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I. INTRODUCTION
A. Purpose and Scope of This Document

One of the most important decisions a university makes is the appointment to its faculty, the promotion of those who are appointed, and especially the awarding of indefinite tenure to those who are expected to make continuing important contributions as faculty members.

Those decisions are particularly complex in the context of a professional and graduate school like the Heinz College, where considerations of composition are an important part of the decision. The total composition of the faculty should reflect an appropriate mix of the constituent disciplines, a balance between disciplinary and applied research, the perspectives of practice, and a commitment to include minorities and women. The faculty must display sufficient flexibility to respond to the dynamic nature of student interests, placement opportunities, and the continually changing salient questions of policy and management and research support availability.

All of these aspects must be reflected in the composition of the Heinz College faculty broadly defined. Some might be viewed as most appropriate for tenure-track faculty, others for research staff, and others might best be pursued by teaching track faculty or adjunct faculty appointments.

This document is specifically addressed to the criteria and the process for reappointment, promotion, and awarding of tenure to individuals in tenure-track positions in the Heinz College. These will normally involve decisions to reappoint an assistant professor, to promote to associate professor, to award tenure, and to promote to full professor. In this document, the term "promotion" is used to refer generically to this entire set of decisions.
The process for appointment and reappointment of adjunct faculty is much less formal and is principally the responsibility of the Dean, but with the consultation of the appropriate group of faculty as defined in section III.B. The appointment of administrative personnel is the responsibility of the Dean.

The general criteria and procedures that must govern are those articulated in the current edition of the *Carnegie Mellon University Faculty Handbook*. These materials should be consulted by each candidate for reappointment and promotion. Because of the special nature of the Heinz College as both a graduate school and a professional school, however, the general criteria must be adapted to the Heinz College context, and the specific procedures to be used need detailed specification.

B. Objectives of the Review Process

The review process described in this document is intended to ensure that the Heinz College faculty is composed of individuals who are outstanding in their fields, who will make important contributions to the research and education programs at the Heinz College, who will make important contributions to their disciplines and to the solution of general problems in public policy and management, and whose achievements will enhance the reputation of the College and attract other excellent faculty and students of great promise. These goals are achieved by attracting faculty who have promise of attaining these objectives, by assuring that those who are retained and promoted show promise by recent accomplishments, and by structuring the promotion process to assure that individual faculty members pursue these goals of excellence.

The procedures are also formulated to ensure that the promotion process has full participation by the appropriate faculty, and they recognize that the faculty review is but one part of the university review process. In particular, the process recognizes that the Heinz College must have a diverse faculty with heterogeneity of disciplines and with considerable variation in individuals' orientation toward practice. The faculty may thus have difficulty in achieving unanimity on a particular case, and the faculty and the Dean may well have differing opinions regarding a
particular candidate. The process is intended to ensure that differing perspectives are reflected in the considerations at higher levels within the university.

II. CRITERIA

At each review session, the performance of the candidate is reviewed to assure that the criteria established for the position are satisfied. The principal requirement which a candidate must satisfy is a demonstration of outstanding achievement in research, with a clear indication of at least comparable accomplishment in the future. For awarding of tenure, and especially for promotion to full professor, the research accomplishments should be considerable and in depth, and should have received strong national recognition for the importance of their contribution. The contributions by candidates for promotion to associate professor should be outstanding in themselves, and should demonstrate the potential for reaching the tenure criterion when that decision must be made. Reappointments as assistant professor must be judged comparably, but with appropriate regard for their shorter period of research activity.

In addition, every candidate should aspire to excellence in teaching and student development. Even with an outstanding research record, performance in teaching that is less than satisfactory can be a sufficient basis for denying promotion.

Outstanding achievement in professional activity or in educational development that attains national recognition and replication might serve to bolster a research record that is excellent but just marginally short of outstanding in terms of quality, quantity, or impact. In no sense, however, could such professional achievements compensate for a research record that is less than excellent.

These considerations of research, teaching, and professional achievement are developed below.

