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# Fall 2017 – Promotion & Tenure Schedule

## A General Timeline of the Promotion and Tenure Decision Process

For Candidates Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure or Full Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Before Board of Trustees Meeting</th>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~8 Months</td>
<td>March 20, 2017</td>
<td>If Candidate would like materials reviewed by a member of the Dean’s Office prior to submission, a copy must be provided to either Curtis Bahn or Mary Simoni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~8 Months</td>
<td>March 31, 2017</td>
<td>In order to facilitate planning, the Department Head is responsible for communicating the department’s proposed AY2017-18 slate of promotions to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~7 Months</td>
<td>April 10, 2017</td>
<td>The Department Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT) should complete its review of and recommendation for promotion and submit memo to the Dean’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~6 Months</td>
<td>May 1, 2017</td>
<td>Candidate turns in bio-sketch; sample scholarly or artistic publications; teaching statement, research statement, and service statement; teaching evaluation summary; a list of 6 internal and 6 external evaluators to the Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head); a list of 6 student evaluators ideally representing a mix of undergraduate and graduate students, including alumni, to the Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head); Candidate and Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head) discuss selection of external and internal evaluators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~4 Months</td>
<td>June 1-9, 2017</td>
<td>Dean’s Office staff supports Department Head with letters, hard copy (external), email (internal and students) to reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~4 Months</td>
<td>June-August, 2017</td>
<td>Dean’s Office staff compiles full dossier of each candidate’s materials and letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~14 Weeks</td>
<td>Late August 2017</td>
<td>Early in the semester, the Department Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT) reviews and votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Department Head. If the Department Head’s recommendation is positive, s/he forwards the dossier and written recommendation to the School Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (SCPT). If negative, the Department Head informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal. In HASS, the Executive Committee functions as the SCPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~12 Weeks</td>
<td>September 1, 2017</td>
<td><strong>Department Head letter due to Dean’s Office.</strong> The SCPT has one week to review the dossier prior to the SCPT vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~10 Weeks</td>
<td>September 8, 2017</td>
<td><strong>The SCPT votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dean.

| ~ 8 Weeks | October 6, 2017 | **The School’s P&T cases are due to the Provost.** If the Dean makes a positive recommendation, s/he forwards the dossier with the written recommendation to the Provost. If the Dean’s recommendation is negative, s/he informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal. |
| ~ 8-3 Weeks | Early October | The Deans Council and the Faculty Committee on Promotion & Tenure (FCPT) independently review P&T cases. |
| ~ 3 Weeks | Mid-November | The FCPT take a vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost. |
| ~ 3 Weeks | Mid-November | The Deans Council takes a vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost. |
| ~ 2 Weeks | Mid-November | The FCPT and Deans Council meet together to vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost. |
| ~ 1 Week | Early December | The Provost makes a recommendation to the President. |

December

The President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

December

Board of Trustees Meeting.

---

**Spring 2018 – Promotion & Tenure Schedule**

**A General Timeline of the Promotion and Tenure Decision Process**

**For Candidates Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure or Full Professor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Before Board of Trustees Meeting</th>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~8 Months</td>
<td>March 31, 2017</td>
<td>In order to facilitate planning, the Department Head is responsible for communicating the department’s proposed AY2017-18 slate of promotions to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~8 Months</td>
<td>August 21, 2017</td>
<td>If Candidate would like materials reviewed by a member of the Dean’s Office prior to submission, a copy must be provided to either Curtis Bahn or Mary Simoni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 7 Months</td>
<td>September 11, 2017</td>
<td>The Department Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT) should complete its review of and recommendation for promotion and submit memo to the Dean’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 6 Months</td>
<td>October 2, 2017</td>
<td>Candidate turns in bio-sketch; sample scholarly or artistic publications; teaching statement, research statement, and service statement; teaching evaluation summary; a list of 6 internal and 6 external evaluators to the Department Head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Dean in the absence of a Department Head); a list of 6 student evaluators ideally representing a mix of undergraduate and graduate students, including alumni to the Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head); Candidate and Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head) discuss selection of external and internal evaluators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~4 Months</td>
<td>October, 2017</td>
<td>Dean’s Office staff supports Department Head with letters, hard copy (external), email (internal and students) to reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~4 Months</td>
<td>Oct.-Jan., 2017-18</td>
<td>Dean’s Office compiles full dossier of each candidate’s materials and letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~14 Weeks</td>
<td>Early January, 2018</td>
<td>Early in the semester, the Department Committee Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT) reviews and votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Department Head. If the Department Head’s recommendation is positive, s/he forwards the dossier and written recommendation to the School Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (SCPT). If negative, the Department Head informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal. In HASS, the Executive Committee functions as the SCPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~12 Weeks</td>
<td>January 19, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Department Head letter due to Dean’s Office.</strong> Executive Committee has one week to review prior to Executive Committee vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~10 Weeks</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Executive Committee votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Dean.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~8 Weeks</td>
<td>February 9, 2018</td>
<td><strong>The School’s P&amp;T cases are due to the Provost.</strong> If the Dean makes a positive recommendation, s/he forwards the dossier with the written recommendation to the Provost. If the Dean’s recommendation is negative, s/he informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~8-3 Weeks</td>
<td>Feb. – April, 2018</td>
<td>The Deans Council and the Faculty Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (FCPT) independently review P&amp;T cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~3 Weeks</td>
<td>Mid-April, 2018</td>
<td>The FCPT take a vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~3 Weeks</td>
<td>Mid-April, 2018</td>
<td>The Deans Council takes a vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~2 Weeks</td>
<td>Mid-April, 2018</td>
<td>The FCPT and Deans Council meet together to vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~1 Week</td>
<td>Early May, 2018</td>
<td>The Provost makes a recommendation to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2018</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 3rd Year Review Schedule

