

SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY

Guidelines for Academic Promotion and Tenure

1. General Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

The School of Technology (SOT) procedures and guidelines for promotion and tenure are based on the College of Health, Science and Technology (CHST) Guidelines for Academic Promotion and Tenure document and the Faculty Guide (Section III Personnel Policy and Procedures). *Any promotion and tenure procedures and guidelines not covered in this document will be the same as in the CHST Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure 10/11/2012 document, the Faculty Guide, and Board of Governors Policy.* Candidates should also consult Academic Policies and Regulations (AP&R) 21, Guiding Principles for the Preparation of Appendices Documentation.

1.1 School Promotion and Tenure Committee

1.1.1 Committee Selection

The School Promotion and Tenure Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of the School Chair, who serves as an ex-officio member without vote, and all tenured full-time faculty members of the School. If the population of tenured faculty in the School is too large, a smaller group of the tenured full-time faculty members of the School will be elected by all full-time tenured and full time tenured-track faculty members of the School. The candidates for election will be between multiple faculty members in a program area, with only one member elected from each area. NOTE: The School Chair will call for the election.

1.1.2 Committee Meetings

The Committee will establish a meeting schedule for the fall semester to ensure that all dossiers are evaluated and written recommendations are made to the Chair and the candidate according to the time line established in the Faculty Guide.

1.1.3 Committee Responsibilities and Duties

School of Technology reviewers serve to ensure the consistent application of the School Guidelines across the program areas of the School and to monitor procedural matters.

1.1.3.1 The Committee will consistently apply, in a fair and professional manner, School Guidelines to all dossiers submitted for the Committee's review and evaluation.

1.1.3.2 The Committee will elect one of its members to serve as a Chair of the Committee.

1.1.3.3 Each faculty member's application is based strictly on that individual's own merit. Candidates are not ranked at any level.

1.1.3.4 Each Committee member will evaluate each dossier submitted for promotion and/or tenure using the Committee Evaluation Form. The full Committee will then meet to discuss each dossier. A quorum of five (5) Committee members is required for all discussions, meetings, and recommendations.

1.1.3.5 The Committee will reach, by simple majority vote of those members in attendance, (at least a quorum) a recommendation on each candidate. This recommendation is then forwarded to the Chair of the School of Technology.

1.2 Committee Chair

The Committee shall elect, from its members, a Chair who shall serve for a term of one academic year beginning the first Committee meeting in the fall semester.

- 1.2.1 The Committee Chair will conduct the Committee meetings to review each candidate's dossier.
- 1.2.2 The Committee Chair will ensure, so far as possible, that the Committee will consistently apply School Guidelines to all dossiers submitted for the Committee's review and evaluation.
- 1.2.3 The Committee Chair will forward the Committee's written recommendation on each candidate to the Chair of the School of Technology and to the candidate.
- 1.2.4 The Committee Chair will convene the Committee as necessary to discuss and act on recommended revisions to the School Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The Committee Chair will conduct School forums to discuss the recommended revisions. The Committee Chair will then submit proposed revisions to the School faculty for a vote recommending approval or rejection to the Chair of the School of Technology.

1.3 School Chair Responsibilities

- 1.3.1 The Chair is responsible in the promotion and tenure process to conduct an independent evaluation of each candidate commensurate with projected needs of the School and College.
- 1.3.2 The Chair shall convene the Committee and review the School's General Procedures, Operational Definitions, and the Committee's role in the promotion and tenure process at the beginning of each academic year.
- 1.3.5 The Chair has the responsibility to assure that the School has General Procedures and Operational Definitions consistent with the College and University Guidelines.
- 1.3.6 The Chair has the responsibility to inform Candidates regarding the School Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
- 1.3.7 If the decision is made to limit each program area to one member on the Committee, the Chair of the School is responsible for initiating an election.

1.4 Procedure to Adopt School's General Procedures and Operational Definitions

- 1.4.1 The faculty will make a recommendation to the Chair of the School of Technology to accept or reject the General Procedures and Operational Definitions by a simple majority vote of the faculty who cast a vote. All tenured and tenure-track School faculty are eligible to vote.
- 1.4.2 These General Procedures and Operational Definitions will be approved by the Chair of the School of Technology and the Dean of CHST.

