SECTION 6
PROMOTION AND TENURE

6.1 PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE AND PROCEDURES

Governing Policies:

Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Considerations:

As required by the Faculty Handbook, deadlines and format of the promotion/tenure application process for the upcoming academic year will be announced by Academic Affairs by the end of the Spring semester. The current calendar is available at http://inside.mines.edu/Calendars.

The Faculty Handbook provides detailed process specifics for promotion and tenure of tenure/tenure-track faculty, and promotion of teaching, research and library faculty. Additional policies regarding the handling of specifics related to these processes are provided below:

1. Faculty members who are otherwise eligible to participate in a Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, but who are on sabbatical may – at their discretion – choose to not participate in Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee activities. If faculty on sabbatical choose to not participate, they are not considered an “eligible” member of the Committee as defined in item 5 below.

If faculty on sabbatical choose to participate in the promotion and tenure process, they are expected do so as full members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty members on sabbatical have identical expectations and obligations to the departmental promotion and tenure process as faculty members not on sabbatical.

2. As provided by the Faculty Handbook, the Department Head may be required to solicit external evaluations of the candidate’s credentials. All letters received from this solicitation must be added to the candidate’s application package, following the procedure identified in 6.3 below. It is not appropriate to exclude any solicited letters.

3. All external letters are kept confidential and are not made available to promotion/tenure applicants before, during, or after the promotion/tenure process. Should the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the Department Head, in their recommendations, refer by name to a person who has submitted a reference and cited that person’s specific opinions, these references should be redacted before the recommendations are provided to the applicant at the conclusion of the process.

4. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee of The Colorado School of Mines needs to see clear evidence of a national and international reputation for a candidate to be promoted to the rank of Professor (as noted in Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2.3). In the case of promotion to Associate Professor and/or granting tenure, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee of Colorado School of Mines needs to see clear evidence of “progress” toward a national or international reputation. For both, the most convincing testimonials are letters from distinguished members of the community of scholars in the candidate’s field who do not have a direct relationship with the candidate. Normally, this precludes CSM colleagues and former advisors.
5. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall examine the dossier, prepare a written tenure report containing a recommendation, and forward the dossier and report to the Department Head. In preparing this recommendation, the Committee should consider the criteria for tenure and promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook and must address the specific items listed in Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual. As part of its recommendation, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall hold an open vote denoting the number of members for and against the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion. Committee members should not abstain from voting in difficult and/or contentious cases. Committee members should, however, disclose conflicts of interest to other members of the committee. In the event of serious conflicts of interest (e.g., a family relative or a previously formal academic advisor) a committee member may, in consultation with the committee chair, recuse himself or herself from deliberations about that specific case. The committee’s report should communicate the vote tally and number of faculty who were recused from the deliberations. In the case of a split vote, an additional letter summarizing the dissenting view also must be submitted so that all relevant information about the case is transparent and shared with subsequent parties to the review process. Throughout and following the process, the content of the deliberations and the individual recommendations and votes of committee members must be kept in the strictest confidence. The committee letter(s) shall be so written as to protect confidentiality. This written recommendation should be added to the application package before submission of the package to the Department Head. At least ¾ of the eligible members of the Committee must participate in the decision (participation in the tenure/review process is a required service activity for all eligible committee members that are not on sabbatical or extended sick leave).

5. As directed by the Faculty Handbook, the Departmental Promotion (and Tenure) Committee reviews the application package and submits its recommendation(s) in writing to the Department Head. In preparing this recommendation, the Committee should consider the criteria for tenure and promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook and is encouraged to address the specific items listed in Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual. The letter of recommendation must list the names of all members of the Departmental Promotion (and Tenure) Committee and be signed by all members who participated in making the recommendation. At least ¾ of the eligible members of the Committee must participate in the decision (participation in the tenure/review process is a required service activity for all eligible committee members that are not on sabbatical or extended sick leave). The final vote (unanimous, or a number for or against the candidate’s request for promotion and/or tenure) should be given. This written recommendation should be added to the application package before submission of the package to the Department Head.

6. The Department Head reviews the application package and the Departmental Promotion (and Tenure) recommendation and makes his/her own written recommendation, which is added to the application package. In preparing this recommendation, the Department Head should consider the criteria for tenure and/or promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook and must address the items listed in Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual. The complete application package is forwarded to the Provost in the format directed by the Office of Academic Affairs. This written recommendation produced by the Department Head should be added to the application package before submission of the package to the Provost.

7. The Office of Academic Affairs shall make complete application packages available to the University Promotion (and Tenure) Committee for their review. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall conduct a thorough and independent review of all tenure applications received during the relevant time period. The Committee should consider the criteria for tenure and or promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook and must address the specific items listed in
Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee shall hold an open vote denoting the number of members for and against the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion. Committee members should not abstain from voting in difficult and/or contentious cases. Committee members from the candidate’s department should recuse themselves from deliberations about that candidate’s case. In addition, committee members should disclose conflicts of interest to other members of the committee. In the event of serious conflicts of interest (e.g., a family relative or a previously formal academic advisor) a committee member may, in consultation with the committee chair, recuse himself or herself from deliberations about that specific case. Throughout and following the process, the content of the deliberations and the individual recommendations and votes of committee members must be kept in the strictest confidence. Following this review, the University Committee shall submit recommendations, including the vote tally and the number of faculty who recused themselves from the deliberations, to the Provost.

8. Again, guided by Section 6.5 of this Procedures Manual, the University Promotion (and Tenure) Committee provides a third formal, and written recommendation related to the action being sought.

7.9. As directed by the Faculty Handbook, the Provost consults with the Deans on all tenure and promotion candidates. As part of this consultation requirement, the Deans shall review each candidate dossier, and each Dean shall provide the Provost a formal written recommendation of each candidate being considered from his/her college.

8. The Provost reviews these all candidate dossiers and all recommendations, decides on final action and seeks Board approval in support of this action in time for faculty promotion and tenure decisions to be announced at the April Faculty Forum.

10. If a need for clarification arises at any stage of the process, any of the parties reviewing the package (Department Head, Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, etc) may contact the candidate to request additional information. In addition, a reviewing party may request clarification from any previous reviewer who has evaluated the package. The request, and the additional information provided by the candidate, should be included as an addendum to the appropriate letter of recommendation produced by the Department Head, Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, etc. Requests for additional information should normally come from the Committee Chair, when applicable.

Last Revision:

September 30, 2014 July 20, 2016
6.2 GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF PROMOTION/TENURE MATERIAL

Governing Policies:

Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Procedure:

For additional considerations on preparing an application package that includes information relevant to the various Committees, Department Head and Provost, please see Section 6.4 of this Procedures Manual.

Application package specifics conforming to the Faculty Handbook for each type of faculty are provided below.

Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure should submit to their Department Head a promotion and/or tenure application package that includes the sections defined below. The format of, and submission date by which these materials should be submitted is communicated to campus by the Office of Academic Affairs prior to the end of the Spring semester.

Each application package must include, in the order given, the sections defined in the Package Template provided on the Academic Affairs website. Packages for consideration of promotion of Teaching, Research and Library faculty may exclude certain sections. Required and permissible package exclusions are as defined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Package Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track</td>
<td>None. All elements shown in the outline must be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Items 5c – Scholarly Activities, and 5d – Publications and Presentations may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 9 – External evaluation letters must be omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items 10b – Scholarly Achievements, 10c – External Fund Raising, and 10d – Student advising may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Item 5b – Teaching and Related Activities may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 10a – Teaching Accomplishments may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Items 5b – Teaching and Related Activities, 5c – Scholarly Activities and 5d – Publications and Presentations may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items 10a – Teaching Accomplishments, 10b – Scholarly Achievements, 10c – External Fund Raising and 10d – Student Advising may be omitted if not relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Revision:

March 20, 2015
6.3. GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING AND REQUESTING REVIEWING EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTERS

Governing Policies:

Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Procedure:

As per the Faculty Handbook, Department Heads are required to solicit evaluations letters from external reviewers for inclusion in promotion and tenure application packages of tenure/tenure-track faculty. External evaluators should be provided, for their review, the promotion and tenure package provided to the Department Head by the candidate excluding sections: 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 as defined in section 6.2 of this Procedures Manual.

Candidates and the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall each supply the Department Head with 5 to 6 names of external reviewers. The candidate may also request that certain individuals not be contacted for reviews; this request should be honored unless the Department Head and Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee determine there are good reasons not to do so. In consultation with the Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Head will then request external letters. The candidate dossier should ultimately contain 5 to 7 letters of recommendation from external reviewers, with a balance between names suggested by the candidate, the Department Head, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the file shall include a notation indicating which reviewers were selected by whom. At least 1/3 of the requested letters should be from reviewers recommended by the candidate. External reviewers should be independent of the candidate and Ph.D. advisors should be avoided. Reviewers should primarily be Professors affiliated with peer and aspirational peer programs. Associate Professors and/or reviewers from other institutions may be acceptable when it is clear that they are nationally recognized, possess pertinent expertise, and understand promotion and tenure norms at peer and aspirational peer institutions. In his/her request for letters of recommendation, the Department Head must make the University and Department expectations clear to the external letter writers. An example request letter is available in the Academic Affairs Procedures Manual. Candidates should not discuss the review with potential reviewers, lest this be viewed as attempting to influence their independence of judgment. Likewise, neither the Department Head nor the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee should reveal their views or assessments about the candidate (including annual evaluations) in communicating with letter writers. The Department Head collects the external review letters, and inserts them into the candidate’s dossier. The dossier should be forwarded to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee when at least half of the requested letters have been received. The committee must review each letter from all external reviewers before making a final assessment.

National data show that implicit bias may be an issue in evaluating candidates with respect to race and gender. For example, letters of recommendation for men often are longer and refer more to a candidate’s publications, research or other career achievements, while letters for women may make reference to their personalities, personal lives or other irrelevant data, and contain fewer descriptors about the quality of their work. Similarly, scholars from other countries may have different cultural expectations for the length and style of letters, which may be shorter than American letters with fewer effusive adjectives. Likewise, research suggests that minorities are often evaluated lower, even for the exact same resume, and that supposedly neutral, quantitative data may be evaluated by reviewers differently for majority and minority candidates. Promotion and Tenure Committees should consider these elements when looking at internal and external letters of recommendation for faculty.

Two sample letters of invitation to external reviewers are provided on the next page.
Dear Professor XXXX,

I am grateful to you for agreeing to evaluate XXXX credentials for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of XXXXX during this academic year.

At the Colorado School of Mines, advancement is based on the individual’s established professional record, indications that the individual will continue to grow professionally, and evidence that the individual will continue to be an asset to the institution. CSM expects members of the faculty to become leaders in their disciplines with strong records of scholarship, demonstrated service to their fields, and dedication to high quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The decision regarding tenure is based on the individual’s academic accomplishments and on an assessment of the potential (or likelihood) for continued growth in accomplishments and professional reputation.

We would very much appreciate your assistance in evaluating the merits of Dr. XXXXX record of scholarship and professional service. Evaluation of the candidate’s teaching is conducted internally, but if you have information about the quality of Dr. XXXXX contributions to pedagogy, we welcome comments on that aspect of the candidate’s case as well.

Please begin with a statement of whether you know the candidate and his work. In this context, address any circumstances that might raise issues of impartiality as they relate to your assessment of the candidate. We would like you to critique the quality of this work and, if possible, to assess its quantity and quality in comparison to the work of others in this discipline at comparable stages in their careers. We would particularly appreciate your evaluation of the contribution that the candidate’s work has made to the field, viewing each published work separately or in combination as seems appropriate. We are interested in your judgment of the quality of the journals and the importance of the conferences through which Dr. XXXXX has communicated this work. We are also interested in any other insights you might have about Professor XXXXX’s scholarly accomplishments. Finally, we ask that you provide your opinion of how Dr. XXXXX's application would be viewed if the case were being considered at your home institution.

The enclosed electronic package includes (1) Dr. XXXXX’s curriculum vitae, (2) his/her personal statement, (3) a series of explanatory narratives, and (4) pertinent materials concerning the criteria for tenure and promotion. Our process requires that we receive your letter by _____________, so that it can be included in the materials that are examined internally. If you have any questions about Dr. XXXXX’s materials or experience, please contact me directly. In accordance with our procedures, we must ask you not to communicate with either the candidate whose work you are reviewing or other members of the department or college concerning your evaluation or the review process.

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your report. Neither the names of the referees nor the full contents of their letters are shared with the candidate. Your letter of evaluation will be made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in our department, and will become part of the candidate’s file reviewed by appropriate committees and administrators at the college and university levels. I should add that in light of a Supreme Court decision (EEOC vs. University of Pennsylvania), such reports may be subject to involuntary disclosure in legal proceedings.

Would you please also send me a brief biographical statement when you send your letter? As mentioned above, our departmental faculty as well as the campus committee and administrators would find your biographical sketch helpful when considering your letter.
Thank you very much for taking the time to convey your professional evaluation. On behalf of my colleagues, I offer our gratitude and appreciation for your thoughtful comments and perspectives.

Sincerely,

XXX
Dear Professor YYYYY,

Thank you for agreeing via our email correspondence to provide an external evaluation of Associate Professor XXXXXX, who is being considered for promotion to the rank Professor in the Department of ZZZZZ at Colorado School of Mines (CSM).

At our institution promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon the individual’s established record. CSM expects an individual with this rank to be an established leader in their discipline with a strong record of scholarship, demonstrated service to their field, a dedication to high-quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate level and to have demonstrated the likelihood of continued growth in accomplishments and professional reputation nationally and internationally.