## A General Timeline of the 3rd-Year Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 31, 2017</strong></td>
<td>In order to facilitate planning, the Department Head is responsible for communicating the department’s AY2017-18 faculty requiring a third-year review to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 8, 2018</strong></td>
<td>All Assistant Professors seeking a contract renewal should have materials reviewed by mentor(s) and Department Head prior to submission to the Department Committee Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT). If Candidate would like materials reviewed by a member of the Dean’s Office prior to submission, a copy must be provided to either Curtis Bahn or Mary Simoni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 29, 2018</strong></td>
<td>The DCPT reviews and votes on the renewal as a recommendation to the Department Head. If the Department Head's recommendation is positive, s/he forwards the dossier and written recommendation to the School Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (SCPT). If negative, the Department Head informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal. In HASS, the Executive Committee functions as the SCPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 20, 2018</strong></td>
<td>Department Head submits DCPT review memo with votes, and candidate’s bio-sketch; scholarly or artistic publications since hire; teaching statement, research statement, and service statement; all teaching evaluations to the Dean’s office for submission to the SCPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2, 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>The SCPT votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Dean.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 30, 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>The School’s 3rd year review cases are due to the Provost.</strong> If the Dean makes a positive recommendation, s/he forwards the dossier with the written recommendation to the Provost. If the Dean’s recommendation is negative, s/he informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A General Timeline of the Lecturer Promotion and Decision Process For Candidates Seeking Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2017</td>
<td>In order to facilitate planning, the Department Head is responsible for communicating the department’s proposed AY2017-18 slate of promotions to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2018</td>
<td>All Lecturer seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer should have materials reviewed by mentor(s) and Department Head prior to submission to the Department Committee Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT). If Candidate would like materials reviewed by a member of the Dean’s Office prior to submission, a copy must be provided to either Curtis Bahn or Mary Simoni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 2018</td>
<td>The DCPT should complete its review of and recommendation for promotion and submit memo to the Dean’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2018</td>
<td>Candidate turns in bio-sketch; sample scholarly or artistic publications; teaching statement, research statement, and service statement; teaching evaluation summary; a list of 6 internal and 6 external evaluators to the Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head); a list of 6 student evaluators ideally representing a mix of undergraduate and graduate students, including alumni to the Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head); Candidate and Department Head (Dean in the absence of a Department Head) discuss selection of external and internal evaluators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5-9, 2018</td>
<td>Dean’s Office staff supports Department Head with letters, hard copy (external), email (internal and students) to reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-April, 2018</td>
<td>Dean’s Office staff compiles full dossier of each candidate’s materials and letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2018</td>
<td>At the end of the semester, the Department Committee Promotion &amp; Tenure (DCPT) reviews and votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Department Head. If the Department Head’s recommendation is positive, s/he forwards the dossier and written recommendation to the School Committee on Promotion &amp; Tenure (SCPT). If negative, the Department Head informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal. In HASS, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Department Head letter due to Dean’s Office.</strong> The SCPT has one week to review the dossier prior to the SCPT vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 2018</td>
<td><strong>The SCPT votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Dean.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2018</td>
<td><strong>The School’s Lecturer Promotion cases are submitted to the Provost.</strong> If the Dean makes a positive recommendation, s/he forwards the dossier with the written recommendation to the Provost. If the Dean’s recommendation is negative, s/he informs the candidate formally, including the candidate’s right to appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July, 2018</td>
<td>The Provost approves or declines the promotion and a notification is provided to the Candidate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART 1. THE FACULTY OF RENSSELAER

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Rensselaer Faculty Handbook presents Faculty rights, privileges, responsibilities and related procedures including the rules and regulations that affect Faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure status at Rensselaer. The Handbook applies to Rensselaer Faculty as defined in Section 1.4.1 at all Rensselaer locations, unless noted otherwise. The Handbook is reviewed annually in accord with the terms of The Faculty Senate Constitution. Handbook revisions require a majority vote of the Faculty Senate, approval of the Provost, the President of the Institute, and the Board of Trustees. Because there are policies and procedures pertaining to the Faculty in their capacity as employees of Rensselaer, this Handbook addresses only those that pertain to the Faculty in their role as Faculty. Institute-wide academic policies are the responsibility of the Office of the Provost. Other policy documents are available from the Division of Human Resources, the Office of Research Administration and Finance, and other Rensselaer entities. To the extent that these affect Faculty, it is the obligation of the Provost to maintain up to date copies of these documents or links to these copies on the official website of the Office of the Provost.

1.2 INSTITUTE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

Rensselaer develops broadly educated men and women who will be able to exert constructive leadership in society and will contribute to human welfare. Both for the enrichment of Rensselaer and for the greatest contribution to society, Rensselaer seeks to nurture an environment for Faculty and students from a variety of geographical, intellectual, ethnic, gender, socio-economic, sexual orientation, and cultural backgrounds.

Founded in 1824 by Stephen Van Rensselaer, the Institute was established “for purposes of instructing persons, who may apply themselves, in the application of science to the common purposes of life.” Rensselaer is the first degree granting technological institute in the English-speaking world. Rensselaer educates the leaders of tomorrow for technologically based careers - we celebrate discovery, and the responsible application of technology, to create knowledge and global prosperity. Today, Rensselaer provides a vital and expanding infrastructure to facilitate its mission and the contributions and creativity of its students, Faculty, and employees.

