Report of the Task Force on Academic Promotion

Peter Hansen and John McNeill, co-chairs
Dan Dougherty, Ingrid Matos-Nin, Jeannine Plummer, Reeta Rao, Pamela Weathers, Sharon Wulf
October 16, 2015

Executive Summary

This report contains the recommendations of the WPI Task Force on Academic Promotion. In summary, the Task Force proposes that WPI:

- Broaden the criteria for promotion from Associate to Full Professor
- Require that every academic department create an elected Professional Development and Promotion Committee to provide mentoring and feedback to all Tenured Faculty and to all Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty
- Modify procedures used by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) during review of promotion cases

The Task Force report provides detail below. This summary highlights several of the most important changes in promotion criteria, departmental mentoring and review, and COAP procedures.

1. To broaden the criteria for promotion from associate to full professor, we recommend revising the existing criteria for promotion from Associate to Full Professor to:

> The candidate for promotion to professor should demonstrate continuing high quality contributions in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service, with a record of outstanding accomplishment in at least one of these areas. The quality and impact of these outstanding accomplishments must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people outside of WPI. The candidate for promotion will submit a portfolio representative of their overall career, with an emphasis on their work since tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

2. We recommend that every department will be required to have an elected Professional Development and Promotion Committee. This committee will meet periodically with all Tenured Faculty and with all Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty, to discuss their professional development, on the following schedule:

- Associate Professors: 3 years after tenure a meeting to discuss a mid-career plan, and between 5-10 years after tenure a meeting to discuss professional development and promotion
- Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: 5 years after initial appointment to discuss professional development and promotion, and every 5-10 years thereafter
- Tenured Full Professors: 10 years after promotion to full professor or after the last Professional Development Review

The purpose of these meetings is to provide mentoring for professional development and advice on nomination for promotion; they are not performance reviews. The departmental Professional Development and Promotion Committees will play an advisory role for mid-career associate professors,

for continuing non-tenure track faculty, and for senior faculty similar to the role played by the department tenure committees for probationary faculty. This process will replace the "Review of Tenured Faculty" in the Faculty Handbook.

3. We recommend that WPI adopt a number of modifications to the procedures used by COAP during its review of a case for promotion.

- Election to COAP
    - We propose that elections for COAP membership be run by the Committee on Governance (COG) with a nominating ballot in a manner consistent with elections for COG and for the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom
- A Recusal Process for COAP
    - We propose that COAP articulate criteria for recusal and procedures for implementing a recusal process
- Composition of COAP
    - To accommodate recusal, we propose that the size of COAP be enlarged by one elected member, and that policies be established for determining which six committee members participate in each case
- COAP's recommendation letter
    - We propose that the COAP letter to the Provost, with its recommendation for or against promotion, should be addressed to the candidate as well as to the Provost, and that this letter should be available to the candidate after the decision by the Board of Trustees
- Appeals procedure
    - We propose that a mechanism be instituted to appeal a negative decision for promotion based on procedural grounds, but not based on the merits of a case

A number of these changes will require motions to modify existing policies in the Faculty Handbook. Taken together, these changes will: provide improved clarity for the criteria, standards, and timetable for promotion; establish a uniform process for collegial mentoring in each department; and enhance the overall environment for the professional development of all full-time faculty at WPI.

The policies governing Professor of Practice appointments and review are complex and pose a unique challenges beyond the charge of this Task Force. Nevertheless, the Task Force would like to highlight the strong dissatisfaction with the current reappointment procedures expressed by many Professors of Practice in the survey of non-tenure track faculty. The Task Force recommends that COAP and COG investigate further revision or changes to the policies regarding the appointment and reappointment of Professors of Practice.

Contents

1. Task Force Charge

The Task Force on Academic Promotion was created at the initiative of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) in coordination with the Committee on Governance (COG) in January 2015 (See Appendix A). COAP proposed this Task Force in November 2014 after reviewing the results regarding promotion in a survey of WPI faculty conducted by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). These surveys indicated that three quarters of tenured faculty received no formal feedback on promotion and highlighted significant dissatisfaction with promotion among Associate Professors and among women faculty. WPI's responses to questions about promotion were below the mean for our peer group and for all institutions. COAP believed these results warranted the appointment of a task force to examine the policies and procedures for promotion and the wider professional development of faculty.

The task force was charged by COAP and COG to study aspects of promotion and to recommend improvements in the process. The Task Force was charged to address:

- Criteria and standards for promotion: content, clarity, and specificity
- Departmental policies and procedures for promotion
- COAP membership and procedures
- Promotion from associate to full professor with attention to both tenured and non-tenure track faculty
- WPI's overall process for faculty professional development

During 2015, the Task Force collected information from within WPI as well as investigated studies of promotion at other institutions. In particular, the Task Force made concerted efforts to gather information about promotion from associate professors, female faculty, department heads, and non-tenure track faculty. The Task Force also examined the wider literature on promotion for associate professors and the professional development of faculty. Many of the frustrations with academic promotion at WPI are also present at other institutions nationwide.

2. Perceptions of Promotion at WPI

WPI's COACHE Survey results are summarized in COAP's proposal for this Task Force (Appendices B and C). In addition to that survey, the task force investigated the perceptions of promotion at WPI by seeking comments from department heads, Tenured/Tenure-Track (TTT) associate professors, women faculty, and Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty including Professors of Practice (PoP). The following is a summary of comments received in the Task Force in surveys of these different groups of faculty regarding their perceptions of the promotion process at WPI.

Department Heads

The responses by Department Heads to questions about promotion in their department indicated a wide variety of policies and procedures. No university-wide policy defined department-level steps for promotion. Most departments had no policy, some had a promotion committee but no consistent policy, and only Computer Science reported a formal procedure that appeared effective. Department promotion committees, when they exist, vary widely in composition. Only two

departments have promotion committees for NTTs—one NTT promotion committee consisted of the department head and the associate head; the other was the department head, an elected member, and one member selected by the person being reviewed. Annual meetings between individual TTT or NTT faculty and Department Heads occur in most but, surprisingly, not all departments. The role of promotion in annual review meetings was described by Heads in terms that ranged from prominent to ad-hoc conversations. Many department heads hoped the Task Force would identify a uniform departmental procedure for promotion.

Associate Professors

The Task Force held two focus groups for associate professors and received additional written feedback via email. The focus groups included 14 associate professors (most in rank about 5+ years) and other feedback from faculty in rank for longer periods. Comments in the focus groups had several unifying themes: 1) unnecessary uncertainty regarding criteria, mentoring, and timing, and 2) lack of recognition for people who spend time on activities that are essential to WPI's mission. In addition, many people reported dissatisfaction with the existing promotion process.

Common areas of concern among associate professors included a need for a conversation about broadening the criteria for promotion, and a lack of clarity in the criteria in the handbook and the annual presentation by COAP. The perception on campus was that the tenure review required a balance of teaching and scholarship, but review for promotion was skewed to emphasize scholarship. Mentorship and guidance was difficult to find, and the timetable for promotion was uncertain. Finally, associate professors noted the non-uniformity of procedural details within departments for nomination, and differences in departmental representation on COAP in comparison to the CTAF process.

Women Faculty

The Task Force received email feedback in a survey of female associate professors and full professors. Responses had several unifying themes: Women are not promoted at the same rate as men; women often have a higher service load and may value teaching more; service and teaching were not valued as highly as research for promotion. In addition, common areas of concern included the breadth of the promotion criteria, inconsistent or non-existent departmental policies, COAP procedures, inadequate faculty development for associate professors and the campus culture.

