

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING ELABORATIONS ON EVALUATION AND CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL, PROMOTION AND TENURE

The purpose of this elaboration, undertaken as authorized by Article 9.1.1.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for tenured and tenure-track faculty, is to provide additional details on the criteria governing performance evaluation in Article 9.0 of the CBA, and thereby assist faculty members to gain a better understanding of the College's expectations of their accomplishments for renewal, promotion and tenure. A second objective is to help faculty to prepare the required dossier (Article 9.2.3.2) showing evidence of meritorious performance in teaching, professional activities and service. Because of the choices that each faculty member must make as he or she strives to achieve academic excellence, it is recognized that no faculty member's list of activities will exactly parallel that of his/her colleagues. A third objective is to elaborate on Article 8.3 of the CBA and to establish College-specific criteria by which faculty can achieve promotion in academic rank.

These elaborations also comply with the minimum requirements set forth in the Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion, published by the Provost and endorsed by Faculty Senate on April 24, 2018. Some text in these elaborations was obtained from these guidelines. Reviewers at various levels of the evaluation process should refer to these guidelines for direction on how to evaluate the quality of teaching, professional activities, and service.

These elaborations are provided in two parts. The first part contains evaluation and promotion criteria for tenured and tenure-track faculty in all Engineering departments outside of the Department of Engineering Technology, collectively known as Engineering Science faculty. The second part contains evaluation and promotion criteria for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of Engineering Technology. Attachments to this document include instructions for dossier preparation and templates for chairs to request letters from external evaluators.

These elaborations have been endorsed by the Engineering faculty in the tenured and tenure-track bargaining unit on January 31, 2020 and are effective for any tenured and tenure-track faculty hired into the College of Engineering after this date. When submitting a dossier for renewal, promotion and tenure, tenured and tenure-track faculty hired into the College of Engineering before this date can choose to utilize this version of the elaborations or to utilize the previous version of elaborations approved by the Engineering faculty in 2006.

Evaluation Criteria for Engineering Science Faculty

1. Teaching

Inasmuch as the mission of the College of Engineering is to educate engineers of recognized quality, effective teaching is of great importance to the College. Innovative instruction methods that are intended to improve student learning are encouraged at every stage of the faculty member's career. In addition to traditional classroom instruction, teaching may include, but is not limited to:

- advising of undergraduate and graduate students,
- supervising undergraduate research, honors, and senior design projects,
- serving as major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations, M.S. theses, and M.S. projects,
- developing new courses, new online courses of existing classroom courses, and new instructional laboratory activities,
- preparing open-access course materials or laboratory manuals,
- integrating inclusive approaches, novel pedagogical techniques and instructional technologies in courses,
- obtaining external recognition or certification for instructional quality, such as Quality Matters certification,
- serving on thesis and dissertation committees,
- College/department approved non-curricular teaching and training activities.

Faculty must demonstrate the quality of their teaching in appropriate ways. A faculty member must present the aggregated results from the anonymous student course evaluation instrument(s) proscribed by the University or the College. This instrument must be administered by someone other than the faculty member who has been approved by the department chair and the faculty member may not attempt to influence the student evaluations in any way. Recognizing the limitations of student course evaluations, faculty must also provide key course materials, including syllabi, class and lab schedules, assessments such as exams and quizzes, and assignments that are most germane to the course objectives.

A faculty member must participate in efforts toward the continuous improvement of student learning and may provide documentation of their participation in this process to demonstrate instructional effectiveness. Evidence may include 1) results of initial assessments of student performance with respect to selected learning outcomes; 2) description of steps taken to improve student performance with respect to these learning outcomes; 3) results of follow-up assessments of student performance to determine whether the steps taken to improve student performance had the intended effect. If provided, evaluation of this material should emphasize the steps taken to improve student performance over the results from initial measures of student performance. Furthermore, this documentation should also demonstrate compliance with department-level assessment processes for maintenance of external accreditation.