Rensselaer strives continuously to attract and nurture a Faculty of outstanding scholars and educators, and will work to provide those material facilities and opportunities needed for optimal achievement and intellectual growth. Central to the purpose of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute are scholarship, education, and service.

Scholarship. Scholarship includes research undertaken at Rensselaer to discover new knowledge, solve problems, stimulate a spirit of inquiry, and educate students. Scholarship may also include significant contributions to the creative and performing arts.
**Education.** Rensselaer provides educational programs of distinction at all academic levels in Architecture, Engineering, Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences, Management, and Science.

**Service.** Rensselaer has an obligation to utilize its abilities to the betterment of the Rensselaer community, the various professions it serves, and society as a whole.

1.3 INSTITUTE ORGANIZATION

1.3.1 The Corporation and Board of Trustees

The Corporation of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute is governed by the Board of Trustees under the *Act of Incorporation* of March 21, 1826, and its amendments as adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New York. The Board is empowered to govern itself under its by-laws and to adopt regulations for the conduct of the Institute.

The Board of Trustees includes up to 34 members elected for terms of four years. The mayor of Troy is an ex-officio member. The Board meets at the call of the Chair of the Board, holding at least four regular meetings during the year.

1.3.2 Institute Administration

The Chief Executive Officer of the Institute is the President, who is assisted by key administrators in broad areas of Institute management.

1.3.3 Academic Affairs

The Provost is the chief academic officer of the Institute. The Deans of the Schools of Architecture; Engineering; Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; Management; and Science; the Vice Provosts and Deans for Graduate and Undergraduate Education, and the Dean for Rensselaer at Hartford; and the Heads of the various academic departments and centers are responsible for the academic programs within their areas.

1.3.4 Research Administration

The Office of the Vice President for Research coordinates major research themes and programs through interdisciplinary, Institute-wide research centers and provides guidance for research programs and policies throughout the Institute.

1.4 FACULTY ORGANIZATION

1.4.1 Faculty Positions

For purposes of this Handbook, “Faculty” at Rensselaer is comprised of the Tenure Faculty and Non-Tenure Faculty only as follows:
The Tenure Faculty are the tenured and tenure-track Faculty, for purposes of this Handbook, and includes the Chaired Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors. The “tenured Faculty” are those Faculty members who have received a grant of tenure from the Institute. The “tenure-track Faculty” are those Faculty members who are hired with, or otherwise granted, a stated expectation that they will be considered for a grant of tenure upon the terms and conditions set forth in the offer letter (or other governing document) and this Handbook.

The Non-Tenure Faculty includes Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Professors of Practice.

Other individuals holding titles as Emeritus, Adjunct, or Visiting Faculty, as described is Part 2.4.3, are subject to relevant Rensselaer policies and procedures but are not within the scope of this Handbook, unless specifically noted. Retired Faculty may participate in Faculty Senate activities to the extent authorized in the Faculty Senate Constitution.

1.4.2 The Schools

The Faculty is organized into the Schools of Architecture; Engineering; Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; Management; and Science. The Schools of Engineering, Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, and Science comprise several departments. Individual Schools may have their own Faculty groups and curriculum committees to deal with intra-School matters.

Additionally, Rensselaer at Hartford, a branch campus, administers academic departments and programs at its campus in Hartford, Connecticut. It is understood that all Faculty appointments are specific to a location, either Troy or Hartford.

1.4.3 The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate is the representative body of the Rensselaer Faculty; it reports its deliberations to the Faculty and to the Provost

General Faculty Meetings. A General Meeting of the Faculty will be held each Fall and Spring semester.

Open Senate Meetings. The president of the Senate shall call an open meeting of the Senate at least five times during the academic year.

Special Faculty Meetings. Faculty issues of pressing importance can be brought before a special meeting of the Faculty.

Procedures for meetings, along with the purposes and organization of the Senate are described in the Faculty Senate Constitution.
PART 2. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

2.1 APPOINTMENTS—INTRODUCTION

This section (Part 2) of the Handbook details the process of the appointment of Faculty and certain academic administrative appointees. The process outlined applies only to the Faculty of the Institute as defined in Part 1.4.1. Other individuals are outside the scope of this Handbook and addressed separately in accord with relevant Rensselaer policies and procedures. Individuals in the Emeriti, Adjunct, Visiting or ROTC Faculty are discussed in Section 2.4.3. All appointments are made in the form of written agreements and must be made in accordance with the guidelines approved by the Board of Trustees and in accordance with Rensselaer Human Resources Policy Guidelines.

2.2 APPOINTMENTS—PROCESS

2.2.1 Overview

The procedure for appointing Faculty and certain academic administrative appointees at Rensselaer varies among the titles and ranks of the individuals in accordance with specifics provided in Section 2.4 of this Policy. The appointment of Faculty begins with an evaluation leading to an appointment recommendation, which is typically initiated at the department level. Each appointment recommendation must include an Appointment Proposal that defines the parameters of the proposed position. The recommendation is then evaluated using the review process defined in Section 2.2.5 where it is either rejected or recommended to the final appointment authority. The particular review process and designated final authority for execution of an appointment varies by position. Section 2.4 describes the attributes of each category of Faculty and outlines the requirements and any exceptions in the appointment process. This Section provides a general overview of the process.