Other remarks from women faculty included each of the following: A narrow interpretation of the current promotion criteria that appeared to value scholarship more highly than other areas was not consistent with breadth of WPI's mission. The criteria appear flexible but there are not many examples of someone promoted based on leadership in teaching. Departments did not have a clear guidelines, expectations or process for nomination for promotion. Department heads either provided no guidance or did not encourage promotion. Self-nominations should be possible instead of departmental nomination. COAP membership might or might not include department colleagues and selection of external letters seemed inconsistent. COAP seemed to look for weaknesses rather than identifying strengths. The focus should be on accomplishments rather than shortcomings. WPI focuses on faculty development for new faculty, but does not provide support for post-tenure mentoring or for discussion of mid-career professional development. Some people get "stuck" at associate: respondents pointed to research showing that women tend to take on more service-heavy obligations, and noted that this was true at WPI.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The Task Force solicited opinions about promotion from all Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty. Of 54 respondents, only eight (8) answered “Yes” to the question, "Is the process for NTT/Professor of Practice promotion clear and consistent?" Very few had received the criteria for NTT promotions and Professor of Practice appointments approved by the Faculty in 2014 (Appendix E). Several unifying themes emerged: academic departments needed to clarify and publicize promotion procedures for NTT/PoP faculty and the process needs to have transparency. Some thought the requirements for promotion in rank from Assistant to Associate Teaching Professor were clear, but not those from Associate to Full Teaching Professor. What does leadership mean? The process for soliciting letters of support or comments on teaching from alumni were also unclear.

Common areas of concern included a lack of feedback, unclear guidelines, department heads who did not know the policy, departmental promotion committees that existed in name only, and an overreliance on question 2 on student rating forms to evaluate teaching. The meaning of continuing professional development and the role of scholarship was unclear: if an NTT is an accomplished scholar that should count in the promotion process since such scholarship was not only a credit to them personally, but also provided recognition and visibility to WPI. NTTs also need mentors, especially for the Assistant Teaching Professors, just like TTT faculty. Promotion should result in a bump in salary.

Professors of Practice

Professors of Practice (PoP) were among the group of NTT faculty surveyed and they identified distinct issues related to evaluation for PoP reappointment. The criteria for reappointment seemed clear to some, but the lack of feedback from COAP or anyone else was a recurring theme. Faculty working toward tenure meet regularly with a group of faculty evaluating reappointment, and others have annual reviews; most PoPs do not have either. Many PoPs have no contact with anyone making decisions about their renewal. COAP may not have anyone who understands industry experience. One response mentioned the confusion that resulted from teaching in a program delivered by CPE while promotion/reappointment was administered by academic departments not vested in their professional growth. After the fifth year reappointment review, the scheduled frequency of a full review with external letters every three years for PoPs was also considered stressful and excessive.

3. Mid-Career Challenges and Mentoring

The Task Force examined the wider literature on promotion with attention to the challenges faced by associate professors and by women. (For a bibliography, see Appendix F.) Associate professors on many campuses have expressed dissatisfaction with promotion to full professor in COACHE surveys, which has led to a wide-ranging discussion in higher education and headlines that ask "why are associate professors so unhappy?"(Wilson, 2012)

The experience of associate professors is very different from probationary assistant professors. Assistant professors often have reduced teaching loads, generous start-up packages, extensive mentoring, fixed timetables, regular meetings with Department Tenure Committees, a clear focus on research and teaching, and protections from excessive service. In contrast, one study identified at least six barriers to promotion for associate professors (Buch, 2011):

1. Lack of attention to career planning by associates
2. Lack of institutional and departmental attention to and support for the career-development needs of associates
3. Lack of career-development opportunities for associates
4. Disproportionate service demands/administrative duties for associates that interfere with progress toward full
5. Lack of transparency and clarity regarding promotion criteria
6. Need for more flexible and inclusive "paths to professor" that recognize a broader range of contributions

All associate professors face these challenges, but studies have found they are more widely shared among women faculty. A "gendered gully of service" appears to pull women associate professors away from research more often than men.(Misra, 2011) Responses to these challenges might include mid-career mentoring, but also a cultural shift in which service is valued and recognized in promotion and performance reviews in accordance with its importance to the life of a university.

The Task Force recommends that WPI develop mid-career planning and mentoring for associate professors. Post-tenure, mid-career planning enables associate professors to articulate their professional goals, align them with criteria for promotion to full professor, and work with mentors to implement their plans. These mentors should include not only senior faculty, but also peers, with Associates mentoring Associates. The National Science Foundation has supported mentoring programs at the Rochester Institute of Technology, University of North Carolina Charlotte, and other institutions that could be models for WPI.

Moreover, the Task Force believes that all full-time faculty at WPI would benefit from individual development plans that articulate professional goals and provide the opportunity to work with mentors to meet them. WPI provides mentoring for probationary tenure-track faculty, but the need for mentoring does not disappear after tenure, or even after promotion to full professor. Indeed, the need for mentoring extends to all full-time faculty whether they are tenure-track or non-tenure track.

Non-Tenure Track faculty encounter barriers to promotion very similar to those listed above for associate professors. In response to these challenges, NTT faculty should have opportunities to create individual development plans and to receive mentoring and feedback on their professional development

and progress towards promotion. Thus, the Task Force recommends that WPI provide resources for career mentoring to all full-time faculty.

4. Professional Development and Promotion Committees

To provide mentoring for professional development and formal advice on promotion to tenured associate professors, non-tenure track faculty, and tenured full professors, the Task Forces proposes that every department create a Professional Development and Promotion Committee. A recurring theme in comments about promotion at WPI has been the non-existent, inconsistent, or ineffective advice and procedures regarding promotion at the department level. The reviews conducted by these committees will provide clarity to the timetable for promotion, opportunities for collegial mentoring in every department, and structures to support the professional development of all full-time faculty.

A Proposal: Professional Development and Promotion Committees

Each department will have a Professional Development and Promotion Committee responsible for mentoring mid-career faculty, and for conducting 5-10 year reviews of Associate Professors, 5-10 year reviews of full-time Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty, and 10-year reviews of full Professors. The purpose of these meetings is to provide mentoring for professional development and advice about nomination for promotion; they are not performance reviews. The Professional Development and Promotion Committee plays a mentoring and advisory role for mid-career faculty, for non-tenure track faculty, and for senior faculty that is similar to the role played by department tenure committees for probationary faculty. In a small department, a single department tenure and promotion committee may serve both roles for the tenured/tenure track faculty.

The Professional Development and Promotion Committee will consist of the Department Head and three elected faculty members. The three elected members of the committee will be:

- Two tenured Associate Professors or Full Professors elected by the Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty in the department. The terms of these two members are staggered
- One Associate Teaching Professor or Full Teaching Professor elected by all of the Tenured/Tenure-Track and Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty in the department

The elected members and the department head should meet annually to establish a timetable and procedures for the Professional Development and Promotion reviews in the department. The individual committee that meets with faculty member to discuss their professional development and promotion will consist of the department head and two of the three elected members:

- for Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty: the committee will be the two elected tenured members and the department head
- for Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: the committee will be the elected Non-Tenure Track member, one of the two elected tenured members, and the department head

An elected member will serve as the chair for each individual committee.

The Professional Development and Promotion Committee will offer annually to meet with full-time faculty below the rank of full Professor to discuss their professional development and accomplishments that might lead to promotion in rank. A tenured Associate Professor will not be obliged to take advantage of this opportunity until three years after tenure. Non-Tenure Track faculty are not obliged to take advantage of the opportunity until five years after initial appointment. These meetings may be informal conversations about professional development, a discussion of a mid-career plan, or a more formal evaluation of professional development and promotion.

Mid-Career Plans for Associate Professors
During the third year after receiving tenure, the Professional Development and Promotion Committee is required to offer to meet with Associate Professors to discuss a mid-career plan for professional development. The purpose of a mid-career plan for professional development is for each Associate Professor to articulate their own post-tenure career goals, align those goals with the criteria for promotion to full professor, and set objectives or milestones that they hope to accomplish by the time of a 5-10 year review.

5-10 Year Reviews For Associate Professors
For a tenured Associate Professor, the 5-10 year review will ordinarily take place no earlier than five years and no later than 10 years after tenure. In exceptional circumstances, such as someone who spent their full probationary period at the rank of Associate Professor or someone who experienced unusually rapid professional advancement, a candidate may request an earlier review, but even in such cases a formal 5-10 year review would not be advised until at least three years after tenure. The timing of the 5-10 year review will be chosen by the Associate Professor. The flexible time-frame for this review enables associate professors to accommodate sabbatical leaves or their own personal circumstances. If they have not scheduled a review after 10 years have elapsed since tenure, then a 5-10 year review will be scheduled at the initiative of the Professional Development and Promotion Committee.

