Informational Community Meeting Tenured & Tenure Track

Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP)

Adapted From Faculty Handbook & Prior COAP Informational Meetings

Welcome!

Congrats on considering going up for promotion!

The purpose of this presentation is to help:
- **Candidates** understand what they will need to put together their promotional package.
- **Nominators** and **Advocates** understand their roles in the promotion process.

Resource Guides

- **COAP website:**
https://www.wpi.edu/offices/faculty-governance/coap

- **Contains:**
  - Guide for Promotion for TRT faculty
  - Guide for Promotion for TTT faculty
  - Scholarship Matrix for Multiple Forms of Scholarship
  - COAP format for CVs
  - Rubric for Evaluating Teaching and Teaching Portfolios

COAP Responsibilities

COAP reviews dossiers following the WPI *Faculty Handbook* criteria and makes **unitary recommendations** to Provost on:

Promotion:

- TTT: *Associate* to *Full* Professor and Professor of Teaching tracks
- TRT: *Assistant* to *Associate*; *Associate* to *Full* Teaching Professor and Research Professor tracks

COAP's role: Support faculty promotion when the dossier, reviewers, nominator, and advocate provide evidence that promotion in rank has been earned.

Reappointment reviews: Professor of Practice (PoP)

Initial Appointments (new hires): Above *Assistant* rank, any track, and PoP (expedited, no JPC)

COAP also facilitates Department Head Reviews and Search Committees

Question Procedure

Questions can be made through chat or by raising hand

We will stop periodically for questions & there will be time at the end for Q&A.

Overview of Presentation

1. Promotion Schedule
2. Promotion Criteria
3. Promotion Dossiers & Procedures
4. COAP
5. FAQs

TTT Promotion Schedule

April 15: Initial email nomination alert to Faculty Governance Coordinator from **Nominator**

May 1: Deadline for the **Candidate** to provide:

> * Name of **Advocate**

> * List of 6 Professional Associates

June 1: **Nominator** & **Advocate** submit list with brief bio of invited <u>External Reviewers</u> to JPC

June 15: **Candidate** submits promotion dossier to Faculty Governance

Summer: Faculty Governance

> * Sends to Professional Associates / External Reviewers a cover letter, candidate's dossier, and promotion criteria

> * Solicits student evaluations from former students and alumni

Aug 15: Deadline for all letters: External Reviewers, Professional Associates, **Nominator**, & **Advocate**

Mid-Late Aug: Faculty Governance Coordinator notifies:

> **Candidate** of any missing Professional Associate letters for candidate to follow up.

> **Nominator** and **Advocate** of any missing External Review letters.

Beginning of A & B terms: Candidate submits any dossier updates (if any)

A/B/C Terms: JPC Reviews, makes recommendation

Beginning of C Term: Decision made and announced

Questions about Promotion Schedule

?

Overview of Presentation

1. Promotion Schedule
2. **Promotion Criteria**
   - **Faculty Handbook:
     Part Two: Policies & Procedures:
     Section 1.D. – TTT**
3. Promotion Dossiers & Procedures
4. COAP
5. FAQs

Criteria for Promotion

Faculty Handbook, Part Two Section 1.D.:

Normally at least five years as *Associate* Professor & at least 3 years as *Associate* Professor at WPI

- High-quality teaching
- High-quality scholarship/creativity
  - Must demonstrate positive external impact beyond WPI
  - Must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people external to WPI
  - Contributions to WPI may demonstrate external impact if disseminated & recognized externally.
- Service at an appropriate level
  - Critical responsibility of tenured faculty

Going Up Early

Associate → (_Full_) Professor

- Earlier promotion nomination "only in exceptional circumstances"

- Must demonstrate considerable professional growth

- **Nominator** needs to explain the exceptional circumstances and professional growth in nomination letter

Assistant → _Associate_ Professor

- Usually tenure & promotion together via CTAF & Joint Tenure Committee

- Earlier promotion via COAP & JPC possible "only in exceptional circumstances"

- _Not covered in today's presentation_

Questions about Promotion Criteria

?