A faculty member may also provide other evidence of instructional effectiveness, including written results from peer review of classroom instruction, written results from review of classroom instruction by trained student observers, letters of support from alumni, comments

from exit surveys, and recognition or awards for teaching and advising. A faculty member may also include comparisons of DFW rates for their courses vs. equivalent courses taught by other instructors, or trends in DFW rates from their own courses to demonstrate improvement in instructional effectiveness over the duration of the evaluation period.

An evaluation of instructional effectiveness should be considered in its entirety over the evaluation period. Evaluation data for individual courses and semesters are less indicative than are patterns across multiple courses and trends over time.

2. Professional Activity

Professional activities include research, development, scholarly investigation and analysis, and creative endeavors and performances which utilize a faculty member's expertise to contribute to his/her academic discipline and related disciplines. Contributions to the wider society, as mentioned in the CBA, will be considered valuable professional activities provided such contributions are in the candidate's academic discipline or closely related disciplines.

A spirit of inquiry is the essential core of every academic institution. Research supports this spirit in a very direct fashion and is also interwoven with the process of stimulating learning. Thus, quality research in their academic discipline is to be highly valued in determining renewals, promotions, and the granting of tenure, and every dossier should include evidence that the candidate is involved in high-quality research. **It is incumbent upon the faculty member to establish an externally-funded research program that supports graduate students and to pursue scholarly activities that lead to archival publications in high impact venues.**

External funding is needed to support the College's research infrastructure and graduate programs, and to provide opportunities for graduate students to conduct high-quality research. High quality peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and/or technical reports, as appropriate to the faculty member's discipline and sources of external funding, are critical for achieving the faculty member's and the College's scholarly profile and play an important role in attracting graduate students and establishing an externally-funded research program.

Evidence of excellence in professional activity may be demonstrated by publication of textbooks that are peer-reviewed and/or adopted by other institutions and by publications in peer-reviewed educational research journals. Publication of textbooks, publication of other significant, peer-reviewed educational publications, and external grant support for pedagogical scholarship and/or educational innovations are expected for those who present instructional accomplishments as a major portion of their justification for professional advancement.

External reviews of a candidate's scholarly work are solicited for an appraisal of a candidate's accomplishments and contributions to the field written by an evaluator specializing in the field at a peer institution or better. An external reviewer must be an unbiased expert in the candidate's area of scholarship, not have had significant collaboration with the candidate, and should have a title that is the same as or commensurate with that for which the candidate is being considered. External review letters must not be solicited from mentors, former professors, members of a candidate's dissertation committee, former students, co-authors or individuals with whom the candidate has collaborated professionally, or individuals with a personal relationship to the candidate. If the candidate's area of scholarship is so narrow that external evaluators must be drawn from those with a close professional relationship, then the candidate's dossier or a separate formal communication should fully explain the past relationship with the reviewer and explain why the exception to this policy cannot be avoided.

At least eight weeks prior to the dossier submission deadline, a faculty member required or seeking to undergo review for tenure and/or promotion must provide the department Chair with a list of at least six reviewers who meet the criteria identified in the previous paragraph. The faculty member must also provide at this time the materials that the faculty member wishes the Chair to send to external reviewers as examples of the candidate's scholarly work or professional activity. The Chair is expected to identify independently at least six additional appropriate reviewers. No later than six weeks prior to the dossier submission deadline, the Chair will select names from either list and solicit external evaluations until the required number of external letters have been received. The communication with potential external reviewers shall not be through the faculty being evaluated. The Chair shall not inform the faculty member which reviewers were contacted, or which reviewers agreed to submit letters.

The number of potential external reviewers contacted should reflect the Chair's judgement on the number needed to obtain at least three submitted letters. Should the Chair receive information that suggests that one or more of the reviewers contacted may not be able to provide an unbiased letter, alternative reviewers shall be contacted in order to end up with at least three unbiased letters. The Chair will request external reviewers to address in their letters the questions provided in Appendix A.

The Chair shall provide the faculty member undergoing review with copies of the letters received from external reviewers, appropriately redacted to hide the identity of the reviewer. When possible, the redacted letters shall be provided at least two weeks before the dossier submission deadline.