The 5-10 review for Associate Professors has a dual purpose: to provide mentoring and advice for professional development and to consider whether the candidate should be nominated for promotion to full professor. This review should normally take place before the end of C term in the year it occurs.

During a 5-10 year review, each Associate Professor will submit a curriculum vitae and personal statement summarizing their contributions in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service, as well as other documentation of their accomplishments for evaluation by the Professional Development and Promotion Committee. The committee will not solicit letters of recommendation but a list of references should be provided. Any evidence that mid-career faculty can provide to demonstrate external recognition will bolster a case for promotion to full professor. The candidate may choose to make their material available to all faculty in the department. Faculty with a joint appointment, or who participate in interdisciplinary programs, also may invite comments from relevant colleagues outside the department.

Following the criteria for promotion to full professor in the Faculty Handbook, the committee will issue a written evaluation. One copy will be given to the candidate and one copy will be given to the department head. The committee will not submit its evaluation to anyone else. This letter is for

personal communication only; the faculty member has the right to use this material as he or she sees fit. The faculty member will have the right to respond to this communication. The letter from the Professional Development and Promotion Committee, in addition to describing the current strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, should indicate whether the committee recommends nomination for promotion. In some cases, the letter from the committee may form the basis of the nomination for promotion that is submitted to COAP by the Department Head.

Any associate professor in any department has the right to be nominated by another individual faculty member for promotion to full professor regardless of the contents of the committee's evaluation.

5-Year Review and 5-10 Year Reviews For Non-Tenure Track Faculty
The department Professional Development Committee is required to offer to meet with full-time Non-Tenure Track faculty below the rank of Senior Instructor, Senior Lecturer, Teaching Professor or Research Professor, during the fifth year after initial appointment. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss an individual plan for professional development. In this individual development plan, each Non-Tenure Track faculty member articulates their own career goals, aligns those goals with the criteria for promotion, and sets objectives or milestones related to promotion.

These 5-year reviews and/or 5-10 year reviews will give attention to the specific criteria expected for promotion by full-time Instructors/Lecturers, Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, Assistant Research Professors, or Associate Research Professors to the next level of rank.

The 5-10 year review may take place no earlier than five years and no later than 10 years after the last review or since the last promotion in rank. The timing of this review will be chosen by the Non-Tenure Track faculty. If they have not scheduled a review after 10 years have elapsed since the last review or last promotion, then a 5-10 year review will be scheduled at the initiative of the Professional Development and Promotion Committee.

These reviews of Non-Tenure Track faculty have a dual purpose: to provide mentoring and advice for professional development and to consider whether the candidate should be nominated for promotion in rank. This review should normally take place by the end of D term in the year it occurs.

During 5-year or 5-10 year reviews, each Non-Tenure Track faculty will submit a curriculum vitae and personal statement summarizing their contributions in the areas required for their position, such as teaching, professional development and service for teaching professors, as well as documentation of their accomplishments for evaluation by the Professional Development and Promotion Committee. The committee will not solicit letters of recommendation but a list of references should be provided. The candidate may choose to make their material available to all faculty in the department. Faculty with a joint appointment, or who participate in interdisciplinary programs, also may invite comments from relevant colleagues outside the department.

Following the criteria for Non-Tenure Track promotion in the Faculty Handbook, the committee will issue a written evaluation. One copy will be given to the candidate and one copy will be given to the department head. The committee will not submit its evaluation to anyone else. This letter is for

personal communication only; the faculty member has the right to use this material as he or she sees fit. The faculty member will have the right to respond to this communication. The letter from the Professional Development and Promotion Committee, in addition to describing the current strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, should indicate whether the committee recommends nomination for promotion. In some cases, the letter from the committee may form the basis of the nomination for promotion that is submitted to COAP by the Department Head.

10-year Reviews of Full Professors
The Professional Development and Promotion Committee is required to offer to meet with each full Professor (tenured or non-tenure track) to conduct a 10-year professional development review. The ten-year review has a singular purpose: to promote the further growth and continued professional development of senior faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creativity and service. Each professor will submit a self-evaluation, updated curriculum vitae, and any documentation of their accomplishments. The full professor may schedule the "10-year review" up to a year before or after the ten year date in order to accommodate sabbatical leaves or similar personal circumstances.

The committee will write a letter describing the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member. One copy will be given to the candidate and one copy will be given to the department head. The committee will not submit its evaluation to anyone else. This letter is for personal communication only; the faculty member has the right to use this material as he or she sees fit. The faculty member will have the right to respond to this communication. During the year in which a 10-year review takes place, the faculty member will not be required to have a separate annual review meeting with the department head.

Reporting
Each department Professional Development and Promotion Committee will send to COAP and to the Provost's Office before the end of the academic year a list of all the full-time faculty in the department by rank and by category (Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty and Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty), and the relevant number of years since either initial appointment, tenure, promotion, the last 5-10 year review, or the last 10-year review.

5. Promotion Criteria and Standards

5.1. Promotion Criteria from Associate to Full Professor

The Task Force proposes that the existing criteria and standards for promotion from Associate to Full Professor be replaced with a new set of promotion criteria. The criteria for promotion have not been modified since they were approved in 1978. The proposed criteria enable each candidate for promotion to identify their own area of outstanding accomplishment. The examples in the definitions of high-quality teaching, scholarship/creativity and service in the proposed criteria have been adapted from the examples in the current criteria for tenure, amended most recently in 2011. Below are restated the current Handbook criteria for promotion. They are then followed by our proposed changes. A summary of current nomination procedures for promotion to full professor may be found in Appendix D.

The existing criteria for promotion to full professor (Handbook 2-11)—to be deleted:

The candidate for promotion to professor should have recent accomplishments of high quality in both teaching and scholarship/creativity and should have demonstrated leadership in one of these areas. This leadership must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people outside WPI.

In addition, all candidates for promotion should have participated to some appropriate degree in activities of service to WPI.

While these criteria serve as general guidelines, outstanding candidates should not be deprived of promotion because of the uniqueness of their contribution.

To clarify the above criteria, the usual interpretations of teaching, scholarship and/or creativity, and service are included below:

Teaching includes the conduct of courses; the direction of projects and independent studies; and academic advising. In evaluating teaching qualifications, the Committee on Appointments and Promotions will consider innovations in teaching and adaptability to the needs of WPI, effectiveness as measured by students, alumni, and colleagues, and the candidate's overall impact and importance in WPI academic programs.

Scholarship and/or creativity can take many forms. It may be demonstrated, for example, by publications in respected research or scholarly journals, by non-routine presentations at meetings of professional or scholarly societies or at seminars at other colleges, or by authorship of well-regarded textbooks or monographs. Creativity may be shown, for example, by applying knowledge as a consultant or inventor, and through artistic publications, exhibitions, or productions. In evaluating this activity, the Committee will consider how it is regarded by knowledgeable peers.

Service may include, for example, active participation in Faculty or departmental governance, involvement in student affairs, officer or committee work in professional societies, and industrial or government liaison leading to support of WPI. Although not entirely separable from teaching or scholarship/creativity, there are many service activities of a semi-administrative nature. Examples of such activities would be organization of conferences or seminars, some aspects of consulting, establishing project centers, and writing proposals.

A Proposal: Promotion criteria from associate to full professor:

The candidate for promotion to professor should demonstrate continuing high quality contributions in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service, with a record of outstanding accomplishment in at least one of these areas. The quality and impact of these outstanding accomplishments must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people outside of WPI. The candidate for promotion will submit a portfolio representative of their overall career, with an emphasis on their work since tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, in each of these areas:

1. High quality teaching (undergraduate and/or graduate) is an essential (but not sufficient) requirement for promotion at WPI. The candidate's activities must demonstrate high quality contributions in teaching. This can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): student course ratings; faculty peer evaluations; teaching comments by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, and the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum; first-year student advising, academic advising and graduate theses supervised by the candidate; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses.
2. High quality scholarship and creativity is an essential (but not sufficient) requirement for promotion at WPI. The candidate's activities must demonstrate high quality contributions in scholarship and creativity. This can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles, conference papers, and/or book chapters; books; exhibitions, and performances; professional awards; citations in the professional literature; presentations at professional meetings; grant proposals and grants awarded; offices held in professional societies; journal editorships; reviews of papers and proposals; and patents.
3. High quality service is an essential (but not sufficient) requirement for promotion at WPI. The candidate's activities must demonstrate high quality contributions in service. This can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (faculty governance and ad-hoc committees, assistance to administrative offices, project center director); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination), service to the local community (board and committee membership in social service and cultural institutions, local government participation); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).

