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1. Criteria for Promotion - Introduction

At the Tepper School of Business, the criteria for promotion, as spelled out in general terms in the Faculty Handbook, are interpreted as follows. All successful candidates for promotion and/or tenure must be judged either

(i) to be (at professor level) or to have the promise of becoming (below professor level) outstanding in research while achieving a high level of competence in teaching and/or educational development, or

(ii) to be (at professor level) or to have the promise of becoming (below professor level) outstanding in teaching and educational development while achieving an extremely high level of competence in research.

The greater emphasis on research reflects our feeling that education on the forefront of knowledge, such as the Tepper School of Business offers, requires an environment in which the faculty members are actively engaged in research. However, teaching and educational development are also taken seriously.
2. Description of Outstanding Performance

A more specific outline of what is meant by outstanding performance in research and education is given below.

A. Research Contributions

Research is defined to be an activity that leads to the production of new knowledge, new insights, creative synthesis of existing ideas, and new methods. Research achievements will be judged primarily in terms of their importance and their validity and secondarily in terms of their volume. The results will typically appear as published papers in professional journals or books which require peer refereeing processes; in some cases, they may appear as books or non-refereed articles. Editorship of an important journal that leads to a reshaping of a field may also be viewed as a research-related activity. The Tepper School of Business gives more emphasis to quality than to quantity dimensions of a person's research contributions. A few outstanding papers will receive greater approval than a long string of mediocre publications. The written work is examined for evidence of originality and importance, both in terms of methods and problem choice.

Research that brings new problems into a discipline, as opposed to elaborations on problems already formulated in the literature, is valued highly, as is research that has significant implications for dealing with important problems facing society. Interdisciplinary research is encouraged. Our aim is to have a distinguished, high quality faculty that is making important contributions to knowledge.

B. Teaching and Educational Development

Outstanding educational development involves significant innovations that are nationally recognized and replicated. We will admit as evidence of outstanding educational contributions any written material in the form of texts or articles involving education, or instructional software or materials and technology, as well as expository articles written for other faculty members or the general community.

Competence in teaching and/or educational development can be measured in part by the enthusiastic reception of innovative materials by our undergraduate, masters, executive education, or Ph.D. classes, or by exceptional administrative service on behalf of the Tepper School of Business. Supervision of Ph.D. students is also considered a significant educational activity at the Tepper School of Business. Evidence of competence in teaching ordinarily would be exhibited by consistent evaluations near the norm in classes such as undergraduate, masters, or executive education where such ratings are solicited.
C. Other Professional Activities

Other professional activities, such as consulting, service on academic committees, elected office in professional associations, and board memberships, will usually be considered more as an indicator of an individual's professional standing than as an important factor in the promotion decision.

3. Specific Promotion or Initial Appointment Criteria

A. Full Professor with Indefinite Tenure:

A candidate for an appointment as or promotion to Full Professor with Indefinite Tenure should be well established as a scholar in his or her field. The candidate will usually be a recognized leader who has made, and can be expected to continue to make, outstanding research contributions. If a candidate has emphasized the area of educational and professional activities, the record should exhibit evidence that he/she is an outstanding educator, having had a broad impact, or having made important intellectual contributions through professional activities, as well as having an excellent base in research activity.

An individual can be brought up earlier either at his/her own initiative or as a result of a periodic screen by the Policy Committee.

B. Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure:

Appointment as or promotion to Associate Professor with indefinite tenure is granted to a candidate whose record shows that the leadership and reputation, inherent in the attributes of a full professor, are in the process of being established. Indeed, all evidence presented should indicate that if the candidate is granted tenure, he/she will earn a Full Professorship in a reasonably short period of time. (A candidate for tenure may simultaneously be considered for promotion to Full Professor.)

The decision to appoint to indefinite tenure must be made by the time an individual has completed eight and one-half years of service with rank of full-time Assistant Professor or Associate Professor without indefinite tenure or the equivalent (as described in the Faculty Handbook).