Overview of Presentation

1. Promotion Schedule
2. Promotion Criteria
3. **Promotion Dossiers & Procedures**
4. COAP
5. FAQs

Materials Collected by Faculty Governance Coordinator

1. Summary student ratings for courses

2. Teaching evaluations from former students and alumni

3. Letters of appraisal from Professional Associates and External Reviewers

4. Other material may be gathered by JPC if needed (usually through the **Nominator**)

Materials Provided by Candidate

1. Names of **Advocate** (and confirm **Nominator**) (by **May 1**)
2. Names of 6 Professional Associates (by **May 1**)
3. Promotion Dossier (by **June 15**)
    - CV (use COAP's suggested format)
    - Personal Statement: Reflections on Teaching, Research, Service, Future Plans (10 Pages Max, Double Spaced)
    - Teaching Portfolio
      - Reflective Statement on teaching and measure of effectiveness (4-6 pages double spaced)
      - Entire portfolio should not exceed 50 pages (including narrative)
    - External Impact Report
    - Sample Scholarly Artifacts (select 3)
4. Any important dossier updates, if any, at beginning of A and/or B terms

Dossier must provide evidence of High-Quality Teaching, High-Quality Research, External Impact, Service at appropriate level

Nominator & Advocate

Nominator

- Normally the Department Head *OR* another tenured *Full* Professor
- Provides initial statement of nomination (**April 15**)
- Writes detailed letter of nomination (**Aug 15**)
- Identifies External Reviewers with advocate (**June 1**)
- Makes 5–10-minute summary presentation to JPC
- Gathers additional material if necessary

Advocate

- Typically, has more subject area expertise than nominator
- May write a letter in support of promotion
- Identifies External Reviewers with nominator
- Makes 5-minute summary presentation to JPC
- Functions to clarify and advocate on behalf of candidate
- Works with nominator to gather additional material if necessary

Professional Associate

- **Candidate** selects 6 Professional Associates by **May 1**
  - Must include Internal and External **peers**
  - Make sure person agrees to write letter prior to submitting their name
- Faculty Governance Coordinator will send Professional Associates Cover Letter, Criteria, and Dossier in Late June
  - If letter does not arrive by **Aug 15**, candidate will be notified so they can follow up with the person
- Professional Associate Selection Tips:
  - Should know the candidate and write a substantive letter
  - Should be able to provide insights into teaching, scholarship, or service
  - Possible People to Ask:
    - Collaborators, Project Co-Advisors, Co-Teachers or Peer Evaluators, Colleague in Professional Association/Community, etc.

External Reviewers

- External Reviewers are "arms-length" reviewers
  - No conflicts of interests or close personal ties to the candidate
    - such as co-author, co-PI, co-advisor, former advisor etc.
  - Appraise candidates' professional achievements
  - Do not make recommendations for/against promotion

- Must be able to judge the candidate's dossier

- Should have high recognition in field
  - Typically *Full* (or equal to *Full*) rank

- Nominator and Advocate identify External Reviewers (by early-mid June)
  - Should contact individuals prior to submitting their names to Faculty Governance Office

- Faculty Governance Coordinator will send Professional Associates Cover Letter, Criteria, and Dossier in Late June
  - If letter does not arrive by Aug 15, nominator and advocate will be notified so they can follow up with the person

- JPC *must receive* 5-6 acceptable (e.g., no perceived COIs) External Reviewer letters

- Candidate must not know who was asked or agreed to review, & must not contact

Teaching Portfolio

- Purpose:
  - provide balanced, critical reflection on strengths, challenges, and future areas of growth for teaching and advising

- Contents:
  - Reflective Statement on approach to teaching/learning and presentation of multiple measures of effectiveness (4-6 pages double spaced)
  - Teaching artifacts/materials
    - Sample syllabi
    - Key assignments or assessments
    - Project advising materials
    - Examples of student work
    - Peer review outcomes

Assessing Quality of Teaching

- COAP will consider:
  - Course Goals & Content
  - Teaching Methods and Practices
  - Achievement of Learning Outcomes
  - Classroom Climate & Student Perceptions
  - Reflection & Commitment to Personal Growth in Teaching
  - Project Based Learning
  - Mentoring & Advising
  - Commitment to Diversity & Inclusion

Potential Indicators of Teaching Quality

Examples for informational purpose (not all items are required):