In addition to high quality in teaching, scholarship/creativity and service, promotion to full professor requires outstanding accomplishments in at least one of these areas. These criteria are flexible enough to permit multiple paths to professor. Each candidate will be evaluated on the outstanding accomplishments in the path they have chosen. Documentation submitted for evaluation by the candidate will provide evidence of high quality contributions in all three areas and identify the area(s) of their outstanding accomplishments.

5.2. Promotion Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The Task Force recommends that the promotion criteria for Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty be revised in a manner consistent with the language of the new promotion criteria, described above.

The promotion criteria for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty are distinct from the criteria for tenured/tenure-track (TTT) faculty. TTT faculty are expected to excel in teaching, scholarship/creativity and service. In contrast, NTT faculty are hired in either teaching track or research track appointments. It would be unfair to impose on NTT faculty the same expectations as TTT faculty to do high quality work in all three areas. For this reason, the current criteria for NTT promotion criteria (Appendix E) requires teaching track professors to be evaluated on high quality teaching and for research track professors to be evaluated on high quality research.

The NTT survey indicated that some NTT faculty were frustrated that their own accomplishments in research were not valued, or were excluded from consideration. The Task Force continues to hold that WPI should not impose the TTT criteria on NTT faculty; we would be doing so, for example, if WPI evaluated teaching faculty on research, or research professors on teaching. At present, it is a "bonus" if a teaching professor does research, but it is not required. The Task Force believes that should remain the case, but agrees that the current language could be revised and broadened so that varieties of professional development may be recognized.

In consequence, the Task Force recommends that WPI revise the NTT promotion criteria to invite NTT faculty to highlight professional development and service alongside high quality teaching. The forms that professional development or service may take are diverse, and the Task Force does not wish to be prescriptive or exclusive. That is, we cannot require that a particular form of professional development must be included or excluded. We recognize the substantial benefits to WPI when all full-time faculty are engaged in their own professional development throughout their career. Indeed, the Task Force hopes that the creation of Professional Development and Promotion Committees in each department (described elsewhere in this report) will foster discussion of career-long professional development among all colleagues.

The following proposal discusses the distinct criteria for teaching track appointments and for research track appointments.

A Proposal: Promotion Criteria for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty

The candidate for promotion in Continuing Non-Tenure Track appointments must demonstrate either high quality teaching or high quality research, and continuing professional development or service, as appropriate to their position at WPI.

Teaching Track Appointments
The candidate for promotion in a teaching track appointment must demonstrate high quality teaching and continuing professional development or service:

- **Instructor/Lecturer**
  The candidate for appointment to Instructor or Lecturer must have an advanced degree or equivalent experience as well as documented teaching ability.
- **Senior Instructor/Senior Lecturer**
  The candidate for promotion to Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer must have exhibited high quality teaching (undergraduate and/or graduate). The candidate must have completed at least five years as an Instructor/Lecturer.
- **Assistant Teaching Professor**
  The candidate for appointment to assistant teaching professor must possess a PhD. degree (or the highest recognized terminal degree for the discipline) and demonstrated teaching ability.
- **Associate Teaching Professor**
  The candidate for promotion to associate teaching professor must have exhibited high quality teaching (undergraduate and/or graduate). The candidate normally will have completed at least five

years as an assistant teaching professor; in exceptional circumstances, such as someone with additional years of service in equivalent titles at WPI or elsewhere, candidates may be considered for promotion after at least three years as assistant teaching professor.

- **(Full) Teaching Professor**
  The candidate for promotion to teaching professor must have outstanding accomplishments in high quality teaching. This usually requires at least five years as an associate teaching professor.

For promotion to *Senior Instructor/Lecturer*, to *Associate Teaching Professor*, or to *(Full) Teaching Professor*, the quality and impact of the candidate's high quality teaching must be recognized by peers within WPI; acknowledgement by external peers is not required but would be viewed favorably. The candidate for promotion will submit a portfolio representative of their overall career with attention to the following two areas:

1. *High quality teaching*. The candidate's activities should demonstrate high quality contributions in teaching (undergraduate or graduate). This can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): student course ratings; faculty peer evaluations; teaching evaluations by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, and the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum; first-year student advising, academic advising and graduate theses supervised by the candidate; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses.
2. *Professional development and service* is valued and considered in the promotion review. Professional development and service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): publications, presentations, proposals, exhibitions, performances, workshops; service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); service to the profession (professional societies, conferences); and service to the community.

Research Track Appointments

The candidate for a research track appointment must demonstrate high quality scholarship/creativity and continuing professional development or service as appropriate to their position at WPI.

- **Assistant Research Professor**
  The candidate for appointment to assistant research professor must possess a PhD. degree and demonstrated ability in scholarly research.
- **Associate Research Professor**
  The candidate for promotion to associate research professor must have exhibited high quality scholarship/creativity. The candidate normally will have completed at least five years as an assistant research professor; in exceptional circumstances, such as someone with additional years of service in equivalent titles at WPI or elsewhere, candidates may be considered for promotion after at least three years as assistant research professor.
- **(Full) Research Professor**
  The candidate for promotion to research professor must have outstanding accomplishments in high quality scholarship/creativity. This usually requires at least five years as an associate research professor.

For promotion to *Associate Research Professor* or *(Full) Research Professor*, the high quality or outstanding accomplishments in scholarship/creativity must be recognized by peers within WPI and by knowledgeable people outside WPI. The candidate for promotion will submit a portfolio representative of their overall career with attention to the following two areas:

1. *High quality scholarship and creativity*. This can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles, conference papers, and/or book chapters; books; exhibitions, and performances; professional awards; citations in the professional literature; presentations at professional meetings; grant proposals and grants awarded; offices held in professional societies; journal editorships; reviews of papers and proposals; work as a consultant or inventor; and patents.
2. *Professional development, service and the mentoring of research students* are valued and considered in the promotion review. Professional development and service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and research area coordinator); service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization); mentoring of research students at the undergraduate (MQP) or graduate levels might include providing feedback on research performance, demonstration of technical skills and professional dissemination skills, or advice regarding professional advancement.

6. COAP Procedures on Promotion

We recommend that WPI adopt a number of modifications to the procedures used by COAP during its review of a case for promotion.

Election to COAP

We propose that elections for COAP membership be run by the Committee on Governance (COG) with a nominating ballot in a manner consistent with elections for COG and for the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom. This should help address some of the concerns in the community about clarity in the promotions process.

A Recusal Process for COAP

At present there is no policy for recusal in COAP, nor even a traditional set of expectations or standard practices to determine when a COAP member might recuse him/herself; in recent years ad-hoc decisions for recusal have been made. We propose that COAP develop a well-defined set of criteria for recusal and procedures for implementing it. See the next item.

Composition of COAP

To accommodate recusal, we propose that the size of COAP be enlarged by one elected member, and that policies be established for determining which six of the seven committee members participate in hearing each case.

Appeals procedure
We propose that a mechanism be instituted to appeal a negative decision for promotion based on procedural grounds, but not based on the merits of a case

COAP's decision letter
We propose that the letter COAP writes to the Provost with its recommendation for or against promotion should be addressed to the candidate as well as to the Provost, and that this letter should be available to the candidate after the decision by the Board of Trustees.

- This would make the process more transparent, and it would help dispel concerns about the fairness of the process
- Such a letter could provide important feedback to the candidate in the case of a negative recommendation by COAP and a negative decision by the Provost: presumably, the letter will identify areas of weaknesses in the dossier for the candidate, so that they might improve their dossier in a future nomination for promotion. In the current system, there is an expectation that the Provost give such feedback, and we expect that to continue. However, it would be better if such an important part of the feedback process were not dependent on a single person, particularly when that person was not directly involved in the committee's deliberations.

