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Criteria

General principles

The criteria for recommendations on appointment and tenure decisions can only be stated in general terms. This is a reflection of the nature of the decision-making process and of the changing character of the University. It is essential, however, that the recommendations be informed by an orderly and fair process of evaluation in which the appropriate faculty members, the department heads, the College committees, and the Dean participate, acting as objectively as possible on the available information and exercising their best judgment.

Recommendations for initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure are to be based on an estimate of the contributions - actual or potential, depending on the nature of the decision - of the candidate to the academic excellence of the University and the College. In general, a recommendation for an affirmative decision will be made if

- (a) the person - if a candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure - has contributed to the excellence of the University and the College by teaching and other educational activities and by research and other scholarly activities; or - if a candidate for initial appointment - is judged to be among those showing the greatest promise of so contributing if appointed; and
- (b) the candidate's retention or appointment will enhance the quality of the University and the College and contribute to the achievement of their goals; and
- (c) it is confidently expected that the criteria for further advancement will be met (unless, of course, the decision is for initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Professor).

As stated in (a) above, there are two basic areas in which a candidate's quality of performance is to be evaluated: Teaching and Other Educational Activities, and Research and Other Scholarly Activities (cf. UP Criteria: Criteria). Thorough consideration is to be given to the candidate's qualifications in each of these areas. With infrequent exception it is expected that, to justify a recommendation for an affirmative decision, a candidate must be excellent, having regard to his or her current stage of development, in both teaching and other educational activities, and in research and other scholarly activities.

It is understood, however, that people may follow varied paths in pursuing their careers. Outstanding contributions in the field of education, or distinguished scholarly activities, may be more compelling arguments for appointment or retention than extensive achievements in research, and may provide a primary justification for a recommendation for an affirmative decision.

It is expected that each evaluation for reappointment, promotion, or the granting of tenure will be based on evidence of solid growth beyond the point reached at the preceding decision. The provisions of the University Policy (UP Criteria: Application of criteria) describe in some detail the level of achievement required for various appointment and tenure decisions.

Teaching and Other Educational Activities
Teaching is an essential component of the University's work. As characterized by the University Policy,

Teaching, a principal function of the faculty, is direct educational involvement with students inside or
outside the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and includes such activities as classroom, laboratory, or studio
instruction, seminars, independent study supervision, and supervision of graduate and postdoctoral
research. It also includes the advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. (UP Criteria:
Criteria, A. Teaching and Other Educational Activities)

The University Policy describes Other educational Activities as including
development of new or reformed courses, curricula, degree programs, and training programs; educational
publications, textbooks, and other instructional materials; and technical and critical popularization. (UP
Criteria: ibid.)

The College has a responsibility to the students and to the University to ensure that there is serious, detailed, and
effective discussion of the teaching performance and qualifications of every candidate for an appointment or tenure
decision.

The evaluation of teaching and of quality in other educational activities thus includes the consideration of such factors as:

- (a) the respect of students, based on their considered opinion that the faculty member conveys up-to-date
  command of the subject matter; is knowledgeable, well prepared, and demanding but considerate regarding
  student effort; inspires individual students; is accessible and helpful to students outside the classroom or
  laboratory; respects and encourages the expression of student opinion; and has left a lasting positive impact
  through his or her teaching;
- (b) the respect of colleagues, both senior and junior, and of teaching assistants, for teaching performance;
- (c) evidence of keeping abreast of scholarship in the subject area of the teaching activity;
- (d) a mature working relationship between the faculty member and research students and postdoctoral associates,
  and evidence of the continued intellectual growth of students;
- (e) course, curriculum, and degree program development: sponsoring of independent research projects;
  contributions to deeper insights into the teaching and learning process; and effective responses to Carnegie
  Mellon's permanent concern with quality education;
- (f) creation of sounds, imaginative, and challenging teaching materials; design and implementation of education
  technology;
- (g) publications on innovations in teaching; leadership in professional organizations in the field of education;
  external seminars, lectures, and conferences on education;
- (h) broad recognition as an outstanding educator.

As stated in the University Policy,

Competence in teaching should be documented by means including colleague evaluations and meaningful
student evaluations obtained through surveys and solicited and unsolicited written opinions. (UP Criteria:
ibid.)

When eliciting student opinions, a serious effort should be made to avoid bias and to obtain responses from mature
students, past and present, reflecting some retrospection.

It is recognized that documenting the quality of teaching at other institutions, in the case of a candidate for initial
appointment who has previous teaching experience in higher education, is considerably more difficult than
documenting research or other activities; recognition of this fact should not excuse those responsible for assembling the
information from making a thorough effort to collect evidence on this point. In the case of a candidate for initial
appointment who has no formal teaching experience, a judgment on the promise of teaching quality must be made as
carefully as possible from all available information.
Research and Other Scholarly Activities

The Mellon College of Science expects that its faculty members will make independent contributions to research and to scholarly work in their fields. There should be concrete evidence of the ability to initiate and to carry through to completion research whose worth is recognized by others in the field. It is indeed expected that a candidate for an appointment or tenure decision will have achieved a national or international professional reputation commensurate with the rank of the appointment.