From an external reviewer, we are primarily interested in your assessment of the merits of Dr. XXXXXX’s record of scholarship and professional service. Evaluation of the candidate’s teaching is conducted internally, but if you have information about the quality of Dr. XXXXXX’s contributions to pedagogy, we welcome comments on that aspect of the candidate’s case. In particular, I would appreciate:

1. A statement of how you know the candidate and his/her work. In this context, please address any circumstances that might raise issues of impartiality as they related to your assessment of the candidate.
2. A critique the quality of the candidate’s work and, if possible, assessment its quantity and quality in comparison to the work of others in this discipline at comparable stages in their careers. We would particularly appreciate your evaluation of the contribution that the candidate’s work has made to the field, viewing each published work separately or in combination as seems appropriate. We would also be interested in your judgment of the quality of the journals and the importance of the conferences through which Dr. XXXXXX has communicated this work.
3. Any other insights you might have about Dr. XXXXXX’s scholarly accomplishments.
4. Your opinion of how Dr. XXXXXX’s application would be viewed if the case were being considered at your home institution (if applicable).
5. A brief biographical statement (one page or less is fine!). Although our departmental faculty know you and your work, the campus committee and administrators would find your biographical sketch helpful when considering your letter

Please recall that ideally we need your letter by October XX, 20YY.

I have enclosed a copy of the Dr. XXXXXX’s materials, including Dr. XXXXXX’s curriculum vita, his personal statement, some recent publications, summaries of graduate students, teaching accomplishments, and research funding, and pertinent materials concerning the criteria for tenure and promotion at CSM. You may also access this material electronically by following the instructions sent in an earlier email.

If you have any questions about Dr. XXXXXX’s materials or experience, please contact me directly. In accordance with our procedures, we must ask you not to communicate with either the candidate whose work you are reviewing or other members of the department or college concerning your evaluation or the review process. Also note that every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your report. Neither the names of the referees nor the full contents of their letters are shared with the candidate. Your letter of evaluation will be made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in our department, and will become part of the candidate’s file reviewed by appropriate committees and administrators at the college and university levels.

Thank you very much for taking the time to convey your professional evaluation. On behalf of my colleagues, I offer our gratitude and appreciation for your thoughtful comments and perspectives.
Sincerely,

XXX
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6.4 PRELIMINARY TENURE REVIEWS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Governing Policies:

Section 8.1.4, Faculty Handbook – Preliminary Tenure Review

Procedure:

Please note that according to Section 8.1.4 of the Faculty Handbook, Preliminary Tenure Reviews of tenure-track faculty should take place during (not after) the sixth semester of the faculty member’s tenure-track service.

The primary purpose of this review is to inform the faculty member and his/her department about progress toward promotion and tenure. The process used to conduct a preliminary tenure review is detailed in section 8.1.4 of the Faculty Handbook. Briefly, the candidate prepares a dossier that is forwarded to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee for review within one month of the start of the sixth semester of service. The Departmental Committee considers the package and makes formal recommendations that are forwarded to the Department Head. The Department Head, in turn, reviews the dossier, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation and makes his/her own formal recommendation. Upon completion of this process, the Department Head reviews the package, process and findings with their respective college Dean. The Department Head then meets with the candidate, provides him/her copies of all of the written recommendations and discusses the findings of the preliminary tenure review process. The Dean notifies the Provost that preliminary tenure review process has concluded and specifically informs the Provost of untenured individuals who have been identified as “at risk” in terms of performance. The Provost may subsequently require formal presentation of remediation plans for faculty at “risk.”

For additional considerations on preparing an application package that includes information relevant to the various Committees, Department Head and Provost, please see Section 6.5 of the Procedures Manual.

The Office of Academic Affairs conveys the submission date by which the dossier should be submitted to the campus near the end of the Spring semester.

The content that the preliminary tenure review package must conform to the regular promotion and tenure package defined in the Package Template provided on the Academic Affairs website, with the following exceptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Package Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track</td>
<td>Item 4 - Candidate statement should focus on career progress since beginning the CSM appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 9 – External evaluation letters should be omitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EFFECTIVE BEGINNING THE AY1718 PROMOTION AND TENURE CYCLE

6.5 ITEMS FOR CANDIDATE, DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING AND REVIEWING APPLICATION PACKAGES FOR TENURE/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY DEMONSTRATION OF ATTAINMENT OF PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE CRITERIA, AND INSTITUTIONAL GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Governing Policies:

Section 8, Faculty Handbook – Promotion and Tenure

Procedure:

This section seeks to define clear expectations for CSM faculty members regarding Promotion and Tenure (P&T). It was drafted by a committee of faculty members, including the Provost, and approved by the CSM Faculty Senate on April 26, 2016. Any substantive amendments to this section must be approved by the Faculty Senate; non-substantive edits (such as clarifications or refinements in wording, organization, etc.) may be made in consultation with the Faculty Senate President.

Reviewers at all levels shall consult this document -- in conjunction with pertinent sections of the CSM Faculty Handbook -- and use these criteria in evaluating P&T applications. Guidelines and expectations for each of the various P&T review groups are provided in Section III below. In the event of a conflict between the Handbook and this document, the Handbook shall prevail.

I. Defining a Path to Excellence

Colorado School of Mines (Mines) is committed to excellence and impact through its teaching, scholarship (research) and service. Mines aspires to be a leading STEM-focused university, known for the uniqueness and quality of its programs, strength of its faculty, success of its graduates, its innovations and entrepreneurial output, strong relationships with industry, and the impact that all of these have locally, nationally, and globally.

The University expectations for promotion and tenure (P&T) discussed below are aligned with Mines’ aspirations and allow for further specification at the College, Department, and Program levels.

II. University Expectations of T/TT Faculty Members Seeking Promotion and Tenure, and Example Evaluation Elements

The following expectations for promotion and tenure are cumulative, as a faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure at a higher rank shall meet all the expectations for that specific evaluation as well as all the expectations for lower level advancements.

The hiring process should be considered a first step in the promotion and tenure process. Mines expects that evaluations of faculty candidates consider each candidate’s qualifications and projected future development relative to its P&T expectations; it is also important that the P&T expectations are communicated to the prospective candidates. This is important to ensure that new faculty members arrive at Mines with the expectation they will move through the P&T process successfully and in a timely fashion.
A. Advancement from Assistant/Associate Professor without Tenure to Associate Professor with Tenure

The University’s expectation is that all faculty members hired as tenure-track assistant or associate professors will achieve tenure by building records that include sustained and impactful contributions in teaching, scholarship, and mentoring, and effective contributions to both University and professional service.

Those receiving favorable recommendations for promotion and tenure will have a record of accomplishments such that evaluators conclude that the applicant can and will continue to contribute to the goals of the Department, College, and Mines at a level expected of Associate Professors.