COAP monitoring of Departmental Professional Development and Promotion Review Committees
Proposals in this report would require each departmental Professional Development and Promotion Committee to report to COAP and the Provost's Office each academic year to confirm that they held the appropriate meetings with full-time faculty. The substance of these meetings will not be reported. Each department committee would provide a list of all the tenured and non-tenure track faculty in the department, with their respective rank and the year of the most recent review.

7. Appendices

A. Charge to the Task Force

B. COAP Proposal to establish a Task Force on Academic Promotion, November 25, 2014

C. Salient results from the COACHE Survey: Report to COAP, August 27, 2014

D. Nomination Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

E. Criteria for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotions and Professor of Practice (PoP) Appointments 2014

F. Bibliography

Appendix A: Charge to the Task Force

WPI Task Force on Academic Promotion

Based on an initiative from the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, and with subsequent coordination with the Committee on Governance, a Task Force on Academic Promotion has been formed to study aspects of promotion at Worcester Polytechnic Institute and to recommend improvements in the process. The charge to this Task Force is as follows.

The Task Force will address:

- Criteria and standards for promotion: content, clarity, and specificity
- Departmental policies and procedures for promotion
- COAP membership and procedures
- Promotion from associate to full professor with attention to both tenured and non-tenure track faculty
- WPI's overall process for faculty professional development

Activities of the Task Force will include (but are not necessarily limited to) the following:

- Collect information from within WPI (e.g., COACHE survey, public meetings, focus groups, online surveys, face-to-face meetings involving all constituent groups of faculty and administrators)
- Collect information from peer institutions
- Draw conclusions on the issues to be addressed and the desired goals of an ideal promotion process
- Suggest changes as appropriate in all aspects of the faculty development and promotion processes for tenured and for non-tenure track faculty
- Exert particular effort to ascertain the views of female faculty
- Collect constituent input on those potential changes and take the results to the faculty and to administrators for action

Timeline:

- The bulk of the information gathering process will take place in spring semester 2015.
- The Task Force will consider whether it is appropriate and feasible to propose any changes before the end of academic year 2014-15, in time for some aspects of the next promotion cycle.
- The Task Force shall report back to COG and COAP with its recommendations and any specific proposals for policy changes no later than January 2016.

Task Force roster:

- Dan Dougherty, CS (Full Professor)
- Peter Hansen, HUA (Full Professor)
- Ingrid Matos-Nin, HUA (Associate Teaching Professor)
- John McNeill, ECE (Full Professor)
- Jeanine Plummer, CEE (Associate Professor)
- Reeta Rao, BBT (Associate Professor)
- Pam Weathers, BBT (Full Professor)
- Sharon Wulf, School of Business (Professor of Practice)

Appendix B: COAP Proposal to establish a Task Force on Academic Promotion

Task Force on Academic Promotion

The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) has reviewed the COACHE Survey results regarding the promotions process at WPI (See attached report dated August 27, 2014). COAP believes that these survey results warrant the appointment of a task force to examine the policies and procedures for promotion and the wider professional development of all faculty.

The COACHE survey asked about the overall reasonableness of the expectations for tenure and promotion, the clarity of the process, the criteria (what counts), the standards (performance threshold), and the body of evidence to be presented (what goes into the dossier). WPI tenure and promotion were rated very differently, absolutely and in comparison to peer groups.

- For tenure, the clarity, criteria and standards were all rated very positively, and higher than ALL of our peer cohort and among the highest nationally.
- WPI's responses to questions about promotion were below the means for our peer group and for all institutions.

For promotion, the COACHE Survey asked about clarity, criteria, and standards with two additional factors: 1) clarity about the timeframe for promotion to full professor, and 2) the department culture that encourages progress toward promotion. Among the most notable findings:

- The lowest values of WPI responses are for department culture and clarity of promotion standards. The means for reasonableness of expectations, clarity of the timeframe, and clarity of whether I will be promoted, were also below the means for our peers.
- 75 % of WPI respondents report they have received NO formal feedback on progress toward promotion to full professor; compared to 63% of peers and 72% nationally. (By contrast, 93% of WPI respondents had received formal feedback on progress toward tenure; higher than peers.)
- Ratings of promotion by women faculty are consistently much lower than by men.

Additional salient results regarding promotion in the COACHE Survey are described in the report below. However, the responses to one question should be highlighted:

- Department culture encourages promotion to full professor (% responding agree + strongly agree):
    - 39 % of faculty overall at WPI (compared to 63% of peers or 61% at all)
    - 52 % of full profs at WPI (compared to 76% at peers or 75% at all)
    - 27 % of associate profs at WPI (compared to 47% at peers or 44% at all)
    - 45 % of men at WPI (compared to 66% at peers or 66% at all)
    - 17 % of women at WPI (compared to 55% at peers or 54% of women at all)

The absence of formal feedback and low levels of satisfaction with "department culture" for promotion suggest WPI has a problem that begins long before promotion cases are considered by COAP. This is not to say that COAP's policies should not be reviewed; they should be examined and modified as appropriate. The survey data suggests the scope of the problem is much wider than COAP procedures alone. The wider dimensions of the professional development of faculty and the department culture

that encourages promotion also need to be addressed. COAP also notes with concern the ratings of promotion by female faculty.

COAP recommends the creation of a Task Force on Academic Promotion to investigate current promotion procedures and to propose appropriate changes or additional actions. The Task Force will gather additional information via public meetings, focus groups, or face-to-face meetings, as necessary. The Task Force will make proposals for specific for action before the end of the 2014-15 academic year. Some of these proposals may need to be brought to the WPI Faculty.

The Task Force will address:

- WPI's overall process for faculty professional development
- Criteria and standards for promotion: content, clarity, and specificity
- Departmental policies and procedures for promotion
- COAP membership and procedures
- Promotion from associate to full professor with particular attention to both tenured and non-tenure track faculty

COAP will play a leadership role in the process, but the working group should be broader. Thus, the task force could be appointed by COAP and the Committee on Governance (COG) jointly. This may include administrators but the Task Force is an initiative of Faculty Governance. Task Force members could include representatives of COAP, COG, associate professors, and NTT faculty members.

Activities of the Task Force:

- Inform the community of this effort, with a report incorporating much of the content of this document
- Collect information from within WPI (COACHE survey, public meetings, focus groups, online surveys, face-to-face meetings involving all constituent groups of faculty and administrators)
- Collect information from peer institutions
- Draw conclusions on the issues to be addressed and the desired goals of an ideal process
- Suggest changes as appropriate in all aspects of the faculty development and promotion processes for tenured and for non-tenure track faculty
- Exert particular effort to ascertain the views of female faculty
- Collect constituent input on those potential changes and take the results to the appropriate committees or administrators for action

COAP approved these recommendations in term A14 and COAP representatives met with COG in term B14. A joint COAP-COG Ad Hoc Committee will solicit volunteers and appoint members of this task force by the end of term B14.

November 25, 2014

Appendix C: Salient results from the COACHE Survey: Report to COAP

Peter Hansen and John Orr, August 27, 2014

The COACHE Survey reports are available in full on myWPI. This document highlights some of the salient results related to Promotion. Note: WPI responses were compared to a group of five peers (Lehigh, Purdue, RIT, University of Rochester, and Virginia Tech) as well as the overall survey pool of more than 26,000 respondents at universities nationwide.

For Tenure and Promotion, the survey asked about the overall reasonableness of the expectations for tenure or promotion, the clarity of the process, the criteria (what counts), the standards (performance threshold), and the body of evidence to be presented (what goes into the dossier). WPI tenure and promotion were rated very differently, absolutely and in comparison to peer groups.

- For Tenure policies, clarity, and reasonableness were all rated very positively—the values of WPI responses are higher than ALL of our peer cohort and among the highest nationally.

- For Promotion, WPI responses in the same categories universally fall below the means for our peer group and for all institutions.