2.2.2 Appointment Recommendation

Typically, Faculty appointments are initiated at the department level, with the exception of Chaired Professorships and administrative appointments, which may be initiated by the Dean, Provost or President. The tenured Faculty of the department initiate the process on the basis of an evaluation and discussion, which may include input from other knowledgeable persons in its Faculty and at Rensselaer. The tenured Faculty recommends the appointment to the Department Head. For those Schools that do not have departments, the process may initiate at the School level.

2.2.3 Appointment Proposal

In concert with the tenured Faculty, the Department Head creates an Appointment Proposal, which includes a criteria statement that specifies (1) the roles and responsibilities of the appointment, (2) the relative weights of the evaluation criteria categories for the appointment (see Section 2.4), including established department-specific criteria, and (3) the terms and conditions of the appointment, including tenure status, the possibility of reappointment, the term of notification of intent to reappoint, whether the appointment is full-time or part-time and to which campus the appointment
applies. The resulting proposal is forwarded to the appropriate academic Dean for review and submission to the Provost for approval.

2.2.4 Appointment Type

Appointments fall into one of two categories, which are usually initiated on the following basis.

**Initial Appointments.** Initial appointments include external candidates who are new hires and internal candidates with a new appointment that does not constitute a reappointment or promotion. The initial appointment process may be initiated on the basis of a search for a candidate with credentials and expertise in line with the appointment criteria and the goals and needs of Rensselaer. All Faculty appointments of more than one year require an open and competitive search as defined in this Handbook.

**Reappointments and Promotions.** Reappointments and promotions are initiated by the Department Head on the basis of the quality of the annual Performance Evaluation of the candidate, as well as the specified appointment criteria and the goals and needs of Rensselaer, as determined by the Department Head.

2.2.5 Appointment Review

Typically, all appointments undergo up to three types of review: Committee Review, Peer Review, and Rensselaer Review, which are defined below. The review standards for each category are specified in Section 2.4.

**Committee Review.** Certain appointments, as outlined below, require review by one or more of the following Rensselaer promotion and tenure review committees: at the department and School level review are the Department Committee for Promotion and Tenure (DCPT) and the School Committee for Promotion and Tenure (SCPT); at the Institute-wide level review are the Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FCPT), the Committee of Deans (CD), and the Joint Committee on Promotion and Tenure (JCPT). These committees are fully described in Sections 3.3 and 3.4.

**Peer Review.** Certain appointments, as defined below, require written peer reviews. For external peer review, reviews are solicited based on a list of potential reviewers selected by the Department Head. The process for obtaining these reviews is described in Section 3.3.

**Rensselaer Review.** Certain appointments, as defined below, may require review by all or part of the Rensselaer community. This Rensselaer Review typically occurs prior to the department recommendation. For example, in most cases a public presentation by the candidate and interviews with the Faculty, staff, and students in a department should be part of the process.

2.2.6 Appointment Authority

The Provost has final appointment authority for all Faculty, except that Chaired Professors are appointed by the Provost with approval by the President. Recommendation to the Provost for Faculty appointments should contain at a minimum, external references, a curriculum vitae, information concerning professional experience
including scholarship and education, and confirmation that the Tenure Faculty of the department has reviewed and recommends the appointment. (Granting of rank and tenure will follow the procedures described in Part 3.)

2.2.7 Appointment Approval

The Provost will prepare a list of appointment recommendations to be forwarded to the President for final approval or as information items, as the case may require. This list forms the basis of the President’s report on final appointments to the Board of Trustees. No officer of Rensselaer has authority to bind Rensselaer to an appointment without following the appointment process described above. Further, Faculty members do not have the authority to make academic appointments, even if the supporting funds come from research grants supervised by the Faculty members. Any such promises or assurances of appointment are unofficial until approved by the final appointment authority as described herein. Candidates should be fully and carefully informed of Rensselaer’s procedures and schedule for consideration of appointment recommendations.

2.3 APPOINTMENTS—CRITERIA

The criteria for appointments are the same as those for promotion outlined in Section 3.1 and are applicable for all appointments.

Appointment Privileges. Full-time Faculty are expected to receive an office, computer, telephone, staff support, and access to other basic facilities and support that are necessary for them to carry out their work. The expectation is that full-time Faculty will have their own office or equivalent, except in cases of financial exigency or short-term space shortages. Faculty will receive a Rensselaer identity card and rights to access campus facilities, including but not limited to athletic facilities, the library, parking, dining halls, and computing facilities. Use of computing facilities will include a computer account that allows access to the Internet, electronic resources provided by the library, and electronic mail. Short-term Non-Tenure, Adjunct, and visiting Faculty are provided a Rensselaer ID, a computer account, and a space within the department appropriate to the needs of their assignment. The Rensselaer ID affords access to the library, and to other buildings and facilities on campus as required.

Term of Appointment. Terms of appointment for Faculty are of three types: an ongoing term which generally applies to tenured Faculty; an open term which is extendable and which generally applies to tenure-track Faculty; or a fixed term which is renewable. Open terms which are extendable, are typically for three years and may be extended for a second term of up to three years, contingent upon the third-year review. “Fixed term” appointments generally apply to the Non-Tenure Faculty. Such appointments are typically of one to five years duration and may be renewed with a new contract for another fixed term.
Notice of Extension. Tenure-track Faculty generally receive three-year appointments and are typically reviewed for re-appointment in the third year. Unless specifically notified of extensions, the termination date specified in the contract shall prevail. In the case of an early termination of a contract for a tenure-track Faculty member, and for reasons other than those resulting from a disciplinary action for misconduct, the following schedule is applicable to tenure-track Faculty: (1) those in the first year of service receive 90 day notice of termination, prior to the end of the first year; (2) those in the second year receive six-month’s notice of termination, prior to the end of the second year; and those in the third year or additional years of service receive a one-year terminal contract.