The University Policy states that, with regard to Research, Scholarly, or Artistic Activities (omitting items not relevant to the Mellon College of Science),

> Competence in the activities of this category should be documented by the record of accomplishment, including publications and inventions; the record of recognition, including awards, prizes, honors from professional societies, and critical reviews of publications and research proposals; and the considered opinions of outstanding experts in the candidate's field, both inside and outside the University. (UP Criteria: Criteria, B. Research, Scholarly, or Artistic Activities)

When judging an individual's contributions to research, it is essential to take into account the diverse organizational formats in which research is carried out in different fields, especially when evaluating participation in a collaborative research effort, whether occasional or institutionalized.

In accordance with the University Policy (UP Criteria: ibid.), the considered opinions of outside experts carry increasing weight as the level of the decision rises. The College shall require outside opinions for all appointment and tenure decisions except for the following: reappointment at the rank of Instructor; promotion from the rank of Instructor to the rank of Assistant Professor; reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Outside opinions may, however, be requested even in such a case if the department or the Dean or a College committee judges that they might contribute significant information.

Other considerations

The following provisions recite, with application to the Mellon College of Science, corresponding provisions of the University Policy (UP Criteria, C. Other considerations).

Candidates for appointment and tenure decisions may also carry out professional activities that should be considered: e.g., professional practice, consulting, public service, service in professional and technical societies, and editorial work on professional journals and other publications. Insofar as such activities either contribute to, or are an extension of, either of the two categories of activities described earlier in this section, they should be considered when evaluating qualifications under each of these two categories.

It is expected that every faculty member will contribute, by means of his or her expertise and the commitment of reasonable time and effort, to the functioning and welfare of the University community, and of the College and his or her department in particular, through such activities as chairing or serving on committees and councils, providing professional supervision of educational, research, and other scholarly University resources, etc. Quality of contributions in this area of Service is to be considered (as well as substantial failure to attend to it), in addition to the main two categories of activities described above.

Procedures

Initiation

Between 1 January and 1 July of every calendar year, the Dean communicates to each department head the list of all
faculty members in the respective department

- (a) whose term of appointment (other than a terminal appointment) expires on 30 June of the following calendar year, or
- (b) whose tenure decision deadline is 30 June of the following calendar year.

The reappointment or promotion decisions, in Case (a), and the tenure decisions, in Case (b), that are required by the University Policy (UP Term and Timing) are termed mandatory decisions, and every mandatory decision process is regarded as automatically initiated on 1 July of the year in question.

All reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions (other than tenure decisions accompanying initial appointment decisions) that are not mandatory under the preceding definition are termed optional decisions. These include early decisions for faculty members without indefinite tenure and decisions on promotion to the rank of Professor.

Every optional decision process is initiated either by a decision of the department head with the agreement of the candidate, or (except for reappointment decisions) at the written request of the faculty member, submitted to the department head. Optional decisions are subject to the pertinent provisions of the University Policy (UP Term and Timing: Early decisions). In order for an optional promotion or tenure decision to be assured of consideration in time to become effective on 1 July of a given calendar year, it should be initiated on or before 1 September of the preceding calendar year.

Every initial appointment decision process (including, if appropriate, an accompanying tenure decision process) is formally initiated by a decision of the department head. This decision to initiate the process must be preceded by steps, undertaken with the permission of the Dean and conducted in accordance with statutory provisions and University personnel regulations, to obtain applications and nominations (by means including posting and advertising) and to examine them; the decision to initiate the process should also be based on consultations with departmental faculty, including, if appropriate, recommendations of departmental committees. An initial appointment decision process may be initiated at any time; the determination of the effective date of the resulting appointment will, however, depend on timing the initiation so as to permit the process to be carried to completion in an orderly manner.

**Documentation**

The department head obtains and assembles the documentation required for the departmental deliberation on each appointment and tenure decision, consulting with the candidate regarding those matters that are wholly or in part the candidate's responsibility. The required documentation is outlined in the appended Checklist, which is an integral part of this Policy; the department head or the candidate may, however, supply documentation not included in the Checklist when it is judged to be relevant to the case. The candidate must be invited to suggest (but may not impose) names of people who should be asked to provide a considered opinion, in addition to those chosen by the department head after consultation with departmental faculty.

**Departmental recommendation**

The departmental recommendation on a proposed appointment or tenure decision shall be determined on the basis of a discussion and a vote at a meeting, or meetings, of specified faculty members in the department, according to the following rules.

**A. Participants**

At the meeting or meetings to determine the departmental recommendation on an appointment or tenure decision, the department head or a faculty member with indefinite tenure designated by the department head presides, whether he or she is, under these rules, entitled to vote or not.

In the following table, the specification of the nature of the decision in question is followed by the specification of those
faculty members in the department who are entitled to vote on the recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Faculty members entitled to vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial appointment or reappointment at the rank of Instructor; or initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Assistant Professor.</td>
<td>All Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor; or initial appointment or reappointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor.</td>
<td>All Associate Professors and Professors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granting of tenure at the rank of Associate Professor (this vote to be preceded by the appropriate one referred to in the preceding paragraph if the granting of tenure is to accompany an initial appointment at, or a promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor).</td>
<td>All faculty members with indefinite tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Professor; or granting of tenure to a Professor appointed without indefinite tenure.</td>
<td>All Professors (excluding those without indefinite tenure).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer appointments and the conversion of appointments in other units into joint appointments shall be treated, for the sole purpose of this table, as initial appointments.