The following are examples of evidence that a candidate may also present to document his or her accomplishments in professional activity:

- A record of attracting funds, particularly from sources external to the University, to support research and/or educational innovation efforts of the candidate and his or her graduate students.
- Publication of peer-reviewed technical research and/or educational research journal articles, conference proceedings, monographs, technical reports, and technical research books.
- Publication of engineering textbooks, with the requirement that these textbooks are accepted by reputable publishers.
- Development of intellectual property leading to patents, trademarks, copyrights, license agreements, and publishing agreements.
- Development of devices, software and/or processes that are widely adopted and advance research, education and/or industry.
- External consulting of a professional nature in one's discipline with the purpose of accumulating experiences of current industrial practice intended to enhance student learning in the classroom.
- Obtaining and maintaining professional registration through continuing education seminars and workshops.
- Record of invited presentations, workshops and seminars at other universities or research institutes.

- Presentations at national and international conferences.
- Preparation and submission of grant proposals for funding.
- Submission and acceptance of research reports.
- Awards or recognition based on scientific or engineering innovations.

3. Service

Given that committees are a vital part of the University's governance system, it is expected that each faculty member will participate in service activities that may include service on committees or other leadership positions at the departmental, College, or University levels. Other forms of service to the University community and to the community at large are also important as they may relate to the application of the faculty member's knowledge in his/her professional field, may increase the reputation and profile of the University within the local, state, national and international communities, and/or may help the department, college and university achieve goals relating to diversity and inclusive excellence.

Certain forms of internal service activities or administrative positions require an above average commitment. Significant participation in appropriate professional, technical, educational and inclusive activities external to the University may benefit the individual, department, college, and university's external profile. Such service should be recognized and valued for its importance to the institution. Faculty members should document these activities for renewal, promotion or tenure. Service activity may include, but is not limited to:

- Organizing and participating in relevant conferences and meetings.
- Serving as editor or on editorial board for national or international journals.
- Service to state, national and international organizations, as related to professional responsibilities.
- Solicited reviews of manuscripts, reviews of research proposals, and reviews of textbooks.
- Service in professional associations and societies.
- Collaboration with other institutions on teaching or research projects.
- Service to industry or other organizations as an unpaid consultant, etc.

Engineering Science Criteria for Promotion in Academic Rank

Section 8.3 of the CBA establishes minimum criteria for various academic ranks from Instructor through Professor. The following provide criteria for the promotion of Engineering Science faculty in academic rank:

To Assistant Professor

All faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor must hold a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in engineering or in a related scientific, mathematical or technical discipline. Tenured or tenure-track faculty without the appropriate terminal degree will be assigned the rank of Instructor. If such an Instructor earns a terminal degree, he/she can be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor following the procedures for promotion outlined in the CBA.

To Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor is coupled with a recommendation for awarding tenure. However, there can be instances where a faculty member is initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure. Advancement to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure requires a record of demonstrated accomplishment in teaching, professional activity, and service, as well as a strong indication of continued future productivity in these areas. The faculty member must present a dossier showing evidence of success in each of the three areas as defined under the Evaluation Criteria for Engineering Science Faculty, including evidence of an externally-funded research program that supports graduate students, and evidence of scholarly activities that lead to archival publications in high impact venues. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is based solely on the accomplishments cited above and should indicate good potential for ultimately attaining the rank of Professor. The decision to promote a faculty member to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure should not consider the amount of time she/he spent at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor without tenure.

To Professor

Advancement to the rank of Professor requires substantial contributions to her/his disciplinary field, including a significant body of archival publications in high impact venues, and sustained external funding that supports graduate students. Evidence of notable contributions in the areas of teaching and service to the College, to the University, to the community and to his/her profession also will contribute to the promotion decision, as will evidence of leadership in these areas as defined under the Evaluation Criteria for Engineering Science Faculty. Promotion to Professor is based solely on the accomplishments cited above and should indicate good confidence in continued performance at a high level. The decision to promote a faculty member to the rank of Professor should not consider the amount of time she/he spent at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure.