Term of Service. Terms of service for Faculty are in two categories: (1) Academic Year Appointments of approximately thirty-six weeks apply largely to Tenure Faculty, and to Lecturers and Professors of Practice; and (2) unless otherwise specified in the appointment contract, Fiscal Year Appointments for the 12-month fiscal year apply largely to certain administrative appointees.

Resignation or Retirement. Faculty should provide a minimum of one semester’s notice prior to resignation or retirement. Only by approval of the Board of Trustees may a Faculty member, who has retired, be employed in any specified fiscal year.

2.4 APPOINTMENTS—POSITIONS AND ATTRIBUTES

2.4.1 Tenure Faculty

Full-time, Tenure Faculty who are actively involved in scholarship, education, and service will remain the primary Faculty model at Rensselaer. All appointments to the Tenure Faculty are made by the Provost; in cases of tenured appointments, with approval by the President and the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee in accord with the appointment contract, Fiscal Year Appointments for the 12-month fiscal year apply largely to certain administrative appointees. Appointments of external candidates to Chaired Professorships must be reviewed following the same procedures for tenured Faculty appropriate to the process for their rank. This review includes review by the Joint Committee on Promotion and Tenure (JCPT, defined in section 3.4.6) for purposes of granting tenure only and, in addition, review by the Chaired Professors. In the case of tenure-track Faculty, reappointment usually occurs after the ‘third-year review.’ This process is based on a review of the curriculum vitae and the individual’s record of service, scholarship, and teaching by the tenured Faculty in the department. The term “scholarship” as used in this Handbook includes research ranging from that which is typically appropriate to the sciences, to creative endeavors typically appropriate to the fine and performing arts. After review, the Tenure Faculty may recommend the appointment to the Department Head, who may recommend the appointment to the Dean for further review. The Department Head is responsible for documenting any recommendations for career development by the candidate. Members of the Tenure Faculty are expected to be actively involved in all aspects of the academic endeavor including scholarship, education, and service.
Members of the Tenure Faculty may acquire tenure, act as principal investigators, chair doctoral committees, advise master’s students, participate in promotion and tenure decisions, vote on curricular matters, and participate in Faculty Senate business.

**Chaired Professor Positions.** Chaired Professorships include Constellation Chairs, Endowed Chairs, Institute Professorships, and Career Development Chairs. It is the responsibility and expectation that all Chair holders will maintain a level of academic excellence and performance consistent with the criteria for awarding the Chair. A component of this responsibility is a level of performance and stewardship to the Institute and, where appropriate, to the benefactor as outlined in the Policy on Chaired Professor Positions. Excellence in scholarship and accompanying strengths in all the professional performance dimensions of scholarship, education, and service is expected, in addition to any specific selection criteria associated with a particular endowed position. The accomplishment of excellence should be evidenced by a history and continued demonstration of outstanding scholarship, academic performance, and national and international recognition. Constellation Chairs are characterized by leadership in a broad area of research of strategic importance to the Institute. Endowed Chairs are characterized by leadership in a specific area of scholarship. Institute Professorships are characterized by an overarching responsibility to Institute wide initiatives and may carry some institutional responsibilities. Career Development Chairs are characterized by strong potential for the highest level of accomplishment. Typically, Chaired Professor appointments will be made to tenured Faculty or to those who will become tenured Faculty upon appointment. However, it is possible for a Chaired Professorship to be granted without tenure.

**Professor.** The rank of Professor is normally attained by promotion from Associate Professor, although a new appointment at the level of Professor is also possible. An individual holding this rank should be an academic leader, possessing a nationally or internationally recognized record of excellence in scholarship, a sustained level of high quality in educational activities that go beyond teaching and advising, and a sustained level of service to the department, the Institute, and the profession. It is possible for an appointment at the rank of Professor to be granted without tenure, for example when the appointee has not been previously tenured at Rensselaer or another university.

**Associate Professor.** The rank of Associate Professor is normally attained by promotion from Assistant Professor, although a new appointment at the level of Associate Professor is also possible. An individual holding this rank should possess a record of excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by an emerging national or international reputation, a level of high quality in educational activities including teaching and advising, and a significant level of service to the department, the Institute, and the profession. While typically the promotion to Associate Professor is attained simultaneously with the granting of tenure, this is not absolutely necessary. It is possible for an appointment at the rank of Associate Professor to be granted without tenure but on tenure-track, such that tenure must be gained within six years of the original appointment.

**Assistant Professor.** Appointments at this rank are usually made for individuals who have completed the Ph.D. or the appropriate advanced degree, or have equivalent experience in the creative arts or other professions.
Holders of this rank should exhibit, through their accomplishments, promise of future distinction in scholarship and education. Appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor are granted without tenure as a tenure-track appointment.

2.4.2 Non-Tenure Faculty Appointments

Non-Tenure Faculty have primary responsibilities for teaching or research, bring specialized experience and expertise to Rensselaer, and fill important roles in both the educational and scholarly missions of Rensselaer.

All appointments to the Non-Tenure Faculty are made by the Provost in accord with the overall appointment process outlined in this section (Part 2). With the exception of appointments of one year or less, all appointments require peer review; however, review by the Institute-wide promotion and tenure committees is not required. Reappointment of Non-Tenure Faculty begins with an evaluation and recommendation by the tenured Faculty (and tenure-track Faculty at the discretion of the Department Head) in the department and proceeds as described in Section 3.1.