An individual can be brought up earlier either at his/her own initiative or as a result of a periodic screen by the Policy Committee.
C. Associate Professor Without Indefinite Tenure

A candidate for an appointment or promotion to Associate Professor should have a record of accomplishment indicating (i) a demonstrated record of competence in research and in teaching and/or educational development, and (ii) a reasonable likelihood that the candidate will satisfy the standards for promotion to indefinite tenure and full professor. The research standard will normally be reflected in publications in respected professional journals or books that are evaluated by the Tepper School of Business faculty and outside researchers as being important contributions.

The decision to promote to Associate Professor without tenure must be made by the time an individual has completed five and one-half years of service with the rank of full-time Assistant Professor or the equivalent (as described in the Faculty Handbook). An individual can be brought up earlier at his/her own initiative or as a result of a periodic screen by the Policy Committee.

D. Reappointment as Assistant Professor

A candidate for reappointment as Assistant Professor should normally have made at least one significant research contribution that is accepted for publication in a professional journal or book which has required peer refereeing processes and should display through other papers the potential for competence in research. There should also be evidence of the potential for competence in teaching and educational activities.

The Tepper School of Business normally offers an initial three-year contract to its tenure track faculty members. However, a number of such faculty serve at least their first year at the rank of Instructor rather than Assistant Professor, since their dissertations have not been completed. To treat all candidates equally, there will be a review of all candidates in the fall of their third year, a formal review for those in their third year at the rank of Assistant Professor and an informal review for those who have spent one or more years at the rank of Instructor. The result of the informal review will normally be an extension of the initial contract by one year in the absence of a contract otherwise. The Tepper School of Business policy is to conduct a formal reappointment review no later than the fall of the fourth year at the Tepper School of Business, independent of the date of the completion of the thesis. The formal and informal review processes are described in the section entitled Evaluation Process. The outcome of the formal review is either a recommendation to the University non-tenure committee for a three-year renewal or for termination with a one-year grace period.

E. Early Review

A faculty member below the rank of associate professor with indefinite tenure may be considered for early review for promotion and/or tenure decision only if the candidate is truly exceptional in his/her achievements and promise.
4. Tenure Clock

The tenure clock is normally begun with appointment to the rank of full-time Assistant Professor. The Faculty Handbook defines rules for computing service time for faculty who have spent part of their service with Special Faculty appointments and faculty with prior service other than at Carnegie Mellon University. Requests to stop the promotion and tenure clocks during a leave of absence must be made in writing to the Dean. Normally faculty will not be allowed to stop these clocks for more than one year during the period for which they hold tenure-stream appointments. This delay in the tenure clock can be used to influence the date of promotion and/or tenure, but not the date of the first reappointment review.

5. Evaluation Process

The evaluation meetings for renewal, promotion and/or tenure generally will be held in the Fall. All candidates for review, whether mandatory cases by service time at the Tepper School of Business/CMU or early cases, shall be notified by the Dean before the end of May preceding the Fall regarding reviews and will be asked to prepare and submit an information packet, typically by mid-July. This packet shall include:

- an up-to-date vitae
- a statement of research activity
- a statement of educational activity, and
- several (typically 3 or 4) articles and/or recent working papers selected by the candidate.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall also include in the package

- a list of up to 6 - 8 external reviewers, normally from leading scholars in the candidate's field of research.

All candidates - renewal, promotion and/or tenure shall include in the package

- a list of eight to ten current or former students.

The process continues as follows for promotion and/or tenure cases. The Dean shall select four or five external reviewers among the six to eight proposed by the candidate and supplement that list with his/her own choice of four or five external reviewers so that six external evaluation letters may be secured. These referees will be asked to make explicit comparisons with other scholars in the candidate's field and to comment on the candidate's qualifications based upon the Tepper School of Business criteria for promotion and/or tenure decisions.

The Dean shall also ask the eight to ten students suggested by the candidate, as well as eight to ten others he/she chooses, to write evaluation letters on the candidate's teaching and contributions to their learning.
Then, for all renewal, promotion or tenure cases, the Dean shall appoint an Ad Hoc Tier-1 review committee for each candidate. The Tier-1 committee may include members from outside the Tepper School of Business, as appropriate (see attached for composition of the committee and procedures).