For promotion, the COACHE Survey asks about clarity, criteria, and standards with two additional factors: 1) clarity about the timeframe for promotion to full professor, and 2) the department culture that encourages progress toward promotion

- The lowest values of the WPI means are for department culture and clarity of promotion standards. The means for reasonableness of expectations, clarity of the timeframe, and clarity of whether I will be promoted, are also below the means for our peers.
- 75 % of WPI respondents report that they have received NO formal feedback on progress toward promotion to full professor; compared to 63% of peers and 72% nationally. (By contrast, 93% of WPI respondents had received formal feedback on progress toward tenure; higher than peers.
- For full professors, the mean values are substantially higher than for associate professors at WPI. This reflects national trends, but responses from full professors at WPI remain lower than peers.
- The WPI faculty view of the reasonableness of the expectations for the accomplishments necessary to merit promotion below the peer and national means in all categories. The difference is smallest for the full professors who have experienced the entire process. Consider the comparatively low percentage answering positively (agree + strongly agree) to the statement “Generally, the expectations for promotion from associate to full professor are reasonable to me.”
    - 51 % of faculty overall at WPI (compared to 60% at peers or 67% at all)
    - 73 % of full profs at WPI (compared to 77% at peers or 80% at all)
    - 30 % of associate profs at WPI (compared to 38% at peers or 50% at all)
    - 57 % of men at WPI (compared to 63% at peers or 70% at all)
    - 30 % of women at WPI (compared to 54% at peers or 61% at all)
- Department culture encourages promotion to full professor (agree + strongly agree):
    - 39 % of faculty overall at WPI (compared to 63% of peers or 61% at all)

    - 52 % of full profs at WPI (compared to 76% at peers or 75% at all)
    - 27 % of associate profs at WPI (compared to 47% at peers or 44% at all)
    - 45 % of men at WPI (compared to 66% at peers or 66% at all)
    - 17 % of women at WPI (compared to 55% at peers or 54% of women at all)
- Clarity of promotion standards (performance thresholds) (somewhat clear + very clear):
    - 41 % of faculty overall at WPI (compared to 57% at peers or 63% at all)
    - 59 % of full profs at WPI (compared to 70% at peers or 73% at all)
    - 25 % of associate profs at WPI (compared to 42% at peers or 50% at all)
    - 47 % of men at WPI (compared to 58% at peers or 66% at all)
    - 22 % of women at WPI (compared to 55% at peers or 58% of women at all)
- Clarity of the timeframe to apply for promotion to full (somewhat clear + very clear):
    - 41 % of faculty overall at WPI (compared to 54% at peers or 57% at all)
    - 48 % of full profs at WPI (compared to 68% at peers or 70% at all)
    - 34 % of associate profs at WPI (compared to 36% at peers or 42% at all)
    - 45 % of men at WPI (compared to 57% at peers or 61% at all)
    - 26 % of women at WPI (compared to 46% at peers or 51% of women at all)
- Clarity of whether I would be promoted to full (somewhat clear + very clear):
    - 30 % of associate profs at WPI (compared to 41% at peers or 44% nation at all)
    - 34 % of men at WPI (compared to 44% at peers or 47% at all)
    - 22 % of women at WPI (compared to 36% at peers or 40% of women at all)
- Overall ratings for the clarity of the promotion process, clarity of the criteria (what things are evaluated), and clarity of the body of evidence (the dossier's content) are rated positively (somewhat clear + clear) by most faculty (>50%), but at levels that vary by rank and by gender and are also lower than our peers or the national cohort
- Ratings of all aspects of the promotion criteria and process by associate professors are lower than by full professors by a large magnitude
- Ratings of promotion by women faculty are consistently lower than by men
- 42 % of associate professors plan to submit for promotion in the next five years
- Reasons for not planning to submit for promotion are varied. At WPI, responses included lack of time/support, not interested, or planning to retire

The COACHE Survey provides the following guidance for "Findings in Context:"

For Associate Professors…

• Be cognizant of the workload that is placed on associate professors. They often find themselves suddenly buried with service, mentoring of tenure-track faculty, and more student advising, as well as more leadership/administrative duties that may actually get in the way of their continued trajectory to full.

• While the academy has provided numerous policies for assistant professors (e.g., research leave; stop-the-tenure-clock; part-time tenure-track), it has done far less for associates. Some ideas include: modified duties; leave; sabbatical planning and other workshops; workload shifts (more teaching or more research); improved communication about timing/nudge to stand for full; small grants to support mid-career faculty (e.g., matching funds, travel support); a trigger mechanism (e.g. 9th year review); and broader, more inclusive criteria.

• Provide mentors; just because a faculty member gets tenure and promoted to the associate rank does not mean that s/he no longer needs or wants a mentor.

Possible actions:

- Recommend adoption of a consistent, formal procedures in every department for the periodic review of progress of associate professors toward promotion to full professor

- Review current promotion procedures by COAP and look for ways to clarify and remove any indications that the process is in any way adversarial

- Clarify the criteria and standards for promotion to associate and to full professor. In the faculty handbook, current statements about promotion criteria are in multiple locations and could be consolidated

- Clarify and publicize the body of evidence required in a dossier for promotion to full professor. This could include expectations about publications, teaching materials, the format of the curriculum vitae, a citation index, and examples of the letters soliciting feedback on a promotion dossier that are sent to professional associates or external referees

- Since the department head will generally be the person in a significant position to offer mentoring to promotion candidates, look for ways to educate department heads about, and make them comfortable with the criteria, standards, and process for promotion to full professor

- Provide workshops or other sessions for recently tenured faculty, mid-career faculty, and/or female faculty to discuss issues related to their professional development and promotion in rank

- Consider providing specific feedback to unsuccessful candidates for promotion, possibly including the letter sent by COAP to the provost

- Since the most convincing evidence of the standards of promotion is provided by the example of those who are promoted, investigate multiple means to publicize the accomplishments of those who have been recently promoted to full professor

- Explore creative ways to promote the professional development of associate professors; these might include modified teaching duties, leaves, workload shifts, matching funds, travel grants, to enhance their professional development and prospects for promotion

Appendix D: Nomination Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

To improve the transparency in the process for promotion, the Task Force includes here an updated version of the nomination procedures currently used by COAP in the case of promotion to Full Professor:

These procedures are to be followed in considering a nomination for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member. In these procedures, COAP has provided a list of documents that are typically most relevant to each type of case; however, candidates may submit additional supporting documents at their discretion.

Calendar

April/May: Nomination by Department Heads or a member of the WPI Faculty. A Department Head must inform COAP of their intention to nominate the candidate by the last Friday in April; nominations by members of the faculty other than Department Heads must be received by COAP no later than two weeks after that date. At this stage, a statement from the Nominator of the intention to nominate is sufficient; the formal letter of nomination must be submitted by mid-August. The Candidate and the Nominator also must identify a second faculty member to serve as Advocate during the informational phase of the nomination process.

June: Deadline for receipt by COAP of supporting material from Candidates and Nominators, especially the list of Professional Associates and External Reviewers

Mid-August: Deadline for receipt of letters from the Professional Associates identified by the Candidate and the External Reviewers identified by the Nominator.

Fall: Continued receipt of letters of recommendation and/or former student evaluations. COAP review of dossiers. COAP will meet with the Nominator and Advocate in A Term, and make its recommendation to the Provost by the end of B Term.

January: Deadline for receipt of COAP recommendations to the Provost in advance of the February meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Promotion to Full Professor: information to be provided by the Candidate

The following information is to be provided by the candidate (All documentation must be submitted in electronic form to the Faculty Governance Coordinator by the specified deadline):

A. **List of Professional Associates**: A list of names and addresses of colleagues, both inside and outside of WPI, who are willing and able to comment on your qualifications in the following areas: teaching (undergraduate and graduate courses, project work and theses), scholarship/research/creativity, and service activities to the department, WPI, the profession and the community. The Committee suggests that the candidate provide each associate with a curriculum vitae and examples of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Please suggest no more than six to eight colleagues, unless the candidate feels that this number is unduly restrictive.
B. A clear **candidate statement** of past accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service, and of future plans. In this statement the candidate must identify their area of outstanding accomplishment.
C. A **curriculum vitae** which gives a summary of the candidate's academic credentials and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship/creativity and service. In order to facilitate the review process, COAP requests that all candidates supply this information in a particular order, which can be obtained from the Faculty Governance Coordinator.

D. A **teaching portfolio** or other documentation of teaching
E. A **citation index** of publications, not including self-citations.
F. **Three samples of material** (such as publications) to support the nomination's area of outstanding accomplishment. The candidate may submit additional supplemental material, but only these three items will be sent to external reviewers.