In addition to all the faculty members entitled to vote on a recommendation, the following are entitled to participate in the deliberation preceding the vote, and therefore also to have access to all the documentation of the case: Professors and Associate Professors Emeriti and Emeritae who would be entitled to vote except for the circumstance of their retirement; and members of the research faculty and lecturer track appointees, according as regular faculty members of equivalent rank and without indefinite tenure would be entitled to vote. Other regular, research, or lecturer track faculty members (in the department or not) not entitled to vote may be invited to participate in some or every part of the deliberation by decision of those entitled to vote. The participation of faculty members not in the department may be particularly appropriate for the evaluation of interdisciplinary contributions by the candidate.

B. Deliberation

The discussion leading to a departmental recommendation regarding an appointment or tenure decision is to be governed by the criteria formulated in the University Policy (UP Criteria) and in the section of this Policy entitled "Criteria", and by no other considerations.

The discussion is to be based primarily on the documentation provided by the department head. Any faculty member, student, or other member of the University community may, however, communicate relevant information and/or his or her opinion to the department in writing. The participants in the discussion may also instruct the department head to request or secure additional opinions or factual information before concluding the deliberation. All materials obtained in any of these ways become part of the documentation of the case.

C. Vote

At the conclusion of the departmental deliberation, those participants entitled to do so proceed to vote:

- (a) in the case of initial appointment decision, on whether to recommend an affirmative decision;
- (b) in every other case, on whether to recommend an affirmative decision or to recommend a negative decision.

If they regard it as appropriate, they may also vote on the inclusion of any specific relevant points in the
recommendation.

The manner of voting is subject to the following conditions:

- (a) all participants entitled to vote have equal votes; and
- (b) the vote is not carried out by secret ballot: either each voter's vote is made known to the meeting (as, e.g., by show of hands), or each voter communicates his or her signed vote in writing to the department head.

In all other respects, the manner of voting is governed by a standing departmental policy or, if there is none, by agreement of the participants entitled to vote.

The participants entitled to vote may also instruct the department head on the manner in which the result of the vote is to be reported.

D. Report

With the exception of the case of a deliberation and vote on an initial appointment decision that does not produce a departmental recommendation for an affirmative decision, a report on the departmental deliberation and vote, and on the resulting recommendation, is prepared by the department head and signed by every participant entitled to vote. Faculty members entitled to vote on the recommendation who were absent will have the reasons for their absence recorded in the report.

The signatures must be preceded by the following statement:

The undersigned faculty members participated in the deliberation on the departmental recommendation regarding the [appointment/reappointment/promotion/tenure] decision concerning N, and certify that the report of the department head truly reflects the decision made at the departmental meeting. These signatures do not indicate approval or disapproval of the recommendation.

Individual faculty members, including those unable, or not entitled, to participate in the deliberation, are of course free to communicate their opinions in writing, either as part of the departmental documentation or directly to the Dean.

The department head may add to the report a separate recommendation; such a separate recommendation must, however, be communicated for information to all those entitled to participate in the deliberation.

E. Disposition

If the deliberation and vote regarding an initial appointment decision do not produce a departmental recommendation for an affirmative decision, the process is thereby terminated. The department head informs the Dean in writing of this outcome, and the file, containing the complete documentation and a record of the termination, is closed.

In every other case, the department head's report containing the departmental recommendation and the required signatures, is communicated to the Dean together with the complete documentation.

Every year the Dean specifies a date, no later than 30 September, on or before which the departmental recommendations on all mandatory decisions must be communicated to the Dean. Departmental recommendations on optional decisions as well as on initial appointment decisions should be communicated on or before the same date or, if this is not feasible, on or before another date specified by the Dean.

The obligation to notify a faculty member of the departmental recommendation on an appointment or tenure decision, as well as to provide, at his or her request, a statement of reasons for the recommendation, is mandated and governed by the University Policy (UP Procedure: College and School Policies, B. Procedure).

College procedures
A. General rules

In accordance with the provisions of the University Policy (UP Procedures: General rules, and College and School Policies, B. Procedure), there are two levels of thoroughness of the procedures for dealing with departmental recommendations on appointment and tenure decisions. A summary procedure is prescribed for: initial appointment and reappointment at the rank of Instructor; initial appointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Assistant Professor; and transfer appointment, without promotion, of a faculty member already appointed with indefinite tenure. A comprehensive procedure is prescribed for all other cases, viz.: reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor; initial appointment and reappointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor; initial appointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Professor; and all tenure decisions.

If a summary procedure is prescribed, the departmental recommendation is considered by the Dean, who may request, at his or her discretion, additional information and/or opinions, including the opinions of departmental or College committees, before formulating his or her own recommendation as provided for below.

If a comprehensive procedure is prescribed, the Dean submits the departmental recommendation together with all the accompanying documentation to the appropriate Ad-Hoc Committee and, together with that Committee's report and recommendation, to the Review Committee, before formulating his or her own recommendation, according to the following rules.

B. Ad-Hoc Committees

On or before 1 September of every year, the Dean appoints two Ad-Hoc Committees on Faculty Appointments (called Ad-Hoc Committees for short), viz., the Ad-Hoc Committee on Appointments Without Indefinite Tenure and the Ad-Hoc Committee on Appointments With Indefinite Tenure (called the Ad-Hoc Non-Tenure Committee and the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee for short, respectively). The members of these Committees serve until the successor Ad-Hoc Committees have been appointed. Occasional or permanent vacancies are filled by the Dean in such a way as to preserve the prescribed composition of the Ad-Hoc Committees.