The Tier-2 review for all candidates is done by the Tepper School of Business Policy Committee. The Policy Committee shall consist of all tenured research faculty at the Tepper School of Business (except in the case of promotion to Full Professor, for which only Full Professors are included). On occasion, outside (i.e. non-Tepper School of Business) tenured faculty member(s) may be asked to join the Policy Committee's deliberations. Where appropriate, untenured faculty may occasionally be invited to participate in the discussion of a case; however, they may not be present during voting.

In the discussion of each candidate for promotion or tenure, an adversary procedure will be employed. The Dean will designate individuals from the Ad Hoc Tier-1 review committee to function in the "pro" and "con" roles. 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 are usually chosen on the basis of their knowledge of the research fields of the faculty member being evaluated. Occasionally, someone from outside the Policy Committee may be invited, because of special expertise, to be one of the advocates and to participate in the subsequent discussion. Each advocate develops a position by carefully reading the articles and/or working papers selected by the candidate as his/her best research, and by giving full consideration to the rest of the individual's research, teaching, and other educational contributions. All members of the Policy Committee are asked to read the material and obtain as much knowledge as possible about the individual being considered.

The evaluation session for promotion and tenure cases begins with the development of the pro and con positions by the persons appointed. These persons take their positions as assigned without regard to their true position. After the presentations, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Tier-1 review committee presents the findings of and the recommendation of the Tier-1 committee, which is followed by a general discussion. All Policy Committee members are free to express their own positions.

All Policy Committee members participate in the evaluation discussions and, frequently, individuals who have taken the pro and con roles function as resource members for the discussion. All members of the Policy Committee are expected to participate in the discussion whether or not their particular field of expertise coincides with that of the faculty member being evaluated. At the end of the discussion the Dean puts each case to a vote.

The evaluation session for renewal cases shall start with a presentation by the Chair of the Ad Hoc Tier-1 review committee. After the conclusion of the presentation, all Policy Committee members are free to express their own positions. At the end of the discussion, the Dean puts the case to a vote.

Policy Committee members shall vote on each renewal, promotion or tenure candidate based on a 0-3 scale, using a form (see attachments).
6. Guidelines for the Candidate's Research and Educational Statements

A. 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 the listing of research output that appears in the Curriculum Vitae. This document is used to present the candidate's research case to the committee. 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, or an overview of a broad area of research interest, (2) publications that have stimulated additional research (3) a discussion of past and present research strategies; and plans and strategies relating to future contributions, insofar as these are known at present.

(Note: This statement should not exceed 4 – 6 single-spaced typed pages. Appendices are permitted.)

B. Candidate's Document Concerning Teaching and Educational

The candidate is responsible for the preparation of a document which evaluates his/her teaching and other educational efforts. This document should include an assessment of all educational contributions, including contributions to curriculum designs or reviews, introduction of new courses, advisory activity or administrative responsibility for both undergraduate and graduate students or programs, especially where there are outputs such as theses and dissertations, development of significant and innovative material for classes or contributions to excellence of existing or new programs, and any other activities considered relevant. A presentation of available "objective" evidence related to teaching, such as student and other course evaluations, should also be included. In discussing professional activities, the candidate should focus on ways these activities have resulted in innovations that have been or are being recognized within CMU and nationally, and on ways in which they may have helped shape research or educational programs or teaching activities.

(Note: This statement should not exceed 2 - 3 single-spaced typed pages. Appendices are permitted.)
7. Final Decision

The Policy Committee attempts to discuss the case until a consensus is reached, but a consensus may not always emerge. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Dean will solicit a vote on the candidate. The final decision on the candidate is of necessity a matter of judgment and rests with the Dean.

A summary of the Policy Committee deliberations and vote, and recommendation from the Dean are formally submitted for discussion to the appropriate University committees (see CMU Faculty Handbook).
1. The Dean/Deputy Dean notifies candidate of review requirement or decision and requests information packet (by May 30)

2. Candidate suggests up to (6 - 8) external reviewers; (by 2nd Monday in June; the Dean/Deputy Dean selects (4 - 5) names from candidate list and adds at least 4 -5 more, with a goal of securing at least (6) external reviews.