Evaluation Criteria for Engineering Technology Faculty

1. Teaching

Inasmuch as the mission of the College of Engineering is to educate engineers of recognized quality, effective teaching is of great importance to the College. The mission of the Department of Engineering Technology is to provide educational programs of recognized quality that direct students toward achieving their educational objectives and professional goals. **Therefore, immersion in undergraduate education through innovative instructional methods that are intended to improve student learning is expected at every stage of the faculty member's career.** In addition to traditional classroom instruction, teaching may include, but is not limited to:

- advising of undergraduate and graduate students,
- supervising undergraduate research, honors, and senior design projects,
- serving as major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations, M.S. theses, and M.S. projects,
- developing new courses and instructional laboratory activities,
- preparing open-access course materials or laboratory manuals,
- integrating inclusive approaches, novel pedagogical techniques and instructional technologies in courses,
- obtaining external recognition or certification for instructional quality, such as Quality Matters certification,
- serving on thesis and dissertation committees,
- College/department approved non-curricular teaching and training activities.

Faculty must demonstrate the quality of their teaching in appropriate ways. A faculty member must present the aggregated results from the anonymous student course evaluation instrument(s) proscribed by the University or the College. This instrument must be administered by someone other than the faculty member who has been approved by the department chair and the faculty member may not attempt to influence the student evaluations in any way. Recognizing the limitations of student course evaluations, faculty must also provide key course materials, including syllabi, class and lab schedules, assessments such as exams and quizzes, and assignments that are most germane to the course objectives.

A faculty member must participate in efforts toward the continuous improvement of student learning and may provide documentation of their participation in this process to demonstrate instructional effectiveness. Evidence may include 1) results of initial assessments of student performance with respect to selected learning outcomes; 2) description of steps taken to improve student performance with respect to these learning outcomes; 3) results of follow-up assessments of student performance to determine whether the steps taken to improve student performance had the intended effect. If provided, evaluation of this material should emphasize the steps taken to improve student performance over the results from initial measures of student performance. Furthermore, this documentation should also demonstrate compliance with department-level assessment processes for maintenance of external accreditation.

A faculty member may also provide other evidence of instructional effectiveness, including written results from peer review of classroom instruction, written results from review of classroom instruction by trained student observers, letters of support from alumni, comments from exit surveys, and recognition or awards for teaching and advising. A faculty member may also include comparisons of DFW rates for their courses vs. equivalent courses taught by other instructors, or trends in DFW rates from their own courses to demonstrate improvement in instructional effectiveness over the duration of the evaluation period.

An evaluation of instructional effectiveness should be considered in its entirety over the evaluation period. Evaluation data for individual courses and semesters are less indicative than are patterns across multiple courses and trends over time.

2. Professional Activity

Professional activities include research, development, scholarly investigation and analysis, and creative endeavors and performances which utilize a faculty member's expertise to contribute to his/her academic discipline and related disciplines. Contributions to the wider society, as mentioned in the CBA, will be considered valuable professional activities provided such contributions are in the candidate's academic discipline or closely related disciplines.

Evidence of excellence in professional activity may also result from publication of textbooks that are peer-reviewed and/or adopted by other institutions and publications in peer-reviewed educational research journals. Publication of textbooks, publication of other significant, peer-reviewed educational publications, and external grant support for pedagogical scholarship and/or educational innovations are expected for those who present instructional accomplishments as a major portion of their justification for professional advancement.

Staying current with recent developments in the various processes, procedures, and equipment used in industry is important for effective instruction. Therefore, faculty are expected to remain professionally involved with industry. Collaboration with professional colleagues on funded or unfunded activities is important and appropriate for professional development. Documented evidence of professional activity must be provided by the candidate for review and must be shown to complement his or her classroom experiences.

External reviews of a candidate's scholarly work are solicited for an appraisal of a candidate's accomplishments and contributions to the field written by an evaluator specializing in the field at a peer institution or better. An external reviewer must be an unbiased expert in the candidate's area of scholarship, not have had significant collaboration with the candidate, and should have a title that is the same as or commensurate with that for which the candidate is being considered. External review letters must not be solicited from mentors, former professors, members of a candidate's dissertation committee, former students, co-authors or individuals with whom the candidate has collaborated professionally, or individuals with a personal relationship to the candidate. If the candidate's area of scholarship is so narrow that external evaluators must be drawn from those with a close professional relationship, then the candidate's dossier or a separate formal communication should fully explain the past relationship with the reviewer and explain why the exception to this policy cannot be avoided.