Each Ad-Hoc Committee consists of between five and eight members, all of whom are faculty members in the University, with at least one faculty member from each of the departments of the Mellon College of Science. The appointments should be made with a view to including some member or members within the general area of activity of each candidate whose case is to be examined; in exceptional cases this may require the appointment of an additional member. The inclusion of a faculty member not in the Mellon College of Science may be appropriate for the evaluation of interdisciplinary contributions by a given candidate, and requests for inclusion of faculty members from outside the college may be initiated by a department head or by the Dean. A department head should not be appointed a member of an Ad-Hoc Committee, unless no other qualified faculty member is available from that department. The Dean designates one member of each Ad-Hoc Committee to chair it.

The members of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee must all be faculty members with indefinite tenure. The members of the Ad-Hoc Non-Tenure Committee must be faculty members with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and should include at least two Associate Professors without indefinite tenure, if available.

The Ad-Hoc Non-Tenure Committee makes recommendations on reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor and on initial appointment and reappointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor when made without indefinite tenure.

The Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee makes recommendations on all tenure decisions; on initial appointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor when made with indefinite tenure; and on initial appointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Professor (including the exceptional case of initial appointment at that rank without indefinite tenure).

When the departmental recommendation is to make an initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate
Professor with indefinite tenure, the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee makes the recommendation, but may instead recommend (taking the place of the Ad-Hoc Non-Tenure Committee) that the proposed initial appointment or promotion be made, but without indefinite tenure, if such an appointment is permitted under the provisions of the University Policy.

Each Ad-Hoc Committee reviews thoroughly each of the cases submitted to it by the Dean and prepares a written report and recommendation, being as specific as possible in stating reasons for the recommendation and reflecting any significant diversity of opinion in the Committee. The recommendation shall be based on the materials in and accompanying the departmental recommendation, as well as on any additional information and/or opinions obtained by the Committee (it being the responsibility of the Committee chair to request and secure such additional material). The report supporting the Committee's recommendation shall address the qualifications of the candidate within the criteria formulated in the University Policy (UP Criteria) and in the section of this Policy entitled "Criteria". It is not the role of the Ad-Hoc Committee to effect new policy or planning decisions through its report.

Each Ad-Hoc Committee adopts its own rules and procedures for carrying out its evaluations and for deciding on recommendations. The Committee's report and recommendation on each case is signed by all members of the Committee and submitted, together with all the documentation, to the Dean.

C. Review Committee

The Mellon College of Science Review Committee on Faculty Appointments (called the Review Committee for short) consists of the Dean, who presides; each Associate Dean who is a faculty member with indefinite tenure; the College's department heads; the Chair of the Faculty Organization of the Mellon College of Science, or the Chair-Elect if the Chair is unable to attend; and two senior faculty members appointed by the Dean on or before 1 September of each year, and from time to time if vacancies occur.

The Dean presents to the Review Committee each case subject to a comprehensive procedure, together with the report and recommendation of the Ad-Hoc Committee and all the documentation. The Review Committee discusses the case and votes on a recommendation to the Dean.

The manner of voting is determined by the Review Committee, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) all members of the Review Committee have equal votes; and
- (b) the vote is not carried out by secret ballot.

In the absence of a contrary determination, the vote is by show of hands, with abstentions permitted.

The Review Committee may also instruct the Dean on the manner in which the vote is to be reported; in the absence of such an instruction, this decision is left to the discretion of the Dean.

D. Disposition

The Dean acts on every departmental recommendation regarding an appointment or tenure decision by formulating his or her own independent recommendation; if the decision is subject to a comprehensive procedure, this recommendation is formulated after the action by the Review Committee.

The Dean's recommendation, his or her report on the action of the Review Committee, the report and recommendation of the Ad-Hoc Committee (the latter two in the case of a comprehensive procedure), the departmental recommendation, and all the documentation, together constitute the College recommendation on each case, which is transmitted by the Dean to the Provost for the implementation of the provisions of the University Policy (UP Procedures: General rules, and University Committees).

The Dean informs the department head and the members of the Ad-Hoc Committee and the Review Committee (if applicable), in confidence, of the recommendation made on each case.
The obligation to notify a faculty member of the College recommendation on an appointment or tenure decision, as well as to provide, at his or her request, a statement of reasons for the recommendation, is mandated and governed by the University Policy (UP Procedure: College and School Policies, B. Procedure).

Annual review

It is the responsibility of each department head, under the general supervision of the Dean, to implement the mandate of the University Policy that

   every faculty member of a rank other than that of Professor is annually given reasonably reliable and detailed information on his or her performance in relation to the department's and the College's goals and resources, and with a view to the prospect of a reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision, as appropriate in each case. (UP Procedure: College and School Policies, B. Procedure)

Confidentiality

Except for such access to, and disclosure of, information as is mandated or explicitly permitted by the University Policy or by this Policy, all information concerning documentation, deliberation, and votes regarding appointment and tenure decisions is to be held by all participants and administrators in strict confidence to the extent permitted by law.
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Introduction

Among the most important decisions made by the administration and the faculty of a university are those involving the status of faculty members. Decisions on initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, the granting of tenure, and salary all shape the kind of faculty we build, and the faculty will determine how well Carnegie Mellon and the Mellon College of Science fulfill their goals. The criteria and procedures prescribed in the present Policy for appointment and tenure decisions are intended to help to make decisions that are fair, timely, clearly understood, and effectively related to the long-term needs of the University, the College, and the individual faculty members. They are also designed with the intention of assisting members of the faculty in planning their own personal and professional development.