3. Candidate suggests names of (8 - 10) students/alumni (one PhD, 2 MS and 2 undergraduates); (by 2nd Monday in June); the Dean/Deputy Dean adds (8 - 10) names

4. Candidate submits information packet to the Dean/Deputy Dean (by 2nd Monday in July)

5. The Dean/Deputy Dean appoints the Ad Hoc Tier-1 Review Committee and the pro and con discussants for the Policy Committee (Tier-2) meeting (by Aug. 15)

6. Information packet submitted by the candidate is distributed to the Policy Committee (by September 1)

7. External evaluation letters and the Tier-1 Committee report are distributed to the Policy Committee prior to meeting

8. Policy Committee discusses case and votes in writing (by Nov. 20)

9. The Dean/Deputy Dean communicates the Policy Committee decision to candidate about three weeks after the last faculty review meeting.

10. The Dean/Deputy Dean writes letter and prepares the folder on candidate for University Review Committee (by Nov. 30)

11. The University Review Committee discusses and votes on the candidate (by Dec. 30)

12. The President/Provost notifies the candidate in writing (by Jan. 31)
1. The Dean/Deputy Dean notifies candidate of review requirement or decision and requests information packet (by May 30)

2. Candidate suggests names of (8 - 10) students/alumni (one PhD, 2 MS and 2 undergraduates); (by 2nd Monday in June); the Dean/Deputy Dean adds (8 - 10) names

3. Candidate submits information packet to the Dean/Deputy Dean (by 1st Monday in August)

4. Information packet submitted by the candidate is distributed to the Policy Committee (by September 1)

5. The Dean/Deputy Dean appoints the Ad Hoc Tier-1 Review Committee (by September 1)

6. The Tier 1 Committee report is distributed to the Policy Committee prior to meeting

7. Policy Committee discusses case and votes in writing (by Nov. 20)

8. The Dean/Deputy Dean communicates the Policy Committee decision to candidate about three weeks after the last faculty review meeting.

9. The Dean/Deputy Dean writes letter and prepares folder on candidate for University Review Committee (by Nov. 30)

10. The University Review Committee discussed and votes on the candidate (by Dec. 30)

11. The President/Provost notifies the candidate in writing (by Jan. 31)
Two-Tiered Review Procedure for Faculty Promotions and Tenure Decisions
Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon
(not for initial appointment as assistant professor or instructor)

Tier-I Review (by Ad Hoc Committee)

1. Composition of Committee

The following are guidelines for the appointment of the Tier-I Review Committee, where the final composition is at the discretion of the Dean.

Appointed by the Dean; composed, whenever possible, as follows:

- 2 or 3 equal or higher rank faculty in candidate's broad research area
- 1 or 2 lower rank faculty in candidate's broad research area
- 1 or 2 other equal or higher rank faculty
- Chair - equal or higher rank faculty in candidate's broad research area

(Note: The faculty member being reviewed may not suggest candidates for the committee.)
(Note: Non-Tepper School of Business faculty may also be appointed to the committee when appropriate)

2. Evaluation based on:

- All materials submitted by the candidate.
- Other information the committee may request from the candidate or from the Office of the Dean.

(Note: *The committee may not access external evaluation letters.)

3. Voting and Report:

- Each faculty member eligible to vote must submit a filled ballot at the meeting. All ballots will be sent to the Dean's Office. (Only faculty of equal or higher rank of the new position being considered may vote on renewal, promotion or tenure decisions.)
- Written report for the candidate. The Dean will meet with the candidate and give a copy to him/her.
- Written report for the Policy Committee which should include a specific recommendation and the score of the vote (but not by individual names). The Dean will distribute the report to the Policy Committee.

(Attachment, Page One)
Two-Tiered Review Procedure for
Faculty Promotions and Tenure Decisions
Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon
(not for initial appointment as assistant professor or instructor)

Tier-II Review (by the Tepper School of Business Policy Committee and other CMU senior faculty as appropriate)

1. The Tier-I Review report and the external evaluation letters, as well as all materials submitted by the candidate, shall be distributed to the Policy Committee Members prior to the meeting.