A. Research Contributions
Research involves activities that lead to the production of new knowledge, new insights, creative synthesis of existing ideas, and new methods. Research achievements will be judged in terms of their validity, their importance, and their volume. The results will typically appear as peer reviewed and other published papers, reports, or books.

The assessment of the quality and the impact of the research contributions will lean heavily on peer judgments as articulated by members of the review committee, by inviting knowledgeable peers (normally from other units at CMU) to participate in the review discussion, and by soliciting letters from peers at other institutions. The letters will be, solicited by the Dean, from peers suggested by the candidate as well as from other knowledgeable senior individuals in the candidate's field.

The evaluation of the quality of the research publications should assess the significance of the work in terms of the importance of the problem addressed, whether it solved an outstanding problem or opened up new lines of inquiry, the innovativeness of the problem formulation and of the solution approach, and the degree to which others followed that work. The extent of citation, the stature of the journals in which results were published, and the quality of the refereeing all shed light on these issues. Research funding where peer evaluations are a key criterion in the funding decision is still another indicator of the quality, innovativeness, and importance of the candidate’s research program especially for pre-tenure promotion and retention decisions.

Financial support of a candidate's research can provide another indication of the significance of the candidate's research contributions, especially when such awards result from a peer evaluation process.

B. Teaching and Educational Development

The scope of the teaching function is defined in the Faculty Handbook:
Teaching, a principal function of the faculty, is direct educational involvement with students inside or outside the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and includes such usual activities as classroom, laboratory, or studio instruction, seminars, independent study project supervision, and supervision of graduate and postdoctoral research. It also includes the advising of undergraduate and graduate students. … Other educational activities include development of new or reformed courses, curricula, degree programs and training programs; educational publications, textbooks, and other instructional materials; and technical and critical popularization.

All faculty members should aspire to excellence in the performance of some appropriate combination of these teaching roles; the combination may well be different for different individuals. Excellence in teaching or educational development alone, without an outstanding research record, is not a sufficient basis for granting a promotion; unsatisfactory educational activities, on the other hand, can be a basis for denying a promotion, even with a strong research record.

Outstanding educational development would involve significant innovations that are nationally recognized and replicated. If the review committee views a candidate's educational development to be outstanding in these terms, then it may use those accomplishments to augment a research record that is marginally short of outstanding. However, they cannot be used to compensate for a research record that is judged to be less than excellent in its scholarly contributions.

Each faculty member is expected to maintain a portfolio containing class syllabi, copies of examinations and assignments, examples of class materials, and course evaluations. These materials will be reviewed by the review committee to assess dedication and competence in teaching and student development.

C. Professional Excellence
Since the Heinz College is a professional school, faculty members are encouraged to engage in professional activities involving public service. Such activities stimulate, help to shape, make more relevant the individual's research and teaching, and ensure that the faculty provide effective role models. This is not a requirement for every faculty member, but professional excellence must be an important characteristic of the tenure-track faculty. This may take place as part of their regular research, as consultants, as members of governmental advisory boards or commissions, as an editor or associate editor of scholarly journals, as the holder of elected or appointed positions in professional societies, or as public officials on leave.

Outstanding professional performance would involve significant innovations that are nationally recognized and replicated. If the review committee views a candidate's professional achievements to be outstanding in these terms, then it may use those accomplishments to augment a research record that is marginally short of outstanding. However, they cannot be used to compensate for a research record that is judged to be less than excellent in its scholarly contributions.

In addition, it is expected that each faculty member will contribute to the university community by serving on committees, participating in campus activities, undertaking a fair share of assignments at The Heinz College, etc. Quality of contribution in this area (as well as substantial failure to attend to it) should also be considered for promotion and Tenure, in addition to the categories listed above.
III. Expected Standards for Promotion

A candidate for an appointment (if he/she is from outside CMU) or promotion to Full Professor should be a recognized scholar in his or her field or discipline. Evidence for such standing shall include the quality and impact of scholarly publications and assessments to that effect of external evaluators of recognized standing in the candidate’s field or discipline. In addition, evidence should be available indicating that the candidate is a skillful and effective teacher. It is very desirable that the candidate have a demonstrated record of contribution to the College and University in the case of internal candidates or in the case of outside candidates to their present institution. Similarly, contributions to professional societies, advisory panels, and/or public service are very desirable. Typically, a candidate for Full Professor would have served as advisor to one or more completed doctoral students.