Members of the Non-Tenure Faculty may act as principal investigators or co-investigators on research grants and contracts. Consistent with their academic expertise and credentials, they may serve as committee members or advisors for master's theses, as doctoral committee members, or co-chair doctoral examination committees with a member of the Tenure Faculty. All such appointments to examination committees must seek approval through the Office of Graduate Education. Non-Tenure Faculty should not be involved in committees or discussions related to promotion and tenure.

Lecturer and Professor of Practice Appointments. Lecturers and Professors of Practice will generally focus on teaching and education, but persons holding these titles are expected to participate in professional development and scholarly activities sufficient to remain current in their fields of expertise. Lecturers and Professors of Practice will possess life experiences that make them well suited for the position and allow them to bring significant expertise in the appropriate field. In some cases, certain qualifications may be accepted in lieu of an advanced degree. Such qualifications should be consistent with a high level of attainment in the relevant field of expertise.

Lecturer. This is a non-tenured regular part or full-time academic appointment. A Faculty member appointed as a lecturer should have a terminal degree in a relevant discipline, demonstrated expertise and/or experience in a specific subject or academic discipline, and must have had prior substantive teaching experience and/or experience as a practicing professional. A Lecturer is appointed to teach multiple courses and/or sections during an academic year or semester. These appointments can be on a multi-year basis. A Lecturer may serve on departmental committees, academic program review committees, and may be involved in student advising that is consistent with their academic expertise and credentials.

Senior Lecturer. This is a non-tenured regular full-time academic appointment. A Faculty member appointed as a Senior Lecturer must demonstrate expertise and/or experience in a specific academic course subject, academic discipline area, and must have had prior substantive teaching experience and/or experience as a practicing professional at a Senior level.
A Senior Lecturer may serve as a Principal Investigator for a research grant or contract. A Senior Lecturer is appointed to teach multiple courses and/or sections during an academic year semester, and/or on a multi-year basis. They may serve on department committees, academic program review committees, and provide student advising that is consistent with their academic expertise and credentials.

**Professor of Practice.** A Professor of Practice is a non-tenured regular full-time academic appointment. A Faculty member appointed as a Professor of Practice must have unique professional experience, a distinguished research record, and/or performed at an Executive or Officer level, and must have made significant impact within a subject matter or discipline in a field important to Rensselaer’s research and academic programs. A Professor of Practice is expected to have a terminal degree in a relevant discipline, possess substantial leadership experience of at least 10 years, and have a national or international reputation for excellence in their field of expertise. A Professor of Practice may serve as a Principal Investigator for a research grant or contract. A Professor of Practice is expected to serve as a principal academic advisor to undergraduate and/or graduate students, direct academic programs, serve on Institute-wide, School, Department, and academic program review committees. They are also expected to provide other academic and student services consistent with their expertise and academic credentials.

### 2.4.3 Special Faculty Categories

Individuals holding titles as Emeriti, Adjunct, Visiting or ROTC Faculty are described below. These Faculty members are outside the scope of this Handbook, unless otherwise specified.

**Emeriti Faculty.** A member of the Faculty may receive emeritus rank upon retirement based upon the recommendation of the Department Head, review by the Dean and Provost, and final approval by the Board of Trustees. The term of appointment for Emeriti is ongoing. This recommendation should be based upon the Faculty member’s outstanding achievements and recognized leadership in the areas of scholarship, education, and service.

**Adjunct Faculty.** The title of Adjunct Faculty is intended for situations in which the appointment is not the primary employment for an individual, or, if already employed by the Institute, is not the primary job responsibility for an individual. Persons holding this title are generally hired for a single semester to teach a specific course, program, or lecture series for a fixed term appointment, which may be renewed. This title may be used to make a courtesy appointment for an individual when an affiliation between that individual and the Institute is mutually beneficial.

**Visiting Faculty.** Visiting Faculty appointments are designed for members of the Faculty that are on leave from their regular place of employment usually for one academic year, but occasionally shorter, and are typically expected to return there after finishing their visit at Rensselaer.

**ROTC Faculty.** Military personnel constituting the ROTC faculties for the Air Force, Army, and Navy are assigned by the government of the United States, subject to the appointment by the Institute as Lecturers or Professors of Practice.
They are appointed by the Provost based on recommendations of the respective branch of the service and the ROTC coordinator.

2.4.4 Academic Administrative Appointments

Academic administrative appointments that hold Faculty rank should follow the appointment procedures outlined in this section (Part 2). Appointments with tenure status must follow the established procedures for appointment, promotion, and tenure.

President and Provost. The President and the Provost are appointed by the Board of Trustees for a term of no specified duration. They hold their respective offices at the pleasure of the President (as to the Provost) and the Board of Trustees (as to the President). In the case of the appointment of the President and the Provost, it is expected that Tenure Faculty will have an integral role in the selection and search process.

Vice Provosts. Vice Provosts and Deans for Graduate and Undergraduate Education, who play a significant role in scholarship and education at Rensselaer, are appointed by the President for a term of no specified duration. It is expected that Tenure Faculty will be involved in the search and selection of candidates for these positions. The appointment will be based upon the recommendation of the Provost in consultation with the Tenure Faculty. Tenure Faculty input will be incorporated in the appointment process.