Promotion to Full Professor: information to be provided by the Nominator
The following information is to be provided by the nominator (All documentation must be submitted in electronic form to Faculty Governance Coordinator by the specified deadline):

1. **External Reviewer List**: the names and addresses of at least five recognized experts in the candidate's field. These names should not be supplied by the candidate and the candidate must not be consulted in the choice of these experts. These names should not include anyone chosen by the candidate in their list of Professional Associates. Typically this list should include authors often cited in the candidate's publications, or scholars citing the candidate in their own publications. The Committee will provide these scholars with copies of WPI's promotion criteria, the candidate's vitae and statement, and three samples of work chosen by the candidate. COAP requires that the candidate's file contain at least five External Reviewer references (in addition to the Professional Associates named by the candidate).

   The names and contact information of the External Reviewers should be provided by the Nominator. Such reviewers should be competent to judge the candidate's professional stature and accomplishments, but should have no close ties to the candidate (such as co-author or co-PI). The External Reviewers are usually at or above the promotion rank being sought. To repeat, the candidate should not be consulted in the choice of these External Reviewers.

   The nominator should contact by phone or email the potential External Reviewers to verify they are willing to provide their letter. The Faculty Governance Office will send the External Reviewers the candidate's materials only after they have agreed to provide the letter. Again, no fewer than five consenting referees should be secured in this way, and their names forwarded to the Faculty Governance Office by the specified deadline.
2. **A nomination letter** that includes:
   a. A description and analysis of the nominee's high quality teaching. The committee already has access to student and alumni ratings, but would welcome additional information on the candidate's capabilities and contributions.
   b. A description and analysis of the nominee's high quality scholarship. As noted in the Faculty Handbook, scholarship/creativity can assume many different forms. If the nominee has accomplished creative work or scholarship other than refereed publications please provide additional documentation and evaluation. As with teaching quality, please describe the manner in which any additional evaluations were made.
   c. A description and analysis of the nominee's high quality service to the department, university, profession or community. COAP will have a list of committees on which the nominee has served; however, this does not always provide a complete picture of the value of the nominee to WPI. Please document any additional information that will be helpful to COAP in its deliberations.

For this nomination to be of assistance to the Committee, the letter must deal with items of substance. Reasons why you believe the candidate should be promoted must be clearly stated.

Please note that the Nominator and an Advocate (another faculty member chosen by the Candidate) will meet with the Committee in A Term to provide input to the informational phase of the review by COAP. Both the Nominator and the Advocate should be prepared for that meeting. The candidate's file, containing the complete dossier and all letters of recommendation from Professional Associates as well as External Reviewers, will be available for review by the Nominator and Advocate in the Office of Faculty Governance.

Provided by Faculty Governance Coordinator:

The Faculty Governance Coordinator (FGC) collects the summary student course ratings for all courses taught by the candidate in the last five years. In addition, the FGC sends invitations to comment on the candidate's promotion to the following:

- External Reviewers: sends the candidate's material (statement, c.v., and three samples of material chosen by the candidate) and WPI's promotion criteria
- Professional Associates: sends WPI's promotion criteria
- Alumni: sends a teaching survey to a random selection of alumni whom the candidate has taught in the last five years (the survey has several rating items and space for comments)

The Faculty Governance Coordinator will make available to COAP as well as the Nominator and Advocate all of the materials returned in response to these invitations, as well as all material submitted by the candidate.

Procedural Summary

During the early summer, COAP will contact the Professional Associates named by the candidate to send copies of WPI's promotion criteria. However, the candidate is responsible for sending to Professional Associates copies of the c.v., candidate's statement, and another other material. At the same time, COAP will contact the External Reviewers (those who agreed to review the dossier when contacted by the nominator), who are asked to provide further information and independent evaluations. External reviewers will be sent a copy of the promotion criteria, c.v., candidate's statement, and three samples of material chosen by the candidate.

The *informational phase* continues in A Term. COAP's dossier for each candidate will consist of all material submitted by the candidate, student course ratings from the last five years and anonymous alumni surveys of former students collected by the Faculty Governance Coordinator, as well as the letters submitted by Professional Associates and External Reviewers.

COAP will meet during A Term with the Nominator and Advocate to discuss the candidate's dossier. The nominator and advocate present the candidate in his or her best light, pointing out their outstanding accomplishments, and providing discipline-specific context for this particular case for promotion. COAP members may ask questions or ask for clarification or missing material prior to entering the deliberative phase.

The A Term meeting might result in a list of action items for the Nominator. These action items could include requests for additions to the curriculum vitae, updates on the status of grants or papers, improved organization of material (such as citations), or requests for new external letters of reference. The Nominator may ask the candidate for information to respond to these requests, but COAP will not

contact the candidate directly. The candidate may submit an update regarding any new updates to their dossier by the beginning of B term.

The *deliberative phase* culminates in a meeting (typically in B term) when only COAP members are present. All discussions are strictly confidential, and all members of COAP must be present before any discussion can take place. No discussion about the merits of the candidate's case can take place outside the meeting. The chair reminds all the members of the criteria in the Faculty Handbook for promotion to the rank being considered, and the merits of the case are discussed. When everyone is ready to vote, a secret ballot is conducted with all COAP members voting. The result is a unitary recommendation from the committee. COAP normally makes its recommendation to the Provost by the end of B term.

After a review of COAP's recommendation, the Provost will meet to discuss with COAP any case in which the Provost is considering a recommendation that differs from that of COAP. The President and Provost then make the recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Candidates for promotion will be notified by the Provost of the Board's decision.

Appendix E: Criteria for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotions and Professor of Practice (PoP) Appointments

Approved by the WPI Faculty, Spring Semester 2014

Faculty Handbook Section 7F

Criteria for promotion to the indicated non-tenure track ranks

- **Assistant Teaching Professor** The candidate for promotion to assistant teaching professor must possess a PhD. degree (or the recognized highest degree for the discipline) and have demonstrated effective teaching ability.
- **Associate Teaching Professor** The candidate for promotion to associate teaching professor must have completed at least three years as an assistant teaching professor, and will normally have completed at least five years. The candidate must have exhibited high quality teaching (undergraduate and/or graduate). High quality teaching can be can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): course evaluations; faculty peer evaluations; evaluations by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum, and graduate student work; freshman advising, academic advising; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).
- **(Full) Teaching Professor** To be considered for promotion to teaching professor, an associate teaching professor must have demonstrated considerable professional growth and development of qualities of leadership. This usually requires at least five years as an associate teaching professor. The candidate must have recent accomplishments of high quality in teaching as well as demonstrated leadership in some aspect of teaching. This leadership must be recognized by peers within WPI, and acknowledgement by external peers would be viewed favorably. High quality teaching can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): course evaluations; faculty peer evaluations; evaluations by alumni; the quality of the Major Qualifying Projects, Interactive Qualifying Projects, the Humanities Inquiry Seminar or Practicum, and graduate student work; freshman advising, and academic advising; teaching innovations; new course introductions; and redesign of existing courses. In evaluating teaching qualifications, the Committee on Appointments and Promotions will consider innovations in teaching and adaptability to the needs of WPI, effectiveness as measured by students, alumni, and colleagues, and the candidate's overall impact and importance in WPI academic programs. Leadership accomplishments in teaching may be demonstrated by some or all of the following: exceptionally high quality teaching that serves as a model for others, development of new courses or other academic activities such as project

experiences, leadership in curricular revisions or other academic initiatives within WPI, leadership of teaching—and learning—related grant proposals and funded projects, publications and presentations related to teaching, and leadership roles in appropriate professional organizations. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).

- **Associate Research Professor** The candidate for promotion to associate research professor must have completed at least three years as an assistant research professor, and will normally have completed at least five years. The candidate must have exhibited high quality scholarship. High quality scholarship can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles, conference papers, and/or book chapters; books; exhibitions, and performances; professional awards; citations in the professional literature; presentations at professional meetings; grant proposals and grants awarded; offices held in professional societies; journal editorships; reviews of papers and proposals; and patents. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (such as faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).