Tenure is granted to a candidates whose record shows that the leadership and reputation, inherent in the attributes of a Full Professor, are established or are being established. Indeed, all evidence presented should support the expectation that if the candidate is granted tenure, he/she will reach the Full Professorship in 2 to 3 years. If a candidate for tenure has all the qualifications of a Full Professor, he/she will be considered for promotion to Full Professor.

A candidate for an appointment or promotion to Associate Professor should have a record of accomplishment indicating clearly that he/she is a potential leader who in due time will be sufficiently well established to deserve promotion to Full Professor.

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Times of Consideration

Generally, the timing of the review process will conform to the decision periods established by general faculty promotion policy at Carnegie Mellon University. This policy requires a decision on tenure or termination not later than 8 1/2 years of full-time service or the equivalent from the
original date of appointment in the case of newly appointed assistant professors. Appropriate university rules apply in other cases. Reviews must be held so that any involuntary termination of service occurs no sooner than the end of the academic year following the one in which the decision is made. This procedure can be accelerated if the candidate requests early consideration or elects to count years of service at other institutions. (See Tenure and Promotion Time Chart below)
TENURE AND PROMOTION TIME CHART
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B. Composition of the Review Committee

The composition of the review committee depends on the rank of the candidate being reviewed. A candidate should be reviewed by all tenure-track faculty members who are senior in rank to the candidate being reviewed.

Under this principle, a committee composed of all full professors will evaluate all promotions to professor; they and all tenured faculty will review all candidates for tenure.

Promotions to associate professor and reappointments as assistant professor will be reviewed by a committee composed of all full professors and associate professors.

Since a number of individuals hold varying kinds of joint appointments in the Heinz College, all those who are in the eligible rank and who are partially supported by the Heinz College budget will be invited as full participants on the review committee but voting privileges require at least 50% support by Heinz except for eligible faculty members who would otherwise meet this support threshold if they were not on temporary leave or fall below this threshold due to support from other external sources such as grants. Tenured faculty on leave will be invited as full participants.

The Dean will normally invite other CMU faculty members of the appropriate rank who have participated actively over an extended period in the Heinz College program, but who may not be currently supported by the Heinz College budget. At the Dean's discretion, he or she may also invite other individuals, normally CMU faculty members, who are particularly knowledgeable about the candidate's work, to serve as resource persons but not to act as voting members of the review committee.

C. Review of Candidates Holding Joint Appointments at the Heinz College

Individuals holding joint appointments in the Heinz College will be reviewed in the same manner as any other Heinz College faculty member.
For individuals who declare a primary appointment in another school or department (including those whose salary is divided equally between the Heinz College and that unit), the Heinz College review will be coordinated with, and will generally follow, that of the primary unit. The Dean's office will secure materials from the unit that has primary responsibility, and these will be circulated to the appropriate review committee responsible for the Heinz College evaluation. The results of the Heinz College evaluation will be sent to the primary unit for inclusion in its recommendation to the appropriate university committee.

For individuals who declare a primary appointment in the Heinz College, the review procedure will be the symmetric opposite of the preceding paragraph.

For candidates for reappointment or promotion whose appointment is 50% in the Heinz College and 50% in another unit, there will be a coordinated but parallel review process agreed upon prior to the review by the Deans of the two units. The nature of this review process will be described to the candidate at the time mandated for notification of an upcoming review.

If a candidate is being considered for tenure jointly in the Heinz College and in another unit, the evaluation will proceed separately, with that of the Heinz College following the normal procedure for tenure review in the College. In these cases, the objective is to secure an independent evaluation by the Heinz College.