At least eight weeks prior to the dossier submission deadline, a faculty member required or seeking to undergo review for tenure and/or promotion must provide the department Chair with a list of at least six reviewers who meet the criteria identified in the previous paragraph. The faculty member must also provide at this time the materials that the faculty member wishes the Chair to send to external reviewers as examples of the candidate's scholarly work or

professional activity. The Chair is expected to identify independently at least six additional appropriate reviewers. No later than six weeks prior to the dossier submission deadline, the Chair will select names from either list and solicit external evaluations until the required number of external letters have been received. The communication with potential external reviewers shall not be through the faculty being evaluated. The Chair shall not inform the faculty member which reviewers were contacted, or which reviewers agreed to submit letters.

The number of potential external reviewers contacted should reflect the Chair's judgement on the number needed to obtain at least three submitted letters. Should the Chair receive information that suggests that one or more of the reviewers contacted may not be able to provide an unbiased letter, alternative reviewers shall be contacted in order to end up with at least three unbiased letters. The Chair will request external reviewers to address in their letters the questions provided in Appendix B.

The Chair shall provide the faculty member undergoing review with copies of the letters received from external reviewers, appropriately redacted to hide the identity of the reviewer. When possible, the redacted letters shall be provided at least two weeks before the dossier submission deadline.

The following are examples of evidence that a candidate may present to document his or her accomplishments in professional activity:

- External consulting of a professional nature in one's discipline with the purpose of accumulating experiences of current industrial practice intended to enhance student learning in the classroom.
- Development of intellectual property leading to patents, trademarks, copyrights, license agreements, and publishing agreements.
- Development of devices, software and/or processes that are widely adopted and advance research, education and/or industry.
- A record of attracting funds, particularly from sources external to the University, to support research and/or educational innovation efforts of the candidate and his or her graduate students.
- Publication of peer-reviewed technical research and/or educational-research journal articles, conference proceedings, monographs, technical reports, and technical research books.
- Publication of engineering textbooks, with the requirement that these textbooks are accepted by reputable publishers.
- Obtaining and maintaining professional registration through continuing education seminars and workshops.
- Record of invited presentations, workshops and seminars at other universities or research institutions
- Presentations at national and international conferences
- Preparation and submission of grant proposals for funding
- Submission and acceptance of research reports.

- Awards or recognition based on scientific or engineering innovations.

3. Service

Given that committees are a vital part of the University's governance system, it is expected that each faculty member will participate in service activities that may include service on committees or other leadership positions at the departmental, College, or University levels. Other forms of service to the University community and to the community at large are also important as they may relate to the application of the faculty member's knowledge in his/her professional field, may increase the reputation and profile of the University within the local, state, national and international communities, and/or may help the department, college and university achieve goals relating to diversity and inclusive excellence.

Certain forms of internal service activities or administrative positions require an above average commitment. Significant participation in appropriate professional, technical, educational and inclusive activities external to the University may benefit the individual, department, college, and university's external profile. Such service should be recognized and valued for its importance to the institution. Faculty members should document these activities for renewal, promotion or tenure. Service activity may include, but is not limited to:

- Organizing and participating in conferences and meetings.
- Service as editor or member of the editorial board for national or international journals.
- Service to state, national, and international organizations, as related to professional responsibilities.
- Solicited reviews of manuscripts, reviews of research proposals, and reviews of textbooks.
- Service in professional associations and societies.
- Collaboration with other institutions on teaching or research projects.
- Service to industry or other organizations as an unpaid consultant, etc.