1.5 Procedure to Revise School Guidelines

- 1.5.1 Revisions to the General Procedures and Operational Definitions may be recommended by the School's tenured and tenure-track faculty to the Committee.
- 1.5.2 The Committee will discuss proposed revisions and determine by a simple majority vote to accept or reject each revision.
- 1.5.3 The Committee will then bring the revised document to the full School faculty for discussion. The faculty will make a recommendation to the Chair of the School of

Technology to accept or reject each proposed revision by a simple majority vote of the faculty who cast a vote. All tenured and tenure-track School faculty are eligible to vote.

- 1.5.4** Revisions accepted by the Chair of the School of Technology and the Dean of CHST will be effective on May 1 following the faculty vote to approve the revision(s).

2. College General Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

3. General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

The candidate must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and achievements in both scholarship and service. Although achievements in scholarship/creative activity and service need not be balanced, collectively the achievements must demonstrate the candidate is worthy of promotion to the next rank.

Departments play a central role in the evaluation of faculty. Department Promotion and Tenure Committees provide an independent evaluation of each faculty's dossier. These committees do not serve as faculty advocates in the process.

Departmental level reviewers must assume important responsibilities. These responsibilities include:

- a) Evaluation of faculty in a fair and professional manner.
- b) Exercise informed professional judgment with respect to the rights of all involved in the process.
- c) Validate the authenticity of the material in the dossier and appendices.
- d) Provide recommendations based upon the evidence in the candidate's dossier and attachments.
- e) Provide a departmental context for a candidate's record of performance within a discipline for succeeding levels of review.

3.1 Discipline and/or Department Specific Operational Guidelines

3.2 Teaching

3.3 Scholarship/Creative Activities

Although the Faculty Guide provides many examples of Scholarship/Creative activities, each department shall identify discipline specific examples of scholarship and creative activity that are applicable toward promotion and tenure. Attachment A identifies several examples of departmental discipline specific examples of technology related creative activities. It should be noted that these types of creative activities cannot meet the external review criterion and are juried by the organizations executive members.

3.4 Service

4. Promotion Guidelines

The College of Health, Science and Technology Guidelines are more stringent in some respects than the minimum requirements stated in the Faculty Guide and Board of Governors Policy. Any promotion procedure or Guideline not covered in the College Guidelines will be the same as in the Faculty Guide. The School of Technology reserves the right to establish requirements more stringent than those of the College.

4.1 Instructor to Assistant Professor

- 4.1.1** Credentials as established by the faculty member's department and Terminal Degree Requirements as approved by the Provost.

4.1.1.1 Certifications and Licenses

Candidates may list professional certifications and licenses. Criterion should be included in the appendices supplied with the dossier.

4.1.2 Teaching

4.1.3. Scholarship/Creative Activities

4.1.3.1 Minimum Refereed Publication/Juried Creative Activity Expectations

4.1.3.2 Additional Scholarly/Creative Activities

The Candidate must present 1 item from the following list, in addition to the 1 required refereed publication/juried creative activity: (The following are additions to the CHST guidelines list)

- e. Applied creative endeavor that is carried out with the deliberate intent of solving a problem. Each applied creative endeavor must be peer reviewed by at least two faculty members of other universities that are approved by the department chairperson (Note: Applied Creative Endeavor: See Attachment A).

4.1.4. Service

4.2. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

4.2.1. Credentials as established by the faculty member's department and Terminal Degree Requirements as approved by the Provost.

4.2.1.1 Certifications and Licenses

Candidates may list professional certifications and licenses. Criterion for such achievement should be included in the appendices supplied with the dossier.