D. New Appointments to the Heinz College Faculty

The review of new appointments is generally expected to adhere to the same considerations and criteria for promotion or reappointment. In view of the uncertainty about the individual's willingness to accept an invitation and the necessity for negotiation of the terms of an appointment, much more discretion inevitably resides with the Dean. It is expected, however, that the basic forms of consultation between the Dean and the faculty embodied in the review process will be undertaken. In particular, all new appointments involving tenure must undergo the same review process as for any promotion to tenure. New appointments as an associate
professor without tenure require the same review process as for any promotion to associate professor.

New appointments as an assistant professor are also expected to involve faculty consultation. In this case, Heinz College faculty should be solicited for their opinion, and when the Dean believes an appointment is appropriate but where the faculty is unable to achieve general consensus, the Dean should convene a meeting comprising the appropriate review group (as specified in Section III.B.), or at least the tenured faculty, for discussion of the issues involved. The final decision, however, will rest with the Dean.

E. Format of the Review Process

1. Distribution of Materials

The Dean's office should distribute to all members of a review committee at least 20 days in advance of the meeting the relevant information submitted by the candidate. Each member of the review committee will receive the candidate's detailed statement on research and teaching accomplishments and future objectives, a detailed vita, and the papers the candidate considers to be the most salient of the portfolio. The review committee will be provided the opportunity to review letters from outside evaluators and current/former students at the review meeting.

2. Discussion Procedure

In the discussion of each candidate, an adversary procedure will be employed. The Dean will designate individuals to function in the pro and the con roles, and as recorder. The individuals serving pro and con should be provided the entire portfolio of the candidate's papers and should be informed of which papers within the portfolio were submitted to the entire review committee. The individuals selected for these roles will normally be those whose research interests match most closely those of the candidate but with concern for appropriate distribution of this heavier workload across the relevant members of the review committee.
The discussion of each candidate will be initiated by the individual assigned the pro role, followed by the individual assigned the con role. During their presentations, they will serve as resource people and will respond to questions of clarification of their position as presented or regarding points of clarification within the candidate's portfolio.

After the initial presentations of the adversarial positions, the roles will be abandoned and the designated adversaries will be able to participate freely in any further discussions. Throughout the discussions, their expertise in the general subject area and their in-depth knowledge of the candidate's research will make them generally valuable as resources for the discussions.

The pro/con procedure is not intended to be an adversarial process for assessing a candidate’s performance. Instead it is intended to insure that both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record are explicitly considered. For this reason it is encouraged that the persons assigned the pro and con roles communicate prior to the review to insure that each is aware of the substantive basis for the others arguments.

Since it may sometimes be the case that no one on the Heinz College faculty feels qualified to fully comprehend the nature of the contribution of a particular candidate's work, the Dean may invite to the review committee meeting other individuals, normally members of the CMU faculty, who could comment knowledgeably about the candidate's work and contribution. The Dean may invite such a presentation following the adversaries' presentations.

The Dean or his/her designee will serve as chairman of the review committee and will chair the discussion, trying to assure that all considerations that bear on the candidate's view are raised. In particular, the Dean or designee will see to it that considerations of the candidate's teaching performance, research performance - including the review by outside peers - and other contributions of the candidate to the Heinz College environment are presented in the review meeting.

3. Voting Procedure
Following the discussion, when the review committee is confident that all the relevant points have been raised and addressed, the Dean or designee will distribute ballots on which each member of the review committee will be asked to rate the candidate on the ballot shown in Figure 2.

The ballot first calls for each committee member to set down the basis of assessment of the candidate's research, teaching, educational development, and professional contributions in accord with the criteria laid out in Section II. Then, committee members are asked to rate the candidate on a continuous scale from 0 to 3, where

0 = the appointment should definitely not be approved;
1 = the appointment should probably not be approved;
2 = the appointment probably should be approved;
3 = the appointment definitely should be approved.