- **Peer Teaching Evaluations**
- Syllabi Samples
- Examples of Key <u>Assignments</u>
- Examples of Key <u>Assessments</u>
- Examples of Classroom Activities or Projects
- Examples of Innovative and/or Evidence Based Teaching Practices
- Examples of Student Engagement
- Examples of MQPs, IQPs, Inquiry Seminars, Practicum, Theses, other projects
- **Course Evaluations & Alumni Survey of Teaching**
- Project Evaluations
- Project Center Development/Leadership
- Examples of Mentoring & Advising Practices
- Examples of Curriculum, Teaching, or Mentoring Strategies designed for diversity & Inclusion
- Curriculum and/or Course Development
- Teaching-Related Awards

Scholarship

- Scholarship is *public*, *available* to members of the scholarly community, and amenable to *review* and *critique* by peers
- COAP recognizes that scholarship comes in forms:
  - Application & Practice
    - Using knowledge to address important problems
  - Discovery
    - Creation of new knowledge
  - Engagement
    - Collaborative partnerships with communities
  - Integration
    - Critical analysis, synthesis, integration, or interpretation of work produced by others
  - Teaching & Learning
    - Development & improvement of pedagogical practices

Assessing Quality of Scholarship

- COAP will consider:
  - Record of scholarly activities and outcomes
    - Since Last Promotion, Since Time at WPI, & Cumulative
  - Type(s) of scholarship engaged in
    - Can be one or multiple forms
  - External dissemination
  - Evidence of positive external impact beyond WPI
  - Recognition of scholarly impact by peers at WPI, external peers, & knowledgeable experts

Potential Indicators of Scholarship Quality

Examples for informational purpose (not all items are required):

- Sample Scholarly Artifacts
- Alt-Metrics
- Awards & Honors
- Books and Book Chapters
- Citation Index (if appropriate)
- Exhibitions & Performances
- Funded Grant Proposals
- Invited Talks, including Book Talks
- Patents
- Peer-Reviewed Publications
- Products shared with stakeholders, communities, teachers, universities (and open to review and critique)
- Public dissemination (podcasts, blogs, etc.)
- Quality of Journals, Book Publishers, Art/Music Venues
- Reviews of Published Work, Creative Work
- Sustained relationships with communities and organizations

Potential Indicators of Scholarship Impact

Examples for informational purpose (not all items are required):

- Bringing to light and/or improving conditions of a community, agency, etc.
- Citations
- Designation as an Expert
    – Invited Speakers, Keynote Addresses, Scholarship Reviewer, Expert Witness in Court Cases
- Editorial positions
- Evidence others influenced by scholarship
    – Adoption of practice/technology/tool, change in perspectives, etc.; Adoption of work in communities
- External Reviewer Evaluations
- External Consulting Roles (based on scholarship expertise)
- Featured Performances
- Generation of major gifts to endow a program
- Leadership in professional organizations
- Number of Views, Shares, Likes, etc. for online dissemination
- Policy Development, Protocols, Market Implementation
- Post-docs, graduate students, undergraduate research leadership
- Press and Media Coverage
- Self-assessment and critical reflection of one's own contributions

Examples of Service

Faculty Handbook, Part Two Section 7.F.:

Service to Department
Department committees MQP area coordinators
Faculty & Staff recruitment Seminar series participation & coordination
Special Events Organizer Program Director

Service to WPI
Campus-wide committees Outreach
Student welfare Student Club Advising
Faculty mentoring Accreditation Committees

Service to Profession
Editor, Referee, Reviewer Committees/Panels
Conference Organizer Professional society membership
Chair/Discussant

Local Civic Engagement
School participation Government or NGO committees
Local non-profit activities Advocacy
Pro-bono Consulting Volunteering Efforts

Potential Indicators of Service Contributions

Examples for informational purpose (not all items are required):

- Awards and Honors

- Being asked to serve in a field/role repeatedly and in different capacities

- Evidence of leadership activity (e.g., Chair of Committee; Lead Professional Society)

- Evidence of assistance in the completion of committee work

- Long term engagement with organization

- Initiatives created

- New faculty/staff/administrators hired successfully

- Recognition of contributions to community, professional groups, etc.,

- Recommendations from committee/task force are made, considered, and/or adopted

Questions about Promotion Dossiers & Procedures

?