The present Appointment and Tenure Policy of the Mellon College of Science (hereinafter referred to as this Policy) supplements the provisions of the Appointment and Tenure Policy of Carnegie Mellon University adopted on 10 December 1990 and in effect from 1 January 1991 (hereinafter referred to as the University Policy), and constitutes the College Appointment and Tenure Policy mandated by the University Policy. Terms in this Policy that are not defined here are as defined in the University Policy. To the extent of any inconsistency between this Policy and the University Policy, the latter shall prevail. When citing provisions of the sections of the University Policy entitled Faculty Appointments: Term of Appointment and Timing of Decisions, Faculty Appointments: Criteria, and Faculty Appointments: Procedures, the respective abbreviations, UP Term and Timing, UP Criteria, and UP Procedures will be used, followed by a subsection title if appropriate.

This Policy shall be applicable on and after 1 January 1992 to all existing and future regular faculty appointments in the Mellon College of Science; except that a person holding a regular faculty appointment in the College on that date shall continue, so long as he or she holds regular faculty appointments in the College without interruption, to be governed by
the College policies on faculty appointment and tenure that were applicable to him or her immediately before that date, to the extent only that such policies conflict with this Policy. A person entitled to this exception may, however, opt in writing to be governed by this Policy without exception.

The sections of this Policy entitled "Criteria" and "Procedures" are intended to apply to the formulation of all College recommendations on appointment decisions (including decisions on initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion) and tenure decisions regarding regular faculty appointments in the Mellon College of Science. A section entitled "Joint Appointments" contains the modifications to these criteria and procedures that apply to joint faculty appointments either within the College or with other units of the University. A section entitled "Research Faculty" contains the adaptations of the criteria and procedures to research faculty appointments in the Mellon College of Science, as mandated by the University's policy on Research Faculty Appointments.
Joint and Courtesy Appointments

Joint Appointments

Introduction

Carnegie Mellon and the Mellon College of Science are committed to encouraging, facilitating, and rewarding interdisciplinary educational and scholarly activities. Appointments of faculty members in more than one department should be designed to further this objective.

The University Policy provides the following definition:

A faculty appointment is called a joint appointment if it is made in more academic units (departments, or Colleges or Schools) than one. For administrative purposes, one of the participating units is designated as the home unit. A joint appointment has a single rank and tenure status. At any given time, a joint appointment has a salary-and-commitment distribution that may lie (for two participating units) anywhere between 50%-50% and 100%-0% inclusive. (UP Term and Timing: Types of appointment)

The provisions of the present section of this Policy govern joint appointments in more than one department of the Mellon College of Science. Joint appointments between the College and other Colleges and Schools of the University are governed in some detail by the provisions of the University Policy (UP Procedures: Joint appointments); subject to those provisions, and to the extent that there is no conflict with them, the College and its departments consider the basic principles stated in the next subsection of the present section of this Policy as binding for such joint appointments, and negotiate all other provisions, either on general or on case-by-case terms, taking the provisions of the present section of this Policy as guidelines for discussion.

The provisions of the present section of this Policy are formulated, for convenience, for appointments involving two departments; but they are to be regarded as applying, with the obvious required changes, to appointments involving more than two departments.

Principles

The following basic principles govern joint appointments involving one or more departments in the Mellon College of Science:

- (a) The joint appointee is qualified to be appointed at his or her rank and tenure status in each of the participating departments.
- (b) The joint appointee is a member of each of the participating departments, and is entitled to vote, as rank and tenure status may determine, at its meetings; but is entitled to only one vote in matters where the Faculty Organization of the Mellon College of Science or the Faculty Organization of Carnegie Mellon University votes as one body, or for Faculty Senate elections. It is expressly noted that, as regards membership in departments of the Mellon College of Science, this provision is applicable to joint appointments between the College and other units of the University.
- (c) The joint nature of the appointment continues during the term of appointment as determined by the University
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Policy (hence, indefinitely in the case of an appointment with indefinite tenure); it may be terminated during such term of appointment only with the appointee's consent.

- (d) The joint appointee is entitled to a designation that incorporates the names of the disciplines of all the participating departments; but a more specific designation (e.g., Professor of Chemical Physics) may be agreed upon.

The preceding basic principles govern all joint appointments, including those with 100%-0% salary and commitment distribution. In the subsection on " Courtesy Appointments" of the present section of this Policy there is an outline of other methods, of various degrees of formality, but short of a joint appointment, for extending one department's

Definitions

For every joint appointment, the participating department having the greater percentage of the salary-and-commitment distribution is the home department; but if the distribution is equal or nearly so, the choice of home department, may be dictated by other considerations, and is made by agreement between the department heads and the faculty member. (Faculty members with substantial commitment to administrative positions may require other administrative and budgetary arrangements.)