Once the ballots are collected, the Dean or designee will announce to the review committee the distribution of the ratings and the average rating.
Name of Candidate: ____________________________

Basis of Assessment (circle):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Less Than Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Less Than Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Development</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Contributions</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating:

3 = Definitely should be promoted
2 = Probably should be promoted
1 = Probably should not be promoted
0 = Definitely should not be promoted

Signature: ____________________________
4. Reporting Procedure to the University Committee

At the start of the discussion of each candidate, the Dean will designate a member of the review committee to serve as recorder of the meeting. The task of the recorder will be to prepare a summary of the highlights of the discussion, reflecting in a balanced way the considerations raised at the review committee meeting. That document should contain a record of the faculty vote on the candidate. The report will be distributed to all faculty members attending the review meeting in order to assure that the document fully reflects the issues raised. The participants in the meeting will sign the document or submit a dissenting statement.

The report prepared by the recorder will be submitted to the Dean for consideration in preparation of his/her report to the university review committee no later than one week after the review committee meeting. The Dean will include the recorder's report as a part of his/her report and recommendation.

5. Privacy of Deliberation

All discussions at promotion review meetings are to be treated as confidential. It is particularly important, in order to foster frankness of discussion, that there be no discussion outside the meeting that attributes any statement to any individual participant in the meeting or to the author of any review letters.

F. Information to be Provided to the Review Committee

The primary materials to be provided to the review committee are the following:

1. A statement prepared by the candidate regarding his/her research accomplishments and plans for the future.
2. A statement prepared by the candidate regarding his/her teaching accomplishments and plans for the future.
3. A statement prepared by the candidate regarding his/her professional activities and plans for the future.

4. A current vita of the candidate.

5. A list of referees submitted by the candidate who are in a good position to judge the quality of his/her work along with copies of letters solicited by the Dean from those referees.*

6. A list of current and former students to be solicited for their evaluations of candidate’s teaching skills.

7. Letters solicited by the Dean from other individuals not on the candidate's list who would also be in a position to evaluate the candidate's work. The source of the letters should be indicated to the review committee.*

78 A complete set of papers published or written by the candidate, with a most salient subset to be distributed to all members of the review committee and with the entire set to be distributed to the adversaries.

8. Documentation of the candidate's teaching evaluations.

Appendix A presents a more detailed specification of the materials that are to be provided.

*Omitted in the case of initial reappointment of assistant professors.
APPENDIX A

MATERIAL FOR DOCUMENTATION FOR THE COMMITTEE REVIEW

A comprehensive description of each candidate's activities is required. In the interests of fairness to candidates themselves, the committee should have information presented in a coherent and recognizable form. The candidate for review is responsible for assembling this documentation and delivering it to the Dean. The following items should be included in the supporting material whenever relevant. Other appropriate material not mentioned in this format may be included but should be incorporated in a rational manner. It is recognized that special circumstances (e.g., appointments from outside CMU) may make the assembly of all items of information listed below unnecessary or infeasible.

Candidate's Statement Concerning Research. The candidate is responsible for the preparation of a document which presents and evaluates his/her research activity. This document is much more than a listing of research outputs that is suggested below for the Curriculum Vitae. This document is used to present the candidate's research case to the committee. Accordingly, it should, at a very minimum, be a thorough and in-depth discussion of past and present efforts and future plans. Although there is no set format, the following items ought to be covered: (1) contributions the research has made to the field (s); this can be a brief statement of the contribution in each publication and working paper; (2) publications that have stimulated additional research or provoked controversies in the literature; (3) contributions to reports or other efforts, no matter whether formal recognition was awarded; (4) a discussion of past and present research strategies; and (5) plans and strategies relating to future contributions, insofar as these are known at present.