4.2.2. Teaching

4.2.3. Scholarship/Creative Activities

4.2.3.1 Minimum Refereed Publications/Juried Creative Activity Expectations

4.2.3.2 Additional Scholarly/Creative Activities

The Candidate must present 1 item from the following list, in addition to the 2 required refereed publication/juried creative activity: (The following are additions to the CHST guidelines list)

- e. Applied creative endeavor that is carried out with the deliberate intent of solving a problem. Each applied creative endeavor must be peer reviewed by at least two faculty members of other universities that are approved by the department chairperson. (Note: Applied Creative Endeavor: See Attachment A)

4.2.4 Service

4.3 Associate Professor to Full Professor

4.3.1 Credentials as established by the faculty member's department and Terminal Degree Requirements as approved by the Provost.

4.3.1.1 Certifications and Licenses

Candidates may list professional certifications and licenses. Criterion should be included in the appendices supplied with the dossier.

4.3.2 Teaching

4.3.3 Scholarship/Creative Activities

4.3.3.1 Minimum Refereed Publication/Juried Creative Activity Expectations

4.3.3.2 Additional Scholarly/Creative Activities

The Candidate must present two items from the following list, in addition to the two required refereed publication/juried creative activity: (The following are additions to the CHST guidelines list)

- e. Applied creative endeavor that is carried out with the deliberate intent of solving a problem. Each applied creative endeavor must be peer reviewed by at least two faculty members of other universities that are approved by the department chairperson. (Note: Applied Creative Endeavor: See Attachment A)

4.3.4 Service

5. Tenure

5.1 Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service Expectations

5.2 Collegiality Expectations

6. Implementation Schedule

6.1 Effective Date

Guidelines (initial or revised) will be in effect upon acceptance by the Dean.

6.2 Implementation Date

The initial Guidelines will be implemented Fall 2014. Revised Guidelines are implemented at the beginning of the Fall Semester of the next academic year.

6.3 Implementation of General Guidelines

Departments will develop and approve a peer evaluation system (2.2.6) and designate discipline-specific items for scholarly/creative activities (4.1.3.2, 4.3.3.1) and service (4.1.4) by August 30, 2013.

6.4 Individual Variance

6.4.1 Candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure in the Fall Semester of 2013 will have the option of using the College of Health, Science and Technology Guidelines or the guidelines in place for their previous college during the 2010-11 academic year. The candidate's choice of guidelines to be used to assess their Dossier should be stated within the Dossier (See the CHST Guidelines Appendix 1).

6.4.2 Candidates who negotiated a foreshortened timeline for Promotion and/or Tenure should document this arrangement within the optional statement or in writing as an appendix.

6.4.3 In recognition of the possibility that individual faculty members may need time to adapt their professional development to meet these Guidelines, Chairs may propose to the Dean, on a case to case basis, variances in the implementation of certain sections of the Guidelines in terms of implementation date or content. Any such variance must be requested 1) at the time of initial

appointment, 2) within 6 months of the implementation date of these Guidelines, or 3) within six months to the implementation date of subsequent revisions. The Dean will exercise professional judgment in evaluating these requests and may approve or disapprove such variances on an individual basis. The Dean, as academic leader in the college, will make the final decision on variance requests.

Attachment A

Applied Creative Endeavor for Promotion & Tenure Consideration

Preface

This information pertains to applied creative endeavor scholarship for faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure within the School of Technology. Affected undergraduate and graduate programs include: Automotive Technology Management, Construction Management, Design & Drafting Technology, Electronics Technology, Engineering Technology, Fashion: Textiles & Clothing in Business, Graphic Technologies, Innovative Technologies, Professional Photography, Technology (Transfer), and Industrial Management and Technology graduate programs.

Applied scholarship may be defined in the School of Technology as peer-reviewed scholarly activity conducted for business, industry, or government. Applied scholarship documentation may lead to a formal report, drawings, or recorded activities necessary to complete a project or activity for an organization. The focus of such applied scholarship is to aid a company or organization in creation, modification, or improvement of a new or existing product, process, display, exhibit, or service. Documentation to authenticate peer-reviewed action on the part of the organization is required to award academic-level scholarship recognition. Case study examples from the industrial technology and engineering technology programs are attached for reference (See case studies).

Applied scholarship submitted in a tenure/promotion dossier must be externally peer reviewed by two faculty members from other universities. These reviews must be in writing and part of the dossier.