For the purpose of determining the procedures regarding a joint appointment, it is defined to be a major joint appointment if the percentage of the salary-and-commitment distribution in the home department does not exceed 75%, and as a minor joint appointment otherwise (the latter kind includes an appointment with a 100%-0% distribution). A deviation from this threshold percentage may, under exceptional circumstances documented in writing, be approved by the Dean for a specific appointment, acting on the concurrent recommendations of the participating department heads, and subject to the consent of the faculty member.

The salary-and-commitment distribution of a joint appointment serves as a guideline for the service that the participating departments may expect from the appointee, and, in particular, for teaching and committee assignments. Short-term fluctuation in commitment need not alter the specified distribution; but the distribution may also be modified from time to time with the agreement of the department heads, the Dean, and the appointee, subject to the provisions of the present section of this Policy regarding the conversion of a minor joint appointment into a major one and vice versa.

Major joint appointments

The most challenging aspect of joint faculty appointments concerns reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Therefore, joint appointments made without indefinite tenure must be made with full consideration of both the added benefits and challenges of a joint appointment at the junior level or in the non-tenure tracks.

To arrive at an initial appointment decision regarding a major joint appointment, there must be concurrent departmental recommendations and an agreement between the participating departments on salary-and-commitment distribution. Concurrent departmental recommendations are also required for the conversion of an appointment in one department into a major joint appointment, as well as for the conversion of a minor joint appointment into a major one; in these two cases, the decision, if made during a term of appointment without change in rank or tenure status, is dealt with in the College by the procedure (summary or comprehensive) appropriate to the nature of the appointment, and becomes formal upon approval by the Dean; it does not affect the current term of appointment.

The following procedures will be followed for major joint appointments within the college made in the research and lecture tracks and for appointments made in the tenure track at a rank below Full Professor with Indefinite Tenure. The procedures for major joint appointments involving departments in other colleges will be negotiated by the Dean or the Dean's designee. The Dean or Dean's designee will endeavor to negotiate a procedure that follows the steps outlined below as faithfully as possible.

1. In the first year of the joint appointment, the appropriate department heads and associate deans will meet to discuss the promotion and tenure timeline to be followed for the candidate. The resulting timeline will be
communicated by written memo to the candidate and a copy will be sent to each department and college. The timelines for the decisions will be consistent with University policies.

2. In the spring prior to an evaluation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the two department heads will discuss the case from their perspectives. They will determine the department that is to be responsible for assembling the case documentation and they will produce the list of external references. They will also identify one senior faculty member from each department who will attend both department meetings to discuss the case. These decisions regarding case documentation and procedures are contingent on the approval of the Dean or, in cases involving two colleges, the two Deans.

3. At the beginning of the following fall semester, each department will meet to discuss the case and each will include the representative from the other unit (identified above) in its discussion of the joint appointment. The department deliberations, vote and the writing of the report will follow the same procedures used for appointments in a single department.

4. The two department heads, or their designees, shall constitute a joint committee. In the event the two department decisions are the same, the joint committee will write a report summarizing the decisions of both departments. This report will be included as part of the case documentation. If the department decisions differ, the chair of the MCS Faculty Organization and appropriate Associate Dean(s) will be added to the above committee. This committee will attempt to clarify the reasons for the differing department recommendations, make their own recommendations, and write a report describing their findings and their recommendation. They may request that the Dean(s) participate in their discussions, but the Dean(s) will not vote on their final recommendation.

5. The report of the joint committee will be included in the case documentation which is passed on to the appropriate MCS Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Appointments for its deliberations. The Ad-Hoc Committee and MCS Review Committee will follow the same procedures used for appointments in a single department.

At any time prior to the meeting of the Ad-Hoc committee, the candidate may make a written request to the Dean that the appointment be changed to a normal appointment in a single department designated in the request. If the Dean and the Department Head of the designated department agree, the case will be sent back to the designated department for its deliberation and recommendation. The case will then proceed as for a normal (non-joint) appointment. The case documentation that goes to the Ad-Hoc and subsequent committees will not include the two original department summaries or the report of the joint-committee since the candidate has withdrawn from consideration of the joint-appointment and initiated the consideration of a revised appointment.

Minor joint appointments

In all appointment and tenure decisions regarding a minor joint appointment, the participation of the non-home department is by way of departmental consent, defined as an affirmative decision reached by the same procedure as would be required for a departmental recommendation regarding the decision in question. In particular, departmental consent of the prospective non-home department is required when making an initial appointment as a minor joint appointment.

When a decision on reappointment, promotion, or the granting of tenure is to be made regarding a faculty member holding a minor joint appointment, the decision is made, following the complete procedure prescribed by this Policy and the University Policy, as if the appointment were in the home department exclusively. If the decision is affirmative, the resulting appointment is held in the home department exclusively, unless the non-home department gives its departmental consent, with the agreement of the faculty member and the home department head, to making the resulting appointment again a minor joint appointment.

A decision to convert an appointment in one department into a minor joint appointment with that department as home department, or to convert a minor joint appointment into an appointment in the home department exclusively, or to make changes in the salary-and-commitment distribution of a minor joint appointment that do not convert it to a major one, if intended to go into effect during the term of an existing appointment, is made by written agreement between the participating department heads, the Dean, and the faculty member, and does not affect the then current term of appointment. The first of these decisions also requires, however, the departmental consent of the prospective non-home department.
Joint and Courtesy Appointments

Review

Periodic reviews of each joint faculty appointment should be conducted, with participation of the appointee, the participating department heads, the interdepartmental program committee chairman, if any, and the Dean. One purpose of this review is to examine the relationship between the appointee's professional development and evolving departmental responsibilities, on one side, and the specified salary-and-commitment distribution on the other.