Candidate's Document Evaluating Teaching and Educational Activity. The candidate is responsible for the preparation of a document which evaluates his/her teaching and other educational efforts. This document is more than the mere listing of the material on teaching and educational activities that is requested for the Curriculum Vitae. This is the document in which the candidate is expected to make his/her case to the committee. It should include (1) a subjective self-evaluation of present and past teaching activities; (2) a presentation of other
evidence relating to teaching, such as results of regularly given student evaluations and other course evaluations that may have been conducted by the candidate; (3) plans for improvement of teaching performance; and (4) an assessment of all other educational contributions, including contributions to curriculum designs or reviews, introduction of new courses, advisory activity for both undergraduate and graduate students especially where there are outputs such as theses and dissertations, development of significant and innovative material for classes when the material is not appropriate as a research contribution, and any other activities considered relevant.

Candidate's Statement Concerning Professional Activities. The candidate is responsible for preparation of a document which evaluates his/her professional activities in public service. This document, as with the research and teaching documents, is to present his/her case to the committee. It should include a self-evaluation of professional activities, outlining (1) the ways in which they have helped shape research and teaching activities; (2) the contributions that have been made to the organizations served; and (3) the extent to which the activities have resulted in innovations that have been or are being recognized and replicated nationally.

Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae and Supporting Information

Biographical Data: Suggested Format

- Name.
- Place and date of birth.
- Education - degree, discipline, university, and date (for each degree earned).
- Former positions (including dates) held at CMU and elsewhere, beginning with the most recent. Include private professional practice. For employment outside CMU, give employer, address, position, and a brief description of activities and responsibilities.
- Consulting assignments - organization, department, address, dates, supervisor or client's name, and significant contributions (optional).

Teaching and Educational Activities: Suggested Format
- Educational contributions (apart from classroom performance and supervision) such as new programs, textbooks, or curricula developed. This information should include evidence of the impact within the discipline.
- Courses taught each semester at CMU. Include units and class level of each course, number of students, dates, and the FCE scores for overall course and instructor ratings. Identify new courses developed.
- Student projects - list undergraduate and graduate projects separately; include graduate theses and dissertations supervised.
- Other educational contributions, such as special advisory functions, guidance of student scholarly organizations, etc.

List entries in each of the categories in chronological order. Indicate the status of all forthcoming work (i.e., submitted, under review, accepted, in press).

- Books.
- Papers critically reviewed prior to publication (as in journal or transactions of a scholarly journal).
- papers in peer reviewed symposia or conference proceedings.
- Sections or chapters in an edited monograph or volume and papers in non-peer reviewed symposia. Edited volumes.
- Book reviews.
- Bibliographies (specify if annotated).
- Other appropriate examples of research or scholarly activities.
**External Grants and Contracts: Suggested Format.**

Identify grants and contracts awarded by title, funding source, and the period and amount of support. Describe role (e.g., principal investigator, associate, participant). The information should be chronological, and should include both grants and contracts awarded to date and pending proposals.

**Other Scholarly and Professional Activities: Suggested Format.**

- Seminars, talks, and other presentations given without publication. List title, place, occasion, and date.
- Government committees, civic appointments, board memberships. Include position held in the group, organization, location, and dates of service.
- Membership and activities in honorary fraternities, professional societies, and associations. List committee memberships and positions on these committees, including dates.
- Editorial duties for professional publications, and major activities in professional societies and meetings.
- Awards, prizes, honors, (excluding predoctoral fellowships or assistantships).
- Identify the honor, awarding agency, its address, and dates.
- Participation in student or faculty organizations, committees, and/or ad hoc appointments.
- Participation in civic, regional, and/or national service organizations.

**Additional Information.**

The candidate is responsible for assembling copies of all appropriate material relating to his/her case (except for letters and other material which is assembled by the Dean). Normally this package is to include all published and unpublished material considered relevant, certainly including all research but also other items such as classroom material thought to be exceptional. For cases beyond reappointment at the assistant professor level where the volume may be large,
the candidate should indicate to the Dean those particular pieces he/she considers to be the most important for the promotion review. Normally the Dean will want at least three complete packages assembled, and a number of other packages which need not include those items not considered most important. It is the responsibility of the candidate to find out from the Dean how many packages of each kind to assemble.