Overview of Presentation

1. Promotion Schedule
2. Promotion Criteria
3. Promotion Dossiers & Procedures
4. COAP
    - **Faculty Handbook:
      Part One: Constitution/Bylaws:
      Bylaw 1.VI**
5. FAQs

Joint Promotion Committee (JPC)

8-member **Joint Promotion Committee** is formed for each promotion case

6 Elected COAP Members, Voting

COAP members are recused or excused for conflict of interest

Nominator & **Advocate**, Non-voting, chosen by **Candidate**

Nominator: Normally Department Head or tenured *Full* Professor,

Provides a detailed letter of nomination, Presents case for promotion

Advocate: Normally full-time faculty member with subject area expertise

Interprets and advocates on candidate's behalf, can provide a letter.

COAP Recusal Policy

Automatic if candidate and COAP member are from the same department or program

For direct conflict of interest (collaborator – grants, publications, courses, for example)

If 2 (or more) COAP members recused, most recent qualified past Chair(s) of COAP serves on JPC

COAP Membership

Current Members

Germano Iannacchione (PH), Chair 2022
John Sullivan (ME), Secretary, 2024
Jeanine Skorinko (SSPS), 2023
Sarah Strauss (DIGS), 2023
Brigitte Servatius (MA), 2022
Ali Rangwala (FPE), 2022
Susan Zhou (CHE), 2024

Incoming Members

3 TBD

Faculty Governance Coordinator

Penny Rock (not a member)

Eligibility

7 elected faculty at _Professor_ rank.

3-year terms, unless a replacement.

No successive elected terms.

No department or program is represented twice.

Ineligible:

- Department Heads
- Deans
- Provost

TTT Promotion Procedure

Joint Promotion Committee (JPC) Deliberations

  All committee members must be present

  Discuss criteria and remind about biases prior to discussions on case

  Discuss candidate dossier and any updates or additional information.

Voting Procedures

  If ready to vote, vote by secret ballot:

  Only COAP members vote (**Nominator** & **Advocate** do not vote)

  Secretary counts the **6 ballots** until either **4 Yes** votes (majority), or **3 No** votes are seen.

  This determines the **unitary recommendation** <u>for</u> or <u>against</u> promotion

  If not ready to vote, schedule another meeting with JPC and gather more information either

  from **Candidate**, **Nominator**, and/or **Advocate**

Recommendation Goes to Provost for Final Decision

  COAP sends a letter to Dean and Provost conveying its recommendation and summarizing the salient reasons and justification (signed by entire JPC)

  Provost reviews dossier and JPC analysis

  Provost consults with Dean and President

  <u>Provost must meet with JPC in cases of disagreement</u>

  Provost sends positive promotion recommendations only to the Board of Trustees (APC) for approval at the next BoT meeting

  Following the Board meeting, candidates are notified officially by the Provost

Questions about COAP

?

FAQ: Eligibility

Is it necessary to be in rank for 5 years before being considered for promotion?

No. However, it is rare that an associate professor can demonstrate "considerable professional growth" (Section D.2.2) in a much shorter period.

Emphasis is placed on work done while at WPI. Consideration of the candidate's record prior to joining WPI is by special arrangement.

Thus, COAP looks at both the <u>cumulative</u> contributions, including before tenure, as well as a record of continuing high-quality teaching and research since tenure.

FAQ: Professional Associates

How many Professional Associates should be on my list?

COAP will ask for 6. These must include a mixture of colleagues at WPI and at other institutions.

Why should I have letters from colleagues at WPI?

Letters from colleagues at WPI help to demonstrate the candidate has met the criteria for promotion across teaching, scholarship, and service.

Am I allowed to view the Professional Associates' letters?

No. All letters received are confidential; the candidates should <u>not</u> ask associates to see the letters after they agree to write.

Do I provide material to my Professional Associates?

Not required. Faculty Governance sends a cover letter and electronic copies of the criteria and the promotion dossier to all reviewers. If the candidate wishes to make more material available, put it online, with links in the dossier, so that all peer reviewers have access.

FAQ: External Reviewers

Am I allowed to view the External Reviewer List?

No. The candidate may provide a list of people <u>not</u> to ask, with an explanation. The candidate should not be asked to suggest names for external reviewers.

What will the External Reviewers see?

Cover letter, the promotion criteria, and the candidate's promotion dossier — including the teaching portfolio and 3 sample scholarly artifacts. If the candidate wishes to make more material available, put it online, with links in the dossier, so that all peer reviewers have access.