- A. Project name
- B. Project background details
 - a. What was done (investigation, process improvement, display, exhibit, etc.)
 - b. Effectiveness of project (documented by the company/organization)
 - c. Names and titles of individuals involved (a minimum of three individuals from the company/organization are required).
- C. Company or Organization information
 - a. Name of company or organization
 - b. Products manufactured or services performed
 - c. Size of company or organization in sales and number of employees
 - d. Location(s)
 - e. Other information that could potentially affect validation of the scholarship
- D. Peer-Reviewable Deliverables (potential documents submitted; at least five areas required)
 - a. Benefits-cost analysis
 - b. Company or organization owner letter of support
 - c. Detailed work-performed documentation
 - d. Display and/or exhibit pictures and documentation
 - e. Drawings
 - f. Equipment specifications
 - g. Executive summary of activity
 - h. Final report
 - i. Focus group documents
 - j. In-process reports, charts, or studies
 - k. Labor estimates and final numbers showing results
 - l. Marketing feasibility study
 - m. Other documented activities
 - n. Six Sigma activities (quality documentation)
 - o. Timelines of activity

Case Study 1: Design for Manufacturing

Project Background:

A small job shop manufactures and assembles products using outside designs. The company now has an opportunity to internally develop a mechanical product from concept to build. However, the internal design staff lacks experience in the complete design cycle. In addition, the pricing on the new product will be highly sensitive. Therefore, a “design for manufacturing (DFM)” approach is desired to minimize the overall development and production costs as well as the overall time to market. The company does not have the resources to hire permanent personnel with this type of experience. Therefore, a faculty consultant is needed to provide up front training on the mechanical design process and DFM. After the initial training, the consultant would then facilitate the design process and insure that the DFM approach was being used to the greatest advantage.

Company Information:

- \$4,000,000 per year in sales
- 15,000 square foot facility
- 50 employees
- Diverse customer base

Deliverables to the Company:

- Design Cycle Training
- Design for Manufacturing Training
- Timeline for design (including Milestones and Deliverables)
- Design/Manufacturing cost analysis
- Facilitation sessions (number to be specified at the beginning of the project)

Documents Created to Support Peer Review:

- Letter from company owner documenting agreement to the project
- Design Cycle training curriculum including handouts and power point
- Design for Manufacturing training curriculum including handouts and power point
- Project Timeline (projected and actual completion)
- Manufacturing cost analysis
- Facilitation session summaries
- Letter of completion from company owner

Case Study 2: Process Improvement

Project Background:

A small metal fabrication manufacturing firm requires faculty assistance in order to optimize product throughput on several of their manufacturing lines. The use of a faculty consultant is needed since in-house personnel lack essential knowledge in process improvement methodologies. Furthermore, to capitalize on the faculty time investment, the faculty must develop and deliver workshops to prepare and lead company improvement teams in the appropriate methodology that would best fit their company culture, size, and production plans.

Company Information:

- \$6,000,000 per year in sales
- 12,000 square foot facility
- 25 employees
- Equipment used is mostly 15 to 35 years old

Deliverables to the Company:

- Manufacturing line processing assessment (Week 1 - 2)
- Manufacturing improvement plan – Includes (Week 3 - 5):
 - Project timeline
 - Labor requirements
 - Equipment refurbishment or replacement requirements (with justifications)
 - Benefits-cost analysis
 - Executive summary (presented to supervision staff – 1 week consideration time)
- Equipment planning (Week 7)
- Design & order tooling (Week 7 – 9)
- Workshop modules developed by faculty (Week 10 – 11)
- Workshops conducted for supervisory and equipment operators (week 11 – 12)
- Equipment installed; tooling received (Week 13)
- Manufacturing lines revised with new equipment and tooling (Week 13 – 14)
- Equipment and tooling usage orientation with equipment operators (Week 15 – 16)
- Project completed; final report written and results documented

Documents Created to Support Peer Review:

- Letter from the company owner on the project effort and success
- Manufacturing line process assessment report
- Project timeline
- Labor, equipment, and benefit-cost analysis documents
- Executive summary (documentation presented to supervisory staff to gain project acceptance)
- Samples of workshop modules developed
- Project summary and results documented by faculty member