The following are expected as appropriate to the particular department or program:

- Dedicated, high quality student instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, where these programs exist, at typical program instructional loads.
- Demonstrate potential for national and international professional recognition.
- Successful mentoring and completion of graduate students at the PhD, MS-thesis, and MS-non-thesis levels, where those graduate programs exist.
- Impactful and sustained scholarship, which may include entrepreneurial outcomes.
- Demonstrated ability to attract external resources as needed to support a strong scholarship program.
- A history of professional, respectful, and ethical interactions with other faculty members, students, and staff.
- Professional service contributions that enhance the faculty member’s visibility and the visibility of Mines.
- University service that demonstrates measurable contributions to Mines.

More details on possible paths to success are outlined below.

Consistent with Mines’ “excellence” and “impact” goals discussed above, the success and impact of graduate student mentoring, scholarship, and service are judged relative to norms at comparable programs at peer and aspirational peer universities.

At Mines, a faculty member must go up for tenure no later than the fall of her/his 6th year as a T/TT professor, unless an extension has been granted. The Faculty Handbook permits consideration of tenure and promotion earlier than the 6th year. Two early-consideration situations exist: (a) faculty members who start their career as Assistant Professors at Mines, and (b) faculty members who are hired at Mines after several successful years at a peer university or other entity (e.g., government laboratory).

For situation (a), candidates are expected to demonstrate a very strong case of sustainable scholarship and success in teaching.
For situation (b), the candidate’s performance at their previous institution(s) should be given full credit in the evaluation of tenure and/or promotion at Mines.

In either scenario, the candidate shall be evaluated solely on the strength of his or her record in meeting the criteria outlined here, not on time served. Length of service at CSM or elsewhere shall not be a specific consideration, and candidates seeking early tenure shall be held to neither a higher nor a lower standard than those of other candidates.

Prior to submittal of a completed package for review, potential candidates are strongly encouraged to discuss their cases with the chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (DPT), the Department Head, and the Dean.

Examples of successful teaching for those promoted to Associate Professor with tenure may include:

• Dedicated, high-quality student instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels as demonstrated by the following: student evaluations, teaching portfolio that includes examples of teaching methods and/or effectiveness, teaching statements, and teaching awards. In general, it is expected that all faculty members participate in the teaching mission of the Department/Program, College, and Mines by teaching courses that are required by degree programs.

• Designing or leading of classroom activities that enhance the educational experience or that are important to the teaching mission, including leading undergraduate and graduate independent studies, advising senior design teams, teaching field session, etc.

• Development and implementation of highly effective or innovative teaching methods and incorporation of feedback from formalized assessments, where appropriate.

• Development of teaching infrastructure.

• Developing new courses or creating enhancements to existing course structures.

• Demonstration of successful out-of-classroom activities that enhance learning or the student experience, including relevant publications, participation in workshops and development activities to improve as an instructor.

• Demonstrating effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open, supportive, and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.

• Demonstrating quality mentoring and the potential successful completion of graduate students at the PhD or MS-thesis levels, where graduate programs exist, and evidence that current PhD students are on track to graduate (e.g., published journal papers, outputs of research co-authored by graduate students, completed milestone exams, etc.). Evaluators may also consider the post-graduate placement and career success of graduated students as indicators of successful graduate student mentoring. Significant mentoring, supervision, or participation in non-thesis master’s programs may also be relevant.

• Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications normally are considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However, contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, including contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or original scholarly research.
• Exhibiting the ability to acknowledge problems encountered when teaching and to make appropriate adjustments with the goal of continuous improvement.

Examples of activities that demonstrate impactful and sustained scholarship (which may include entrepreneurial outcomes) for those promoted to Associate Professor with tenure may include:

• Peer-reviewed archival publications, including journal articles, book chapters and monographs, and peer-reviewed conference presentations/publications. Candidates should provide supporting evidence (for example, referees' reports and acceptance rates) that will yield insight into the quality and impact of any work reported.

• Documented use of the output from the candidate’s research and entrepreneurial activities by others for their research and entrepreneurial activities, where examples might include working with industry, governments or municipalities to enhance operations via diffusion of technology into practice; citations in policy briefs or policy papers or involvement in the development of industry guidelines; providing expert input to media offerings; serving as an expert resource for written, broadcast, or internet media. Such activities may also include local, national, or international community outreach.

• Successful proposals for external support of research activity, as needed to support a strong scholarship program appropriate for the discipline.

• Demonstration by Assistant Professors that they have moved well past the research of their terminal degree and are successful at establishing new and productive lines of inquiry, with a trajectory that indicates a career of sustainable and impactful scholarship.

• Development of special facilities to support research activities for multiple faculty members and student researchers at Mines.

• Invitations to give talks at regional, national or international meetings, or at other universities/research centers.

• Invention disclosures, patent applications, and patent awards.

• Creation of new commercial entities or organizations that will incubate, develop, and deploy technologies resulting from research or transfer results from research into existing commercial entities.

• Meaningful contributions to science and technology policy or societal debate, development, and deployment. Examples might include testifying as an expert in front of state or national legislatures or international governing bodies, writing white papers supporting the development and implementation of appropriate policies or community engagement strategies.

• In certain fields, such as the arts, humanities, and social sciences, distinguished creation should receive consideration appropriate for these disciplines. In evaluating creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate’s merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression, as per accepted standards in those fields.

Professional service contributions typical of those promoted to Associate Professor with tenure that enhance the faculty member’s visibility and the visibility of Mines may include:

• Manuscript reviews for scholarly archival journals or peer-reviewed conference proceedings.

• Reviewing for professional organizations, funding agencies, or national labs.

• Member of University, Departmental, or Program Committees.

• Organizer of sessions at a national or international professional meeting.

• Member of a subcommittee in a national or international professional organization.

• Service designed to enhance public knowledge and familiarity with diffusion of technology.

• Service on national advisory boards and committees.
• Service to the University through shared resource acquisition and development or development of research or teaching infrastructure,
• Involvement in activities that enhance the student experience,
• Undergraduate student advising,
• Graduate academic advising (e.g., advising non-thesis graduate students)
• Organization, submission, and acquisition of training grants to support education activities.

• A history of professional and respectful interactions with other faculty members, students, and staff, within Mines, including collaboration and constructive cooperation in teaching, scholarship, and service, without hostile, demeaning, aggressive, disrespectful, or exploitative interactions with faculty members, staff, or students.

B. Advancement from Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure to Professor with Tenure

Those receiving favorable recommendations will have achieved national and international recognition, including evidence of significant leadership in their field(s). The successful applicant will demonstrate detailed evidence for potential of continued scholarly excellence and leadership, and in addition should promote the vision and goals of their Department and/or Programs and Mines, internally and externally.