Engineering Technology Criteria for Promotion in Academic Rank

Section 8.3 of the CBA establishes minimum criteria for various academic ranks from Instructor through Professor. The following provide criteria for the promotion of Engineering Technology faculty in academic rank:

To Assistant Professor

Faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor in Engineering Technology must hold Master's degree in engineering with 30 semester hours of additional study in advanced engineering coursework above the Master's level or professional registration with a minimum of 3 years of experience in the field. Alternatively, faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor in Engineering Technology can hold a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in engineering or in a related scientific, mathematical or technical discipline. Tenured or tenure-track faculty without the appropriate credentials will be assigned the rank of Instructor. If such an Instructor earns the appropriate credentials, he/she can be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor following the procedures for promotion outlined in the CBA.

To Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor is coupled with a recommendation for awarding tenure. However, there can be instances where a faculty member is initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure. Advancement to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure requires a record of demonstrated accomplishment in teaching, professional activity, and service, as well as a strong indication of continued future productivity in these areas. The faculty member must present a dossier showing evidence of success in each of the three areas as defined under the Evaluation Criteria for Engineering Technology Faculty, including evidence of innovative instructional methods that are intended to improve undergraduate student learning. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is based solely on the accomplishments cited above and should indicate good potential for ultimately attaining the rank of Professor. The decision to promote a faculty member to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure should not consider the amount of time she/he spent at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor without tenure.

To Professor

Advancement to the rank of Professor requires a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in engineering or in a related scientific, mathematical or technical discipline. Promotion to Professor also requires substantial contributions to her/his disciplinary field, including the advancement of engineering education and/or disciplinary research as evidenced by archival publications in high-impact venues and/or external funding for educational or disciplinary research initiatives. Evidence of notable contributions in the areas of professional activity and service to the College, to the University, to the community and to his/her profession also will contribute to the promotion decision, as will evidence of leadership in these areas as defined under the Evaluation Criteria for Engineering Technology Faculty. Promotion to Professor is based solely on the accomplishments cited above and should indicate good confidence in continued performance at a high level. The decision to promote a faculty member to the rank of Professor should not consider the amount of time she/he spent at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure.

Guidelines for Dossier Preparation

The purpose of the dossier is to enable the evaluators to arrive at a fair judgment of the faculty member's performance. However, the preparation of a dossier is for evaluation by people not necessarily identified with the individual's field, and therefore must communicate the extent of a faculty member's accomplishments to a reviewer that may not be an expert in the faculty member's discipline. A dossier should include only the materials appropriate and necessary to support renewal, promotion, or tenure. The dossier for renewal, promotion and tenure must include:

- A current curriculum vitae.
- A detailed narrative statement for each evaluation criterion, explaining how and to what extent the activities claimed have met the criteria set forth in this document.
- Documentation in support of the above narrative.
- For faculty undergoing review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: All annual workload assignments, annual professional activity reports (ARPA), and renewal evaluation documents since the faculty member arrived at UT.
- For faculty members undergoing review for promotion to full Professor: All annual workload assignments, annual professional activity reports (ARPA) and five-year Professional Assessment reports since the faculty member was reviewed for tenure.
- Copies of the College of Elaborations and the relevant departmental elaborations, if applicable.
- An inventory of the dossier's contents.
- The results of the proscribed student course evaluations, including both quantitative data and comments identified in the relevant Teaching section earlier in this document.
- Other documentation that demonstrates instructional effectiveness or other teaching related documentation identified in the relevant Teaching section earlier in this document.

In citing publications, the faculty member should list the co-authors in the order of authorship on the final manuscript and include page numbers in the actual publication. The CV, narrative or elsewhere in the dossier should separately list:

- Refereed journal publications with clear distinction between submitted, accepted/in press, and published
- Books and book chapters
- Software, patent disclosures, patents, etc.
- Refereed and unrefereed conference papers and other publicly accessible papers
- Unrefereed publications and research reports
- Abstracts and summaries

The faculty member should identify in the narrative for professional activity or elsewhere in the dossier the contributions of the faculty member towards the scholarly work product relative to co-authors. In citing proposal submissions and external funding received, the faculty must clearly identify:

- Source(s) of funding.
- Duration and the total amount of funding from the external source and the faculty member's share of the funding secured.
- Names of the PI, the co-PI, and other co-investigators.
- Percentage effort on the proposal attributed to each investigator (must add to 100%).
- Fair market value of in-kind funding, such as equipment donations.