Case Study 3: Lean Six Sigma

Project Background:

A large electric motor company has undergone substantial personnel changes due to attrition in the last 18 months. This personnel problem has resulted in the loss of in-house talent in the use and application of Lean Six Sigma (quality) principles. Therefore, to keep continuous improvement activities in process, each manufacturing facility is allowed to hire a faculty person to support Lean Six Sigma projects. The faculty member is expected to create all Lean Six Sigma documents, design tooling, prepare personnel in Six Sigma quality control procedures and techniques, and facilitate process improvements for the final build and testing area of a sub-fractional horsepower electric motor manufacturing line.

Manufacturing Facility Information:

- \$40,000,000 per year in sales
- 120,000 square foot facility
- 195 employees
- The manufacturing facility builds and sells electric motors and gear motors

Deliverables to the Company:

- Project timeline
- Quality Function Deployment “House of Quality” for final build and testing area CTQ’s (Critical-To-Quality)
- Cause & Effect Matrix
- Process Maps
- Failure Mode & Effects Analysis
- Design & order tooling
- Data collection plan
- ANOVA, Multiple Regression or other statistical analyses
- Gage Repeatability & Reproducibility Analysis of final build and test equipment
- Calibration procedures creation
- Work instruction creation
- Control Chart creation for final test
- Green Belt (quality) training documentation creation
- Green Belt workshops conducted
- Other Lean Six Sigma Tools prepared, as required

Documents Created to Support Peer Review:

- Letter from the manufacturing plant’s general manager documenting the project
- Project timeline
- Quality Function Deployment Analysis
- Cause & Effect Matrix
- Process Maps
- Failure Mode & Effects Analysis
- Data collection plan
- Statistical Analysis of processes
- Workshop planning and content
- Gage Repeatability & Reproducibility Analysis
- Examples of calibration procedures and work instructions created
- Examples of Control Charts and/or Green Belt training documents created and utilized
- Project summary and results documented by faculty member

Case Study 4: Color Management

Project Background:

A regional medium sized printing company is interested in developing color management procedures across divergent manufacturing facilities employing different printing processes. For a project efficiency and political impartiality they elect to use outside consulting services. The project entails travel to three different printing facilities, each employing different printing processes, and evaluating current color management practices. Based on this experience, the consultant is to research current color management technologies and make recommendations as to new unified and more efficient methodologies.

Printing Company Information:

- \$2 billion dollars per year in sales
- International and national print manufacturing facilities
- Lithography, flexography, and gravure print processes employed
- 30,000 employees
- Product lines include greeting cards, gift wrap, paper plates and napkins, and other social communication products

Deliverables to the Company:

- Report of current color management as practiced in each facility
- Report of current state-of-the-art color management techniques
- Recommendation of changes to improve color management operations
- Implementation plan
- Presentation of findings and recommendations to company executives

Documents Created to Support Peer Review:

- Letter from each manufacturing plant manager documenting visitation
- Report describing current color management system
- Report describing current color management state-of-the-art practices
- Report describing recommended changes to color management activities
- Implementation plan
- PowerPoint presentation
- Invoices itemizing services and expenses
- Proposed next steps

Case Study 5: Gracol 7 Lithography

Project Background:

A large international printing company is interested in possibly adapting “Gracol 7” guidelines for process control and print standardization in Lithography. Internal expertise in this technical area is weak and therefore the company decides to utilize outside consulting services to help in the evaluation. The request is for an in-depth analysis of “Gracol 7” and how it would function in their specific print environment. A presentation is to be made at the corporate headquarters to upper-level management to describe benefits and risks relative to adoption of “Gracol 7”.

Printing Company Information:

- \$2 billion dollars per year in sales
- Creative division and lithographic division involved
- Lithography accomplished on 40 inch Komori sheetfed presses
- 3,000 employees affected by the potential change
- greeting card product

Deliverables to the Company:

- Presentation of findings and recommendations to company executives

Documents Created to Support Peer Review:

- Letter from Manufacturing VP documenting presentation
- PowerPoint presentation
- Invoice itemizing services and expenses
- Proposed next steps