Deans. The Deans of the five Schools, are appointed by the President, usually for specified term of five years, which may be extended. The appointment will be based upon the recommendation of the Provost in consultation with the Tenure Faculty and Department Heads of the respective Schools. A major, in-depth peer review and evaluation of each Dean will be performed by the Provost at least once every five years. The review will solicit input from the Tenure Faculty of the School, with the opportunity to provide such input on an anonymous basis.

Associate and Assistant Academic Deans. Associate and Assistant Academic Deans are appointed by the Dean for a term of no specified duration. It is expected that Tenure Faculty of the School will be involved in the search and selection of candidates for these positions. The appointment will be made in consultation with the Tenure Faculty of the School.

Center Directors. Center Directors include Directors of Institute Centers and Directors of School Centers, which are also known as embedded center directors. Directors of Institute Centers are appointed by the President, for a specified term of three to five years, which may be renewed. The appointment will be based upon the recommendations of the Vice President for Research and the Provost in consultation with the Tenure Faculty associated with the Center. Directors of Institute Centers report to the Vice President for Research. Directors of School Centers are appointed by the President, usually for a specified term of three to five years, which may be renewed. Directors of School Centers report to the Dean of the responsible School, and appointment is based upon the recommendation of the Dean and the Provost, in consultation with the Tenure Faculty associated with the Center. A major, in-depth peer review and evaluation of each Center Director will be performed at least once every five years. The review will solicit input from the Tenure Faculty associated with the center, with the opportunity to provide such input on an anonymous basis.
**Department Heads.** Department Heads are appointed by the President, usually for a specified term of three to five years, which may be renewed. The appointment is based on the recommendations of the Dean and Provost in consultation with the Tenure Faculty of the respective department. A major in-depth review and evaluation is required prior to reappointment and will be performed during the year prior to termination of the then-current appointment. The review will solicit input from the Tenure Faculty associated with the department, with the opportunity to provide such input on an anonymous basis.

**Other Academic Administrative Appointments.** Associate Heads and other departmental academic administrative positions are appointed by the Dean, typically for a term of three to five years. The appointment is based on the recommendation of the Department Head in consultation with the Tenure Faculty.

**2.5 APPOINTMENTS—GENERAL STIPULATIONS**

The following stipulations govern the appointment process at Rensselaer.

**Tenure through Department.** Tenure shall be held by a Faculty member only through the department at the specific campus in which it was granted and is not automatically transferable to another department or campus. For example, a tenured or tenure-track position that is held through the appropriate department at Rensselaer at Hartford, is not transferable to any other department at Hartford and is not transferable to Rensselaer’s Troy campus. However, at the discretion of the Institute, it is possible for a Hartford Faculty member to be granted tenure in a Troy department provided the candidate undergoes the usual process for the granting of tenure in that department.

**Primary Appointment.** Appointment to a Faculty position in the home department is the primary appointment of an individual hired principally to be a member of the Faculty. Additional assignments, such as Vice Provost, Vice President, Dean, Department Head, Center Director, a joint appointment to another department, etc. are ancillary appointments. Upon completion of these additional assignments, an individual reverts to the primary Faculty appointment.

**Joint Appointments.** Cooperative undertakings by individual Faculty members with other departments and other academic programs are encouraged and, in some instances, additional appointments with other departments may be made by the Provost upon a recommendation from the Department Head that is based on the vote of the Tenure Faculty of the relevant departments and programs. Joint appointments should be reviewed by the respective Department Heads on a periodic basis, but in no case, shall the term of the joint appointment extend beyond the termination date of the primary appointment. Continuation of the joint appointment assumes significant scholarly involvement in the activities and affairs of the Departments. Specific rights and responsibilities afforded to joint appointees will be determined by the Department Heads based on input from the Faculty of the departments.

**Acceptance of Appointments Elsewhere.** Tenure Faculty at Rensselaer may not simultaneously hold tenure elsewhere. Tenure Faculty who accept a concurrent academic position at another institution must obtain approval from their respective Dean and the Provost prior to accepting such an appointment.
2.6 APPOINTMENTS—SALARY

2.6.1 Fiscal and Academic Year Pay

The fiscal year of the Institute begins July 1 and ends the following June 30. The academic year is approximately 36 weeks in duration. Half of the academic year’s salary is attributed to the Fall semester and half to the Spring semester. Nine-month and twelve-month academic year Faculty appointments will be paid their annual academic year salary in a manner consistent with applicable state and federal laws and Rensselaer policy.

2.6.2 Salary Changes

Salary Changes. Salary changes for individual members of the Faculty are not automatic, but based on achievement and competitive market forces, while remaining within the limits of available funds and the salary structure at Rensselaer.

Salary Recommendations and Approval. Faculty salary recommendations and salary adjustments are within the prerogative of the Provost, who will consider the Performance Evaluation conducted by the Department Head, and reviewed by the Dean of the appropriate School, subject to the final approval of the President. The Provost provides an annual summary report on Faculty compensation to the President.

2.6.3 Supplemental Pay

All recommendations for supplemental pay for Faculty must be processed through the respective Department Head, fund manager, Dean, Provost and Vice President for Human Resources. Supplemental summer pay for Faculty on academic year appointments will be governed by the Rensselaer Policy on Supplemental Pay for Faculty (rev. August 2008).

2.7 PERFORMANCE, EVALUATION AND MENTORING

Performance Evaluation. It is the responsibility of the Department Head each calendar year to conduct a formal, written Performance Evaluation of the performance of each Faculty member in their department in the areas of scholarship, education, service and established department-specific criteria. Chaired Professors are also evaluated by the Dean and the Provost at the time of reappointment.