Candidates should demonstrate sustained performance for all expectations listed in Section II.A. In addition, candidates should demonstrate the following:

• Significant leadership in the candidate’s field(s) that enhances the faculty member’s visibility and the visibility of Mines. The leadership may be associated with teaching, scholarship, and/or organizations that promote either education or research.
• National and international recognition and reputation.
• Success with mentoring and completion of graduate students at the PhD, MS-thesis, and MS-non-thesis levels, where those graduate programs exist.
• Institutional service, including leadership roles, to the Department and/or Programs and Mines.
• Demonstrated mentoring and other activities that help Mines’ colleagues achieve promotion and/or tenure. This could be within the department or in other programs at Mines, as appropriate.

More details on possible paths to success are outlined below.

Consistent with Mines’ “excellence” and “impact” goals discussed above, the success and impact of graduate student mentoring, scholarship, and service are judged relative to norms for faculty members at the rank of tenured full professor at comparable programs at peer and aspirational peer universities.

External validation of national and international recognition and reputation are important.

Examples of successful teaching for those promoted to Professor with tenure may include:

• Dedicated, high-quality student instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels as demonstrated by the following: student evaluations, teaching portfolio that includes examples of teaching methods and/or effectiveness, teaching statements, and teaching awards. In general, it is expected that all faculty members participate in the teaching mission of the Department/Program, College, and Mines by teaching courses that are required by degree programs.

• Designing or leading of classroom activities that enhance the educational experience or that are important to the teaching mission, including leading undergraduate and graduate independent studies, advising senior design teams, teaching field session, etc.
• Development and implementation of highly effective or innovative teaching methods and incorporation of feedback from formalized assessments, where appropriate.

• Development of teaching infrastructure.

• Developing new courses or creating enhancements to existing course structures.

• Demonstration of appropriate breadth in the instructional assignments, including success at a variety of courses and at a variety of levels (lower-division undergraduate, upper-division undergraduate, and graduate).

• Demonstration of successful out-of-classroom activities that enhance learning or the student experience, including relevant publications, participation in workshops and development activities to improve as an instructor.

• Demonstrating effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open, supportive, and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.

• Completion of graduate students that includes graduation of PhD students (depending on norms for the discipline at peer and aspirational peer institutions). Evaluators may also consider the post-graduate placement and career success of graduated students as indicators of successful graduate student mentoring. Significant mentoring, supervision, or participation in thesis or non-thesis master’s programs may also be relevant.

• Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications normally are considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However, contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, including contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or original scholarly research.

• Exhibiting the ability to acknowledge problems encountered when teaching and to make appropriate adjustments with the goal of continuous improvement.

Examples of activities that demonstrate impactful and sustained scholarship (which may include entrepreneurial outcomes) for those promoted to Professor with tenure may include:

• Peer-reviewed archival publications, including journal articles, book chapters and monographs, and peer-reviewed conference presentations/publications. Candidates should provide supporting evidence (for example, referees' reports and acceptance rates) that will yield insight into the quality and impact of any work reported.

• Documented use of the output from the candidate’s research and entrepreneurial activities by others for their research and entrepreneurial activities, where examples might include working with industry, governments or municipalities to enhance operations via diffusion of technology into practice; providing expert input to media offerings; serving as an expert resource for written, broadcast, or internet media. Such activities may also include local, national, or international community outreach.

• Successful proposals for external support of research activity, as needed to support a strong scholarship program appropriate for the discipline.

• Development of special facilities to support research activities for multiple faculty members and student researchers at Mines.

• National and international awards for research activity.
• Invitations to give talks at regional, national or international meetings, or at other universities/research centers. International reputation is particularly important for promotion to Professor.
• Invention disclosures, patent applications, and patent awards.
• Creation of new commercial entities or organizations that will incubate, develop, and deploy technologies resulting from research or transfer results from research into existing commercial entities.
• Meaningful contributions to science and technology policy or societal debate, development, and deployment. Examples might include testifying as an expert in front of state or national legislatures or international governing bodies, writing white papers supporting the development and implementation of appropriate policies or community engagement strategies; and participating in National Academy of Engineering, National Academy of Sciences, or National Research Council committees and panels.
• In certain fields, such as the arts, humanities, and social sciences, distinguished creation should receive consideration appropriate for these disciplines. In evaluating creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate’s merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression, as per accepted standards in those fields.

Professional service contributions typical of those promoted to Professor with tenure that enhance the faculty member’s visibility and the visibility of Mines may include:

• Chair of a University, College, Departmental, or Program committee,
• History of service on University, College, Departmental or Program committees,
• Successful mentoring of untenured faculty members,
• Involvement in activities that enhance the student experience,
• Undergraduate student advising,
• Graduate academic advising (e.g., advising non-thesis graduate students)
• Editor or associate editor of a scholarly archival journal,
• Organizer of a national or international professional meeting,
• Officer, or other substantive leadership position, in a national or international professional organization,
• Writing letters for promotion and tenure of colleagues,
• Service designed to enhance public knowledge and familiarity with/ diffusion of technology,
• Service on national advisory boards and committees,
• Service to the university through shared resource acquisition and development or development of research or teaching infrastructure,
• Organization, submission, and acquisition of training grants to support education activities,
• A history of professional and respectful interactions with other faculty members, students, and staff, within Mines, including collaboration and constructive cooperation in teaching, scholarship, and service, without hostile, demeaning, aggressive, disrespectful, or exploitative interactions with faculty members, staff, or students.

III. Guidance for evaluators on implementation of the criteria

General:
• Each committee and individual involved in the review process shall judge the candidate with respect to the criteria outlined in this document, evaluating whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive.
• External reference letters should be given significant weight because often the best information on the candidate’s level of performance relative to the norms of his/her discipline at peer and aspirational peer universities and programs is discerned from the external letters.

• Evaluation of a faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service should be commensurate with his or her approved “distribution of effort agreement” as per section 7.1.1.A.2 in the Faculty Handbook. Reviewers shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitment and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. However, outstanding performance in one area may not automatically compensate for a weak performance in another area.

• The criteria listed in this document will also guide the determination of the appropriate academic status for individuals joining the faculty above the rank of Assistant Professor.

• The examples listed in section II above are meant to be illustrative of items that candidates may document in a promotion dossier, and candidates are not expected to provide evidence of all the items listed as “examples” above.

Scholarship:
  • Consistent with Mines’ “excellence” and “impact” goals discussed above, successful applicants will have accomplishments and sustained excellence and impact in scholarship and entrepreneurial activities (when relevant) to be recommended for promotion and/or tenure. The success and impact of graduate student mentoring, scholarship, and service should be judged relative to norms at comparable programs at peer and aspirational peer universities. Candidates shall be evaluated with respect to applicable criteria in their fields and departments (or other loci of appointment). Such factors as graduating PhD or MS students, co-authorship with graduate students, the raising of research dollars, and the relative importance of certain research outputs such as conference papers and academic journals are field-dependent and should also be evaluated with respect to the standards and practices of the candidate’s field(s). Accordingly, reviewers should recognize that metrics of performance are not the same in all disciplines, that many faculty members contribute to interdisciplinary programs, and that faculty members from several different disciplines may be employed within a single department.

