School Task forces • Departmental or Program Committees – curriculum, accreditation, UG, G, Tenure Committee, PhD Committee, etc. • Special events for student and student organizations in schools/departments – e.g., panels, dinners, workshops, open houses/recruitment • Program Directors	• New faculty/staff are hired successfully • Recommendations from Ad hoc Department/Program/School Task forces and Committees are made, considered and (sometimes) adopted • Evidence of leadership activity, e.g., Chair, Liaison, Coordinator, Voluntary "beyond the call of duty" contributions • Departmental service awards • Program initiatives created, number of students enrolled, etc.
To WPI Community	• Campus-wide Search Committees – for DHs, administrators, senior staff	• New administrators and senior staff are hired successfully

54

	• Ad hoc University-wide Task forces • University-wide Committees – COG, CTAF, COAP, FAP, CAP, etc. • University Panels, e.g., NFO, STEM Faculty Launch • Insight Advising program • WPI Mentoring Program (New Faculty, Associate Faculty, Mutual Mentoring) • Advisor to student clubs, fraternities/sororities, academic groups • Service to accreditation and quality of life at WPI, e.g., ABET, AACSB, AAUP, honorary societies	• Recommendations from Ad hoc University-wide Task forces are made, considered, and (maybe) adopted • University-wide Committees complete their work • Evidence of leadership activity, e.g., Chair, Liaison, Coordinator, Voluntary "beyond the call of duty" contributions • Trustee's service awards
To Field/Profession	• Journal/Conference reviewer (for papers, workshops, symposia) • Organizer of conferences, conference workshops, symposia, panels • Chair/discussant in conference sessions • Journal Editor, Associate Editor or member of journal editorial board • Memberships and leadership roles in professional groups and societies • Invited member to ad hoc Task forces in one's professional societies and groups	• Recognition or awards for journal/conference reviewing • Size and quality of conference, conference sessions, panels, workshops. • Journal impact factor (as a measure of journal quality) • Recognition from professional groups and societies • Being asked to serve field/profession repeatedly and in different capacities • Leadership roles in conferences, professional societies, task forces
To Local/Regional Community	• Volunteer work in support of the local community, e.g., schools, social service agencies, community-building organizations, other kinds of organizations	• Contributions are valued by community organizations – testimonials provided • Long term engagement with organization and repeated invitations to work together

	• Pro bono consulting and assistance to people and agencies in local community • Work in local government (e.g., serve on town committee)	• Contributions to community are measurable and recognizable

Prepared by ADVANCE Working Group, Summer 2020 and updated and endorsed by COAP Spring 2023.