Courtesy Appointments

There frequently arise circumstances in which a faculty member of one department or of a center at Carnegie Mellon becomes active in research or education in another department in which that faculty member does not hold an appointment. This involvement typically occurs in the context of research collaboration or team-taught courses. In such cases, it may be appropriate for the second department to offer the faculty member a courtesy appointment of a degree of formality short of a joint appointment and without any salary obligations to the faculty member on the part of the second department. (It should be noted that it is not necessary to be a member of a department to serve as a thesis advisor to students in its doctoral programs.)

Beyond obvious occasional courtesies, such as service on appropriate departmental committees or inclusion in departmental mailing lists, which may be extended by the department head, more formally specified courtesies are at the discretion of the departmental faculty. A courtesy appointment shall be approved by the Dean on recommendation by the head of the department, supported by a vote of the department's faculty. The recommendation of the department head should specify the courtesies to be extended, the term of the appointment (not to exceed five years), and a date by which the terms of the appointment should be reviewed by the department. Such courtesies may include any or all of the following:

- Use of departmental letterhead.
- Inclusion in departmental faculty lists (as in catalogues and program brochures) as "faculty affiliated with the department".
- Access to departmental instrumentation.
- Reasonable use of secretarial assistance and office supplies.
- Office space (if available).
- Participation in departmental faculty meetings, if qualified by rank and tenure status, but without being entitled to vote.

The faculty member may use a title or designation indicative of a joint appointment, but the affiliation with the second department in internal departmental records must indicate that the arrangement is one of a courtesy appointment.
Research Faculty

Introduction

Under the provisions of the University Policy on Research Faculty Appointments, this Policy is applicable to decisions on appointment, reappointment following evaluation, and promotion in the research faculty, with the adjustments and interpretations specified below. (Research faculty appointments cannot be made with indefinite tenure.) To the extent of any conflict between the provisions of this Policy as applied to such decisions and the provisions of the University Policy on Research Faculty Appointments, the latter shall prevail.

Criteria

In adapting the provisions of the section entitled "Criteria" of this Policy to the requirements of the University Policy on Research Faculty Appointments, the following provisions are to be observed.

A research faculty appointee is to conduct his or her research and produce publications with the same independence expected of regular faculty members of equivalent rank in his or her field. With due regard to the manner in which research in that field is funded, he or she is expected to serve as principal investigator, or to be qualified to serve in that capacity.

A research faculty appointee is expected to contribute to educational activities of the department and the University. Such contributions may be in the form of supervision of undergraduate, graduate, or postdoctoral research, service on examining and research advisory committees, teaching of seminars or lectures in courses, facilitation of collaborative research, or participation in other educational activities, including outreach. The commitment to educational activities by a research faculty appointee is not expected to be as extensive as that of a regular faculty member.

The provisions regarding the area of Service in the section entitled "Criteria" of this Policy are applicable, with a reasonable adaptation of the expected extent of commitment, to research faculty members.

Departmental recommendation

The following table specifies the regular and research faculty members entitled to vote on the recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Regular and research faculty members entitled to vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment at the rank of Assistant Research Professor.</td>
<td>All Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment following evaluation at the rank of Assistant Research Professor; or appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Research Professor.</td>
<td>Professors, and all research faculty appointees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment following evaluation at the rank of Associate Research Professor.</td>
<td>All Associate Professors, Professors, Associate Research Professors, and Research Professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment or reappointment following evaluation at, or promotion to, the rank of Research Professor.</td>
<td>All regular faculty members with indefinite tenure, all Associate Research Professors reappointed following evaluation, and all Research Professors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College procedures

Appointment at the rank of Assistant Research Professor follows a summary procedure. All other appointment, reappointment, and promotion decision processes regarding research faculty follow a comprehensive procedure.

### Ad-Hoc Committees

When considering cases regarding research faculty appointments, each Ad-Hoc Committee must be augmented by the inclusion of one or two research faculty appointees, as follows, if available: research faculty members of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee must be Research Professors, or Associate Research Professors who have been reappointed following evaluation; research faculty members of the Ad-Hoc Non-Tenure Committee must be Research Professors or Associate Research Professors.

The Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee deals with all evaluations for reappointment at the rank of Associate Research Professors and for appointment and reappointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Research Professors.

The Ad-Hoc Non-Tenure Committee deals with all evaluations for reappointment at the rank of Assistant Research Professor and for appointment at, and promotion to, the rank of Associate Research Professors.
Case Documentation

Description of Case Documentation

The sections in the following sample Table of Contents must be included in the case documentation for an appointment or tenure decision.

Table of Contents

I. Table of Contents
II. Department Report
III. Department Signature Sheet
IV. Curriculum Vitae
   A. Personal Data
   B. Publication list
   C. Information reflecting the candidate's external reputation
   D. Service and committee work within the University
   E. Contributions to Education
V. Educational and Service Activities Statement
VI. Research Activities Statement
VII. Internal Letters of Recommendation
   A. Sample Request Letter to Internal Referees
   B. List of Internal Referees
   C. Recommendations
VIII. External Letters of Recommendation
   A. Sample Request Letter to External Referees
   B. List of External Referees
   C. Recommendations
IX. Student Letters of Recommendation
   A. Sample Request Letter to Student Referees
   B. List of Student Referees
   C. Recommendations
X. Faculty Course Evaluations

Appendix. (optional, use for any additional material)

I. Table of Contents

All sections should be included, but sections which are not applicable should consist of a single page containing the section number, title, and the words "Not Applicable."