  • In evaluating the various activities and outcomes, quantity alone cannot be the deciding factor. The quality, significance, and impact of each contribution must be considered, ideally within the framework of the norms at peer and aspirational peer universities and programs. Evaluators must be confident and conscientious enough so that routine activity is not mistaken for serious accomplishment.

  • Quality research may happen without associated research dollars; bringing in research dollars alone, without output, is likely not a sufficient measure of impact. Conversely, research dollars should be valued to the extent needed to fund a vibrant and impactful research program. The university recognizes the value of scholarship that is documented as having a high impact, even if it does not require extensive monetary support.

Teaching:
  • Student success is highly valued at Mines. Applicants with poor to mediocre teaching and mentoring records should not be recommended for promotion and/or tenure.

Service:
  • The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to candidates who prove themselves to be
able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and
the formulation of departmental, College, and University policies.

• Professional service is required and necessary for building reputations. Involvement by all faculty
members in professional service activities is expected and required, although pre-tenure faculty
should work closely with their Department Head to take on an appropriate amount of service. The
significance and impact of service activities is assessed by evaluators, and the expectations are
very different for applicants for promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor and for
promotion to Professor, as described above. Citizenship activities that are unrelated to
professional roles in the University (e.g., coaching a school soccer team) while laudable, do not
constitute evidence for P&T.

Interdisciplinarity:
• It is recognized that some faculty members may cross disciplinary boundaries in their research
and/or teaching, and such innovation is valued at Mines. Evaluators should consider
interdisciplinary work with respect to the standards in those disciplinary fields holistically.

• Research may involve multiple collaborators having different roles from a range of disciplines,
and that some faculty members’ research programs may be highly collaborative. Development of
collaborative and/or interdisciplinary programs at Mines is encouraged and valued, and reviewers
should consider these activities to be a positive attribute in evaluating applications for promotion
and/or tenure. Faculty members may contribute to multi-investigator efforts in both lead and
supportive roles, but in all cases the contributions should be significant and lead to research
pursuits that would not be possible without their involvement. Successful faculty members will
generally have records that reflect both lead and supporting roles in their research activities.

• Development of, and contribution to, interdisciplinary educational programs and courses is highly
valued at Mines.

Standards of conduct:
• Professional and ethical behavior is also highly valued at Mines. There is an overarching
University expectation that faculty and staff members exhibit the highest standards of personal
integrity and professional responsibility as articulated in section 6.2 of the Faculty Handbook.
Applicants with evidence of hostile, demeaning, aggressive, disrespectful, or exploitive
interactions with faculty members, staff, or students shall not be recommended for promotion
and/or tenure.

Diversity and Equal Opportunity:
• Research suggests that implicit bias may be an issue in evaluating candidates with respect to race
and gender. For example, letters of recommendation for men often are longer and refer more to a
candidate’s publications, research or other career achievements, while letters for women may
make reference to their personalities, personal lives or other irrelevant data, and contain fewer
descriptors about the quality of their work. Similarly, scholars from other countries may have
different cultural expectations for the length and style of letters, which may be shorter than
American letters with fewer effusive adjectives. Likewise, research suggests that minorities are
often evaluated lower, even for the exact same resume, and that supposedly neutral, quantitative
data may be evaluated by reviewers differently for majority and minority candidates. Promotion
and Tenure Committees should consider these elements when looking at internal and external
letters of recommendation for faculty.¹

¹ Examples include: Trix, F., and C. Psenka (2003) “Exploring the color of glass: letters of recommendation for
• Contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications. These contributions can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities.

**Timing:**
• The expectations for candidates who have stopped their clock pre-tenure should be the same as those for candidates on the standard timeline. The additional time in rank due to the stopped clock should not result in higher expectations.

• In evaluating applications for promotion and/or “early” tenure, candidates shall be evaluated solely on the strength of their records in meeting the criteria outlined above, not on time-served. Length of service at CSM or elsewhere shall not be a specific consideration, and candidates seeking early tenure and/or promotion shall be held to neither a higher nor a lower standard than those of other candidates.

**Awarding of Tenure:**
• The awarding of tenure amounts to an institutional investment in the faculty member’s long-term contribution to the scholarly and educational mission of the university. It is not merely a “reward” for doing what is expected; it is an investment in the future. Evaluators should review applications with this in mind and be satisfied that sufficient evidence of a continuing and maturing satisfaction of the various criteria is present in all cases.

**Promotion to Professor:**
• Every Professor at Mines is expected to be a University leader, contributing in a major way to the mission of the Department, College, and the University. Excellent performance and impactful activities in most of the major sectors of activity (teaching, scholarship, service, engagement) is expected. It is not enough to be successful at a level of productivity that was sufficient for promotion to Associate Professor for another five years of activity. There is an expectation of some qualitative difference in the scope and level of contributions for the promotion to Professor. For example, in the instructional arena, the types of activity that would be convincing of university leadership would include: teaching a broader range of classes, designing new courses, or participating substantially in curriculum development; and mentoring of PhD students to graduation. In research, one might expect: undertaking longer-range projects; the establishment of a substantial body of work that cements an expert’s reputation; having multiple streams of inquiry in play; invitations to give keynote or other special presentations at conferences or universities, with national and international scope; leading interdisciplinary teams on more complex projects; collaborations with an expanding circle of colleagues, both at Mines and externally. Service contributions could include: chairing committees at the departmental and university levels; serving on national review panels; membership on editorial boards of quality journals; exhibiting intellectual leadership that advances the institution beyond the goals of a faculty member’s department and beyond the accolades of their own career; and leadership in professional societies.

**A. Expectations of Departmental P&T Committees (DPTs)**

The DPT plays a critical role in the process for evaluating candidates. Specific expectations for the DPT, in addition to the duties stated in the Faculty Handbook and the Procedures Manual, can improve clarity, transparency, and consistency in DPT operations across campus. As DPT evaluations are based largely on a collection of individual opinions, it is difficult to ensure consistency in DPT decisions. Thus, it is recommended that DPTs take on a more active, regular role in advising faculty members seeking P&T, as this would provide greater clarity of expectations for individual faculty members.

- The DPT should define commonly held discipline-specific criteria for successful candidates comparable to criteria at peer and aspirational peer programs. The DPT’s evaluation and eventual recommendation should define these criteria, and be consistent with them.

- P&T evaluations and discussions may have a serious impact on the morale of the faculty member being evaluated, and also on the morale of the entire department. Thus, the DPT should consider wording its recommendation letters carefully: they should be factual and, if appropriate, contain objective and clear evaluations of candidate qualifications relative to P&T expectations.