How many External Reviewers are there?

At least 5 letters must be <u>received</u> from qualified external reviewers

FAQ: External Reviewers

What are External Reviewers asked to provide?

An independent critical assessment of the candidate's contributions to, and standing in, the professional community; the quality of the scholarly artifacts; and the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

"We would appreciate receiving a letter from you that summarizes the nature of your professional relationship with the candidate, if any, and appraises the candidate's professional achievements. We are not asking you to make a recommendation for or against promotion, and we ask you <u>not</u> to speculate about whether the candidate might be promoted at another institution. Rather, we would like you to share with us your assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses."

FAQ: External Reviewers

Who does what with the reviewers?

The candidate contacts Professional Associates to ask if they are willing to write a letter; purpose is an honest appraisal.

The Joint Promotion Committee, including the Nominator and Advocate, identifies and contacts External Reviewers.

The Faculty Governance Office (Penny Rock) sends all peer reviewers a cover letter and electronic copies of the promotion criteria, and the candidates' dossier — including the candidate's sample scholarly artifacts.

Reminders to peer reviewers for late letters should come <u>only</u> from the Faculty Governance Office or members of the Joint Promotion Committee.

FAQ: Dossier Scholarly Artifacts

What are sample scholarly artifacts?

For most candidates, the sample scholarly artifacts will be 3 peer-reviewed articles that have been published since tenure and/or promotion. A candidate might substitute a book or other artifacts

Scholarly contributions may be documented and disseminated through a variety of artifacts besides peer-reviewed articles

Sample scholarly artifacts must be publicly available, amenable to critical appraisal, and in a form that permits exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community.

FAQ: Dossier Scholarly Artifacts

My main scholarly artifact is a book. Will COAP buy copies of my book for all the reviewers?

No. The candidate is responsible for providing electronic copies of all the material for the promotion dossier. If a scholarly artifact is best presented through a hard-copy (a book or something else), then the candidate is responsible for providing a sufficient number of hard copies of the artifact for all of the peer reviewers (Professional Associates and External Reviewers) as well as several copies for the Joint Promotion Committee.

FAQ: Scholarship/External Impact

How important is external funding?

It depends. In some areas or fields, external funding is critical to support a research program. In other areas, it is not. External funding demonstrates external recognition and impact through peer review.

What you do with funding matters more than its source.

Are you PI / Co-PI / Senior Personnel / Consultant / Advisory Board member? Some roles reflect proposal writing effort; others reflect stature in the field. PI is assumed to have greatest responsibility for proposals. However, Co-PIs might have made equally significant contributions. **Ensure that your role is clear.**

Is external funding more important than the number of publications? PhD students? citations? patents? new commercial enterprises? exhibitions? sales of computer games? other indicators? Any indicators are contextual to each case.

FAQ: External Impact

How is external impact assessed?

According to the criteria (section D.1.4), external impact should be assessed based on the relevant standards in the areas of the candidate's scholarly contributions. The candidate's personal statement should identify the area or areas of their scholarly contributions across teaching, scholarship, and service and indicate examples of external impact beyond WPI.

While quantitative measures such as the number of refereed publications and citations or the level of external funding will remain important indicators of quality and impact for many scholars, WPI recognizes that the weight assigned to such measures varies widely between academic fields as well as along the continuum of scholarship.

FAQ: External Impact

May I use Altmetrics to measure impact?

Yes. Candidates should provide whatever evidence of external impact is appropriate for their case. If an article or teaching module is among the most read or downloaded at a journal or repository, say so.

What are Altmetrics?

An alternative or supplement to indicators such as citations, journal impact factors, h-index, other indices. Ask librarians.

FAQ: More

What if I don't get promoted?

A letter from the Provost should provide constructive advice to the candidate so that they may address any issues and resubmit the case for promotion consideration in the future.

Usually wait 2-3 years, then you may be nominated again.

Discuss strategy with your Department Head and department promotions committee

Questions?

Germano Iannacchione

Chair until June 30, 2022

gsiannac@wpi.edu

Penny Rock

Faculty Governance Coordinator

prock@wpi.edu

COAP website
https://www.wpi.edu/offices/faculty-governance/coap

On behalf of COAP, thank you for all that you do to make WPI great!