II. Departmental Report

Include:

1. A descriptive synopsis of the candidate's teaching and other educational activities; research and other scholarly activities; and service;
2. An assessment of the quality of the candidate's achievements in each of these categories;
3. A description and evaluation of the role that the candidate is expected to fill in the department; and

III. Departmental Signature Sheet

The departmental signature sheet should contain the following statement:

"The undersigned faculty members participated in the deliberation on the departmental recommendation regarding the [appointment/reappointment/promotion/tenure] decision concerning [name], and certify that the report of the department head truly reflects the decision made at the departmental meeting. These signatures do not indicate the approval or disapproval of the recommendation."

The signature sheet should contain the names of all members of the department who are eligible to vote. Any missing signature should be labeled as "not present", "not available", or "declined" to signify that a member of the department was not at the meeting, was at the meeting but is not available to sign the signature sheet, or has declined to certify that the report reflects the decision made at the departmental meeting.

IV. Curriculum Vitae

A. Personal data
   Include educational record and all previous professional appointments.

B. Publication list
   Include items such as
   1. Books;
   2. Papers published or accepted for publication in recognized journals or conference proceedings that employ the review process;
   3. (Optional) Papers submitted for publication but not yet accepted;
   4. (Optional) Un-referenced reports (with Government abstract number).

C. Information reflecting the candidate's external reputation
   Include items such as:
   1. Citations and awards;
   2. Invited talks at professional meetings and conferences; seminars and colloquia;
   3. Journal editorships;
   4. Membership in and offices held in professional societies;
   5. Committee work outside the University;
   6. Consulting;
   7. Contract and grant support; including the funding that the candidate has had in the past, current funding, and currently submitted proposals;
   8. Reviews of publications and research proposals.

D. Service and committee work within the University

E. Contributions to Education
   List items such as:
   1. Courses and seminars taught by the candidate;
   2. Advising and mentoring of undergraduate students including a list of the students;
   3. Graduate degree candidates and the postdoctoral collaborators
      Include information on the candidate's current and past Ph.D. students who should be listed with the titles and dates (or expected dates) of their theses and (for past students) their present locations. Similar lists of M.S. students may also be appropriate in certain cases.

V. Educational and Service Activities Statement

Candidates should outline their educational and service activities and career goals. This may include discussion of the candidate's contributions to: 1) the creation of teaching materials, e.g., textbooks, lecture notes, examinations, original
laboratory exercises, examples of student projects; 2) course, curriculum, and degree program development, 3) deeper insights into the teaching and learning process, and effective responses to Carnegie Mellon's permanent concern with quality education; and 4) the creation of sound, imaginative, and challenging teaching materials; design and implementation of educational technology. They may also include a discussion of other activities which serve the university community.

VI. **##** Research Activities Statement

Candidates should outline their research activities and career goals.

VII. Internal Letters of Recommendation

This section includes letters from current members of Carnegie Mellon faculty. Subsection A includes a sample letter of request and Subsection B includes a list of all those from whom letters were requested.

A. Sample Request Letter to Internal Referees
B. List of Internal Referees
C. Recommendations

VIII. ____ External Letters of Recommendation

This section includes letters from people outside Carnegie Mellon who are qualified to speak on the candidate's work. Information about both teaching and research should be requested. The letters requesting letters of recommendation and all related outgoing correspondence must have the prior approval of the Dean; copies of these letters of request, etc., should be included as subsection A. Subsection B should be a list of all those from whom letters were requested with very brief statements on each, and an indication of which of these were proposed by the candidate and which by the department.

A. Sample Request Letter to External Referees
B. List of External Referees
C. Recommendations

IX. #__ Student Letters of Recommendation

This section includes letters from students, past and present, undergraduate and graduate. The letters requesting these letters from students and all outgoing correspondence must have the prior approval of the Dean. Subsection A should include copies of these letters of request. Subsection B should contain a summary account of the criteria for selecting the students to be addressed, the number of requests made, and a list of the responding addressees. The letters of request to the student should contain the following paragraph:

"Your comments are very important to us in considering the case. They will become an important part of the written documentation that is reviewed by members of the department and by the college and university promotion committees for their recommendations. No one other than the participants in the promotion process will have access to your comments."

A. Sample Request Letters to Student Referees
B. List of Student Referees
C. Recommendations

X. ____ Faculty Course Evaluations

Appendix. (optional)
Any additional evidence bearing on the quality of the candidate's teaching or research performance.

A collection of supporting materials may also be put together that is not part of the case proper, but which could be used by committees. This includes reprints and preprints of articles, copies of books, lecture notes, etc. These will be returned to the candidate.

**Footnotes**

* Indicates UP and MCS Criteria
** Indicates an item which should be prepared by the candidate or by the department head in consultation with the candidate.
# Indicates an item which may not be appropriate for initial appointments or candidates who are not already at the University
+ Indicates an item which is not required for reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, nor for reappointment at the rank of Instructor or promotion from that rank to that of Assistant Professor.