2. Presentation by 'pro' and 'con.' (The Dean shall select Pro and Con, whenever possible, from among senior faculty members of equal or higher rank in Tier-1 review committee.)

3. Presentation by Chair of Tier-I Review Committee.

4. Discussion by members.

5. Voting based on 0-3 scale, using ballot, to be signed by each member (form attached).

(Note: Exactly the same procedure shall be followed for initial faculty appointments at rank of associate professor without indefinite tenure or higher or for renewal at the rank of associate professor without indefinite tenure if the initial appointment of the candidate was at that rank.)
Ballot
Faculty Appointment, Renewal, Promotion and Tenure Decisions
Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University
(not for initial appointment as assistant professor or instructor)

Candidate's Name: ____________________________________________________________

Candidate’s current rank at the Tepper School of Business: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion to:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor without Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Appointment as:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor without Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewal as:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor without Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please check only one box:

3 ☐ (definitely yes)  A ☐ (abstention)
2 ☐ (probably yes)
1 ☐ (probably no)
0 ☐ (definitely no)

☐ I will submit a written explanation within 24 hours of this meeting as to why I have chosen to abstain.

Signature
________________________________________
Print Name
________________________________________
Date

My Rank:
Full Professor
Associate Professor with Tenure
Associate Professor without Tenure
Assistant Professor

(Attachment, Page Three)
Two-Tiered Review Procedure for Faculty Renewals
Teppper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon
(not for initial appointment as assistant professor or instructor)

Tier-I Review (by Ad Hoc Committee)

1. Composition of Committee

The following are guidelines for the appointment of the Tier-I Review Committee, where the final composition is at the discretion of the Dean.

Appointed by the Dean; composed, whenever possible, as follows:

• 1 to 3 equal or higher rank faculty in candidate's broad research area
• 2 or 3 lower rank faculty in candidate's broad research area
• 2 to 4 other faculty
• Chair - equal or higher rank faculty in candidate's broad research area

(Note: The faculty member being reviewed may not suggest candidates for the committee)
(Note: Non-Tepper School of Business faculty may also be appointed to the committee when appropriate)

2. Evaluation based on:

• All materials submitted by the candidate;
• Other information the committee may request from the candidate or from the Office of the Dean.

3. Voting and Report:

• Each faculty member eligible to vote must submit a filled ballot at the meeting. All ballots will be sent to the Dean's Office. (Only faculty of equal or higher rank of the new position being considered may vote on renewal, promotion or tenure decisions.)
• Written report for the candidate. The Dean will meet with the candidate and give a copy to him/her.
• Written report for the Policy Committee that should include a specific recommendation and the score of the vote (but not by individual names). The Dean will distribute the report to the Policy Committee.

(Attachment, Page Four)
Two-Tiered Review Procedure for
Faculty Renewals
Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon
(not for initial appointment as assistant professor or instructor)

Tier-II Review (by Tepper School of Business Policy Committee and other CMU senior faculty as appropriate)

1. The Tier-I Review report, as well as all materials submitted by the candidate, shall be distributed to the Policy Committee Members prior to the meeting.

2. Presentation by Chair of the Tier-I Review Committee.

3. Discussion by members.

4. Voting based on the 0-3 scale, using ballot to be signed by each member (form attached).
**Ballot**
Faculty Appointment, Renewal, Promotion and Tenure Decisions
Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University
(not for initial appointment as assistant professor or instructor)

Candidate's Name: ________________________________

Candidate’s current rank at the Tepper School of Business: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion to:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor without Indefinite Tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Appointment as:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor with Indefinite Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor without Indefinite Tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewal as:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor without Indefinite Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please check only one box:

3    □ (definitely yes)        A    □ (abstention)
2    □ (probably yes) 
1    □ (probably no) 
0    □ (definitely no)

I will submit a written explanation within 24 hours of this meeting as to why I have chosen to abstain.

Signature: ________________________________
Print Name: ________________________________
Date: ________________________________

My Rank:
- Full Professor
- Associate Professor with Tenure
- Associate Professor without Tenure
- Assistant Professor