- DPTs should develop plans for mentoring and providing feedback to untenured colleagues on the tenure-track. At a minimum, the Chair of the DPT should meet at least once per year with each tenure-track faculty member to discuss progress toward tenure and/or promotion and to provide recommendations and feedback.

B. Expectations of the Department Head (DH)

The DH plays an important role in the P&T process through several activities: providing regular mentoring of untenured faculty members; monitoring the process from package submission to recommendation to the UPT; selecting external letter writers and request input; and providing an evaluation of the candidate that may include relevant information not considered by the DPT.

- The DH should ensure that external letters are provided in a timely fashion. Selection of letter writers should follow the language in the Faculty Handbook and the Academic Affairs Procedures Manual.

- The DH recommendation must be comprehensive, addressing all criteria defined for P&T. They must be supportable by the evidence presented in the dossier, external reference letters, and/or the DPT recommendation. In addition, the DH letter should also clarify the disciplinary-specific norms and expectations.

- The DH is in a unique position with regard to P&T because he/she interacts with all faculty members in a manner that is not typical for faculty-faculty interactions, and is also responsible for implementing important departmental/College/University initiatives or requirements for which a majority of faculty members in the Department may not be knowledgeable. Thus, the DH recommendation should address any considerations not addressed by the DPT, such as special contributions toward important departmental, College, or University goals, participation in interdisciplinary programs, or other information deemed relevant.

- In each annual review, the DH should clearly assess progress towards P&T. This assessment must be based on a compilation of previous years' efforts and outcomes, and not simply the annual FDR.

- The DH should meet at least once per year with untenured tenure-track faculty members, in addition to the annual review, to discuss progress toward P&T. The DH should provide
recommendations and feedback to the faculty member at each meeting about how to proceed towards successful promotion.

C. Expectations for the University P&T Committee (UPT)

The Faculty Handbook currently defines the function and responsibility of the UPT in Sections 8 and 12.8.1, but the Faculty Senate has proposed to the Handbook committee a more detailed articulation of UPT responsibilities and processes. One this has been addressed by the Handbook Committee, the Faculty Senate should update this paragraph to delineate expectations for UPT not otherwise addressed in the Handbook.

D. Expectations of the Deans

Currently, per the Faculty Handbook, the deans participate in the P&T process as advisors to the Provost at the final evaluative stage of the decision process. The Faculty Senate has proposed to the Handbook committee a more direct role in the decision process. Once this role has been clarified by the Handbook Committee, the Faculty Senate should update this paragraph to delineate expectations for UPT not otherwise addressed in the Handbook.

The following documentation is based on a memorandum sent to the Associate Provost and Faculty Handbook Committee on April 30, 2014. These guidelines represent the recommendations of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Mentorship and Transparency in Promotion and Tenure Processes.

CANDIDATE:

The purpose of this section is to provide the candidate with additional information that supplements the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2 Guidelines for Submission of Promotion/Tenure Material. These guidelines are intended to help the candidate prepare his/her dossier in a manner that best presents his/her accomplishments. Due to inherent differences among different fields, it is not expected that all recommendations apply to all candidates or that each candidate should rigidly follow every last recommendation herein. Furthermore, these guidelines may not be all-inclusive. Finally, candidates should be fully aware that they are ultimately responsible for the accuracy and readability of a tenure or promotion package. Packages that do not follow format or are unduly burdensome in terms of length or lack of organization may be returned without review. Note that where tables are called out or prescribed, totals should be given where appropriate.

1. Candidate Statement
Within the candidate's dossier, the information below should appear within Item 1 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Provide a summary—typically 1 to 3 pages—of important accomplishments (impacts and advances) related to scholarship, teaching, and service in such a way as to demonstrate a positive trajectory. Build upon facts, describe the unique strengths and circumstances of the application.
- Applications for promotion to Full Professor should provide specific examples of leadership and national/international recognition.

2. Teaching
Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 12 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- For each course, list the number of students in the class and responses to questions related to teaching methods effectiveness (questions 901 scantron-based, 1 Blackboard-based) and overall
instructor effectiveness (questions 911 scantron-based, 10 Blackboard-based) from student evaluations.

- Briefly describe innovative course development activities and practices.
- Provide information other than student course evaluations that will assist the committee to determine teaching effectiveness and student learning (e.g. class visits, course portfolios).
- Provide clear data on student advising (level of effort, co-advisors, outcomes). Differentiate undergraduate research advising from conventional advising. For undergraduate research advising, list student names, research period, graduation semester, project title, and outcomes, such as conference presentations or publications. See Section 6.2 of Procedures Manual for details on graduate research advising.
- Include workshops and short courses, number of attendees, and your role (e.g., organizer, lecturer, one of two instructors for three-day course, etc.).

3A. Scholarship—Publications

Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 13 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Provide separate lists of archival journal publications, book/book chapters, and conference proceedings. Clearly identify publications that are peer reviewed and those that are not.
- Provide information regarding the quality of journals in which the candidate has published his/her work. In particular, provide acceptance rates and/or impact factors (or any other published quality indicators or measures). This information may be listed in a table within the publications section. If acceptance rates are difficult to obtain from the Internet, candidates may consider contacting journal editors directly.
- If authors are listed alphabetically, define candidate’s role and level of contribution. Clearly mark (1) the publications where the candidate is the corresponding author and (2) all co-authors who are CSM students and CSM post-doctorals. In the example below, CSM students are underlined and the corresponding author is denoted by *.


- If appropriate, include metrics such as number of citations, h-index over entire career, and h-index while at CSM.

3B. Scholarship—Funding

Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 14 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Clearly state the total funding that the candidate has been involved in securing as well as the individual’s total share.
- Clearly identify the amount of funding that is credited to the candidate in each multi-investigator grant.
- Clearly identify the candidates’ role on each funding award, e.g. PI, co-PI, senior investigator, etc.
- In collaborative grants with outside institutions, identify the amount expended at CSM.
- Provide information on how the funds were utilized to support students, post-doctoral, and/or technicians.
- Identify products such as number of papers, software, workshops, book, patents, etc. that resulted from the funding generated.
• List non-funded proposals (same level of detail as funded proposals) to demonstrate track record for trying to obtain grant funding.

4. Service

Within the candidate’s dossier, the information below should appear within Item 15 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

For all of the items listed below, note that the candidate should state his/her level of effort and the impact of the contributions. In other words, a list of service does not provide sufficient information.

• National and international committees, editorial boards, panels, review teams, etc.
• Departmental and campus committees, graduate student committees, junior faculty mentoring, etc.
• Professional societies
• Outreach activities
• Organizing conferences, sessions, workshops, etc.

DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE:

The following comments and questions are intended to help provide guidance and food for thought to Department Heads and Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees as they review applications and construct formal recommendations of these applications.