- **(Full) Research Professor** To be considered for promotion to research professor, an associate research professor must have demonstrated considerable professional growth and development of qualities of leadership. This usually requires at least five years as an associate research professor. The candidate must have recent accomplishments of high quality and demonstrated leadership in scholarship/creativity. This leadership must be recognized by peers within WPI, and by knowledgeable people outside WPI. Scholarship and/or creativity can take many forms. It may be demonstrated, for example, by publications in respected research or scholarly journals, by non-routine presentations at meetings of professional or scholarly societies or at seminars at other colleges, or by authorship of well-regarded textbooks or monographs. Creativity may be shown, for example, by applying knowledge as a consultant or inventor, and through artistic publications, exhibitions, or productions. In evaluating this activity, the Committee will consider how it is regarded by knowledgeable peers. Service is valued and considered in the promotion review. Service can be evidenced in many ways, including (but not limited to): service to WPI (committee work, assistance to administrative offices); service to the candidate's department (curriculum committees, MQP area coordinators, faculty recruitment, seminar series participation and coordination); and service to the profession (participation in national and international committees and panels, in local chapters of professional societies, in conference organization).

Criteria for re-appointment as Professor of Practice

- **Professor of Practice** The candidate for re-appointment as Professor of Practice must demonstrate that he/she continues to bring a unique current area of expertise, by virtue of non-academic industry-related experiences, in an area of institutional need, to teaching, and that his/her teaching performance is of high quality. The professional expertise and continued currency in the field must be supported by documented evidence, such as by reviews from knowledgeable persons external to WPI. Appropriate activities could include such industry-related experiences as summer or part-time positions, production of commercial designs or other artifacts, consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance, leadership positions in recognized professional societies, relevant, active service on boards of directors, documented continuing professional education experiences, scholarly or professional publications or presentations, and significant participation in professional conferences.

Calendar for Consideration of Promotion of Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty and for Re-Appointment of Professors of Practice

July 1: Receipt by COAP of promotion nominations and supporting materials from Department Head and/or Program Director.

August 15: Receipt by COAP of candidate's supporting documents.

Fall semester: COAP review of dossiers. At its discretion, COAP may choose to meet with the nominator and/or advocate.

Late January: Receipt of COAP recommendations by the Provost, in advance of the February Board of Trustees meeting.

Appendix F: Bibliography

American Academy of Religion, and Peter J. Paris. "Post-Tenure." In *AAR Career Guide for Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession*, edited by Miguel A. De La Torre, 2006. https://www.aarweb.org/publications/post-tenure

American Council on Education. Office of Women in Higher Education. *An agenda for excellence: Creating flexibility in tenure-track faculty careers*. American Council on Education, 2005. http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/An-Agenda-for-Excellence-Creating-Flexibility-in-Tenure-Track-Faculty-Careers.aspx

Anonymous. "Terminal Associate." http://science-professor.blogspot.com/2009/03/terminal-associate.html

August, Louise, and Jean Waltman. "Culture, Climate, and Contribution: Career Satisfaction Among Female Faculty." *Research in Higher Education* 45, no. 2 (03/01 2004): 177-92. 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000015694.14358.ed. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B%3ARIHE.0000015694.14358.ed

Awando, Maxwell, Ashley Wood, Elsa Camargo, and Peggy Layne. "Advancement of Mid-Career Faculty Members: Perceptions, Experiences, and Challenges." In *Gender Transformation in the Academy*. 199-220, 2014. http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/S1529-212620140000019009

Bates, Diane C, and Elizabeth Borland. "Fitting In and Stalling Out: Collegiality, Mentoring, and Role Strain among Professors in the Sciences at a Primarily Undergraduate Institution." *Polymath: An Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Journal* 4, no. 2 (2014): 50-68. https://ojcs.siue.edu/ojs/index.php/polymath/article/view/2929

Blanchard, Kathryn D. "I've Got Tenure. How Depressing." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 31 2012). http://chronicle.com/article/Ive-Got-Tenure-How/130490

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. http://gordonlibrary.wpi.edu/vwebv/holdingsInfo?bibId=70897

Buch, Kimberly, Yvette Huet, Audrey Rorrer, and Lynn Roberson. "Removing the Barriers to Full Professor: A Mentoring Program for Associate Professors." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 43, no. 6 (10/31 2011): 38-45. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.618081

Curtis, John W. "Inequities Persist for Women and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Economic Status of the Profession, 2004-05." *Academe* (2005): 19-98. http://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/2004-05salarysurvey

Dow, Neal. "Terminal Associate Professors, Past and Present: Why do some academics stall at midcareer?" *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 26 2014). http://chronicle.com/article/Terminal-Associate-Professors/145537/

Findlen, Paula. "What Counts: On Books, Articles, and Productivity." *Perspectives on History* 51, no. 6 (September 2013) https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/september-2013/what-counts-on-books-articles-and-productivity

Fox, Mary Frank, and Carol Colatrella. "Participation, Performance, and Advancement of Women in Academic Science and Engineering: What is at Issue and Why." *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 31, no. 3 (05/01 2006): 377-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10961-006-7209-x

Fox, Richard A. "Mentoring Mid-Career Faculty." American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, http://www.asha.org/Academic/questions/Mentoring-Mid-Career-Faculty/

Gardner, Susan K., and Amy Blackstone. ""Putting in your time": Faculty Experiences in the Process of Promotion to Professor." *Innovative Higher Education* 38, no. 5 (11/01 2013): 411-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-012-9252-x

Givins, Terri. "The Disgruntled Associate Prof." *Inside Higher Ed* (August 6 2012). https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2012/08/06/essay-difficulties-facing-associate-professors

Gunter, Ramona, and Amy Stambach. "As balancing act and as game: How women and men science faculty experience the promotion process." *Gender Issues* 21, no. 1 (12/01 2003): 24-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12147-003-0020-1

Hult, Christine, Ronda Callister, and Kim Sullivan. "Is There a Global Warming Toward Women in Academia?". *Liberal Education* 91, no. 3 (2005): 50-57. https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/there-global-warming-toward-women-academia

Jaschik, Scott. "Different paths to full professor." *Inside Higher Ed* (March 5 2010). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/03/05/osu

———. "Unhappy Associate Professors." *Inside Higher Ed* (June 4 2012).

https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/06/04/associate-professors-less-satisfied-those-other-ranks-survey-finds
Misra, Joya, Jennifer Lundquist, E Dahlberg Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. "Associate professors and gendered barriers to advancement." 2010. http://people.umass.edu/misra/Joya_Misra/work-life_files/Associate%20Professors%20and%20Gendered%20Barriers%20to%20Advancement%20Full%20Report.pdf
Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. "The ivory ceiling of service work." *Academe* 97, no. 1 (Jan-Feb 2011): 22-26. http://www.aaup.org/article/ivory-ceiling-service-work
Modern Language Association. "Standing still: The associate professor survey." *Report on the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession* (2009). https://www.mla.org/assocprof_survey
Ohio State University. "Providing Leadership for Faculty Promotion: A Guide for Full Professors and TIU Chairs." http://womensplace.osu.edu/assets/files/TIU_Chair-WEB.pdf
Rochester Institute of Technology. "Post-Tenure Mentoring." http://www.rit.edu/cla/posttenurementoring/
Rockquemore, Kerry Ann. "Mid-Career Mentoring." *Inside Higher Ed* (Nov 28 2011). https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2011/11/28/essay-need-tenured-faculty-members-have-mentoring
Sabharwal, Meghna, and Elizabeth A. Corley. "Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline." *The Social Science Journal* 46, no. 3 (9// 2009): 539-56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2009.04.015
The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). "COACHE Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure and Promotion." (2014) http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1023643.files/Benchmark%20Best%20Practices/COACHE_BenchmarkBestPractices_TenurePromotion.pdf
UNC Charlotte ADVANCE. "Mid Career Mentoring." http://advance.uncc.edu/programming/programs/mentoring/mid-career-mentoring
Wenzel, Stacy A, and Carol Hollenshead. "Former Women Faculty: Reasons for Leaving One Research University." (1998). http://www.cew.umich.edu/sites/default/files/wenzel98.pdf
Wilson, Robin. "Why Are Associate Professors so Unhappy?" *Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 3 2012). http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Are-Associate-Professors/132071/