A faculty member should separately list departmental, college, university, community and professional committees on which he/she has served. For each item, faculty should state the extent of his/her involvement, including approximate number of hours spent per month, and the application of his/her knowledge in the member's professional field.

Appendix A - Template for requesting a reference letter for Engineering Science faculty

DATE

Dr. First Lastname
Distinguished Professor
Department of AAA Engineering
ABC University
City, State ZIP

Dear Dr. Lastname:

Subject: External Review of Dr. Jordan Doe, Department of AAA Engineering

Dr. Jordan Doe in the University of Toledo's Department of AAA Engineering is undergoing review for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate/Full Professor. On behalf of the department, I thank you for your willingness to provide a fair, objective and independent evaluation of Dr. Doe's professional accomplishments. I have attached a copy of Dr. Doe's CV and copies of the scholarly publications that Dr. Doe provided for the review process.

Please know that your identity will be held in confidence to the extent possible. The State of Ohio is an open-records state and under the state's public records laws, we are compelled to provide a copy of your letter in response to compliant requests. We provide candidates a copy of your letter redacted to remove any information that may reveal your identity. We will not, however, share your identity with the candidate unless Dr. Doe specifically requests it in accordance with the state's public records laws.

I ask that you provide your candid assessment based on the following specific questions.

1. How long have you known Dr. Doe and in what capacity? Do you feel that you can provide an unbiased assessment of Dr. Doe's professional accomplishments?
2. What is your professional assessment of the quality of Dr. Doe's work?
3. How well does Dr. Doe's scholarship contribute to key questions or issues in the relevant field(s)?
4. How would you characterize the recognition Dr. Doe's work has garnered among peers in the U.S. and internationally?
5. Are there other comments you would like to include, such as your assessment of Dr. Doe's service contributions to professional and technical societies?

Again, thank you for your valuable time and efforts in providing this evaluation. It would be most helpful, if I can receive your review on or before DATE. If I can provide any additional information, please contact me at (419) 530-1234 or by email at Riley.Chair@utoledo.edu.

Sincerely,
Riley Chair, Ph.D., P.E.
Chair, Dept. of AAA Engineering

Appendix B - Template for requesting a reference letter for Engineering Tech. faculty

DATE

Dr. First Lastname
Distinguished Professor
Department of AAA Engineering
ABC University
City, State ZIP

Dear Dr. Lastname:

Subject: External Review of Dr. Jordan Doe, Department of Engineering Technology

Dr. Jordan Doe in the University of Toledo's Department of Engineering Technology is undergoing review for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate/Full Professor. On behalf of the department, I thank you for your willingness to provide a fair, objective and independent evaluation of Dr. Doe's professional accomplishments. I have attached a copy of Dr. Doe's CV and copies of the professional activity documents that Dr. Doe provided for the review process.

Please know that your identity will be held in confidence to the extent possible. The State of Ohio is an open-records state and under the state's public records laws, we are compelled to provide a copy of your letter in response to compliant requests. We provide candidates a copy of your letter redacted to remove any information that may reveal your identity. We will not, however, share your identity with the candidate unless Dr. Doe specifically requests it in accordance with the state's public records laws.

I ask that you provide your candid assessment based on the following specific questions.

1. How long have you known Dr. Doe and in what capacity? Do you feel that you can provide an unbiased assessment of Dr. Doe's professional accomplishments?
2. What is your professional assessment of the quality of Dr. Doe's work?
3. How well does Dr. Doe's professional activity contribute to key questions, issues and/or education in the relevant field(s)?
4. How would you characterize the recognition Dr. Doe's work has garnered among peers in the U.S. and internationally?
5. Are there other comments you would like to include, such as your assessment of Dr. Doe's service contributions to professional and technical societies?

Again, thank you for your valuable time and efforts in providing this evaluation. It would be most helpful, if I can receive your review on or before DATE. If I can provide any additional information, please contact me at (419) 530-1234 or by email at Riley.Chair@utoledo.edu.

Sincerely,
Riley Chair, Ph.D., P.E.
Chair, Dept. of Engineering Technology