• Provide information regarding context of candidates’ accomplishments relative to peer departments and institutions.
• What are the expectations in terms of number of publications and research funds generated?
• How do you weigh writing a textbook as a teaching or research contribution?
• What is the average teaching load in your department for a research active faculty member by rank?
• What are the general expectations with respect to the teaching of number of undergraduate, graduate and advanced graduate level courses in your department?
• What are the expectations in your department in relation to the number of M.S. and Ph.D. students a candidate has helped to graduate before going for tenure and promotion?
• Do you count graduate student advising and supervision of special study courses towards teaching?
• Do you count advising undergraduate research towards teaching?
• Do you consider faculty mentoring as a valuable service and how do you assess outcome?
• Are there details unique to CSM that will assist external reviewers to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments?
• For the candidate’s discipline, are other avenues used to disseminate scholarly work (e.g., writing a textbook, instructional software and videos, professional development workshops, etc.)?
• What are the expectations for service at the department, campus, and extramural levels?
• Regardless of field, the case must be made that the candidate has had a strong impact on: students and student outcomes, research appropriate to their field and appointment, and enhancement of the reputation of CSM.
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6.6 ITEMS FOR CANDIDATE, DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING AND REVIEWING APPLICATION PACKAGES FOR LIBRARY FACULTY

The following documentation is based on a memorandum sent to the Associate Provost and Faculty Senate in February, 2015. These guidelines represent the recommendations of the Library Director and the Library Faculty regarding promotion considerations for Library Faculty. These criteria were endorsed by the Faculty Senate in March, 2015.

We are providing these guidelines to help the Library Director prepare promotion dossiers that make the best case for the candidates from the Library, and to provide promotion committees and department heads/college deans with information to support a balanced view of the candidate’s application for promotion.

It is generally understood in a research university that production of new knowledge is the paramount criterion for promotion. The application of criteria for librarians cannot and should not share this emphasis. It is more appropriate and even crucial that a librarian contributes to the improvement of the practice of academic librarianship rather than exhibit a body of research. Promotion to higher ranks is based on the career growth of the librarian, as demonstrated by a balance of professional and scholarly activities and service, with professional activities holding the largest proportion of the candidate’s accomplishments.

All library faculty are expected to apply disciplinary knowledge and innovation to local practice. However, due to typical division of duties in an academic library, no one candidate is expected to exhibit achievement in all of the other areas of librarianship/professional accomplishments listed below. Consider any or all that are applicable:

1. Librarianship/Professional Accomplishments

* Creative and/or innovative application of knowledge to local practices, grounded on expertise in academic librarianship.
* External recognition for professional expertise including awards, consultancies, etc. Include the nature of and criteria for the award; nature of consultancy and the organization requesting the service.
* Project management, grants, or gifts in the academic library environment. Include:
  o Scope of your project, goals and objectives, resources.
  o Impacts of this project on library mission, outcomes.
* Teaching and/or development of information skills:
  o Information, including student course evaluations, that will assist the committee to determine teaching effectiveness and student learning (e.g. class visits, input from students and instructors, participation/use numbers, awards).
  o New courses, activities, or guides to information resources in appropriate media.
  o Creativity in instruction, as demonstrated by local innovations, adaptation of instructional content for local audiences, implementation of workshops, student-oriented seminars, exhibitions, displays.
  o Instructional books or other materials considered as a teaching and/or research contribution.
* Research/subject-specific knowledge. Include:
  o Evidence of expertise in point of need support for students and faculty, including progressive development of subject expertise relevant to academic programs.
  o Ability to connect library resources with users and interpret user needs, demonstrated by improvement of services, collaborative research with faculty and students, or user needs assessment.
  o Development of resources to support research/curriculum needs in appropriate media; for example, subject-based guides, web resources, reference works, seminars, etc.
* Resource/collection management.
  o Demonstrated ability to develop collection resources to support the university’s curriculum and research needs, including user needs assessment, usage data, and collection level evaluations.
Development of consortia or partnership arrangements. Include the impacts of these activities on the library and campus.

Management of services from external vendors and publishers, including creating efficiencies in workflow, partnering to develop new products, interface modifications, and contract negotiations and implementation.

Access/data management:
- Demonstrated impact on access to resources, including activities to assess users’ needs and the level at which those needs are met, metadata statistics, etc.
- Rankings, awards, or consultation roles defining skill level for metadata creation or data management.
- Level of expertise in project management with data imports/exports, system configuration, or migration according to industry standards and local practices.
- Scope of access/data management projects, including impacts on the library and campus.

2. Publications & Research

- Quality of journals in which the candidate has published his/her work. Include:
  - Level of journal importance—Top tier, second tier, etc.
  - Quality or impact indicators, publisher’s reputation.

- In academic librarianship, identify other avenues used to disseminate scholarly work (e.g.: presentations at conferences or workshops, blogs or wikis).

- Level of importance, scope of audience—Top tier, second tier, etc.

- Quality or impact indicators, publisher’s reputation.

- In the list of publications, clearly identify works that are peer reviewed.

- Define the average expected number of publications per year of a library faculty.

- Identify the level of scholarly contribution to the discipline (include reviews, use statistics, etc.) for works in academic librarianship of:
  - Reference works, for example indexes, compilations, encyclopedias, databases, annotated bibliographies.
  - Interdisciplinary works: Works that apply aspects of librarianship to other disciplines.
  - Descriptive/analytical works based on collections, practices or assessment.
  - Software, interface design, classification systems, innovative processes.
  - Critical or review contributions to communications media (e.g., journals, newsletters, websites).
  - Presentations at professional conferences, workshops, special programs, etc. Identify scope of audience (regional, national or international audience) and impacts on the discipline.

- Internal research reports grounded in the discipline’s literature.

- Describe scope of your research, including goals and objectives, resources.

- Identify the impacts of your research on library mission. Include outcomes.

3. Service

- Level of effort and impact in serving in local, regional, national, and international committees, editorial boards, panels, review teams, conference planning groups, etc. Include:

- Scope of activities for your position.

- Describe outcomes, service awards, recognitions, etc.

- Level of effort and impact of service to the Library, Mines community, and the public.

- This could include committees, task forces, or service to local, state, private or public organizations.

- Describe your contributions and outcomes.

- Library/university administrative assignments. Describe scope of activities and outcomes.

- Development of policies, bylaws, guidelines, or standards. Describe level of involvement and impact on the organization.

- Outreach, including participation as a representative of the library/university at public events, presentations to public and private civic organizations, K-12 education groups.
Noteworthy contributions should be highlighted and elaborated on for the consideration of the Committee. The candidate should explain the nature and significance of each emphasized contribution.

4. Reference Letters

- Provide information on the process used to solicit references (how the list was prepared; how many were requested; whether the candidate provided any input; names that were used from the candidate-provided list).

- Any information on the reviewers who wrote the letters (their credentials and standing in the field, etc.)
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