Performance Appraisal. Where applicable, as part of the Performance Evaluation, the Department Head should also include a written Appraisal concerning the individual's progress towards reappointment, promotion and tenure. The Department Head is required to solicit relevant information for the Appraisal from the Faculty member, and it is the responsibility of the Faculty member to supply such information.

Personal Interview. A copy of the annual Performance Evaluation and, where appropriate, Appraisal, signed and dated by the Department Head, must be given to the Faculty member who should acknowledge receipt of the Evaluation/Appraisal by signing and dating it.
The document, containing both signatures, should be returned to the Department Head, and a copy should be provided to the Faculty member. A Department Head is expected to review the Performance Evaluation and Appraisal in a personal interview with the Faculty member.

If the Faculty member disagrees with the written Performance Evaluation or Appraisal, he or she is expected to make such disagreement known to the Department Head, and has the option to comment on the evaluation, in writing. The Faculty member may also provide a written opinion or explanation of the evaluation or appraisal.

A copy of the Performance Evaluation and Appraisal conducted by the Department Head, signed and dated by both parties, as well as the written response of the Faculty member, if any, are forwarded by the Department Head to the Dean for further review. It is the responsibility of the Dean to arbitrate any continuing disagreements concerning the Performance Evaluation and Appraisal, and to inform the Department Head who in turn will inform the Faculty member of any final decision that is required to be made.

In the case of a School with no departments, the written Performance Evaluation, Appraisal and Personal Interview are conducted by the Dean or the Dean's delegate, and the results of the evaluation and written responses, if any, are forwarded to the Provost, who then arbitrates any continuing disagreements. All cases of disagreement with the Dean are further reviewed by the Provost, who then informs the Dean and Faculty member of the final decision as required.

**Mentoring of Faculty.** Effective Faculty mentoring is essential to foster Faculty development. As such, all Faculty members, especially tenure-track Faculty, will be provided the opportunity to work with a Faculty mentor. The goal of each Faculty mentor is to assist fellow Faculty members in reaching their fullest potential as members of the Rensselaer community.

During the first months after a tenure-track Faculty member's appointment has begun, the mentoring of the new tenure-track Faculty member will be the responsibility of the Department Head. Within a year of the new tenure-track Faculty member's appointment, the Department Head will arrange for a mentor to work with the new Faculty member until a tenure decision is reached.

The Department Head will consult with the new tenure-track Faculty member before assigning a mentor. The Department Head will ask the tenure-track Faculty member to propose possible mentors with whom he/she would like to work, and whenever possible will assign a mentor from the names suggested by the tenure-track Faculty member. In the event that a tenure-track Faculty member prefers not to work with a mentor, a mentor will not be assigned. A specific professional relationship between the new Faculty member and the mentor is viewed as an appropriate basis for mentoring. The selection of the mentor or the election by the Faculty member not to have a mentor will be noted in the Faculty member's file.

In particular, Faculty mentors should support new tenure-track Faculty members in finding and utilizing the campus resources to assist in course development, teaching, advising, proposal development, and research. The mentor should work to introduce the
new tenure-track Faculty member to Rensselaer and appropriate professional communities. The mentor should assist the Faculty member in preparing her/himself for tenure review and decision by providing information, support and guidance throughout the probationary period. Similarly, a tenure-track Faculty member is expected to initiate discussion and assistance from his/her Faculty mentor in order to ensure a fully-effective mentoring relationship.

PART 3. PROMOTION & TENURE

Recommendations on academic promotions and the granting of tenure are extremely important to both the individual Faculty member and to Rensselaer. Procedures, therefore, must be well-defined and adhered to in all cases. However, given the desired diversity of the Schools, it is also important that the procedures remain flexible enough to reflect these differences. It is also important that the departmental and School contexts of each case be recognized, considered, and respected at the Institute-wide level of review.

3.1 PROMOTION

3.1.1 Introduction

Promotion is a means of recognizing the academic achievements of individual Faculty. All promotions must follow the guidelines established in this Handbook. Ranks and titles among the Faculty are outlined in Section 2.4. Promotion among Faculty at Rensselaer is typically from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or from the rank of Associate Professor to Full Professor.

Consideration of promotion can be initiated by the individual, by the individual’s Department Head (or Dean in the absence of a Head), or by the appropriate Tenure Faculty, holding at least the academic rank that would result from the promotion, in the individual’s department (or School in the absence of a department). Promotion may occur at any time during an individual’s career.

Promotion decisions are made separately from tenure decisions, even though they may sometimes be considered simultaneously. It is recommended that all Faculty maintain a comprehensive biographical sketch and other relevant material that is updated on a continual basis to reflect the accomplishments of the individual. This dossier will then be used as the basis for the promotion case.

3.1.2 Promotion — Approval

Tenure Faculty. In the case of all tenured and tenure-track Faculty, promotion is approved by the President after recommendations have been made by the appropriate Faculty (Tenure Faculty holding at least the academic rank that would result from the promotion) in the individual's department, the Department Head (or Dean in the absence of a Head), the committee for promotion and tenure of the appropriate School, the Dean of the appropriate School, the three Institute-wide committees defined in Part 3.4, and the Provost. These recommendations will consider input from selected internal and external peers and from students. The candidate should be promptly notified once the final
decision is made. The criteria for promotion are outlined below.

**Non-Tenure Faculty.** In the case of non-tenure Faculty, promotion is approved by the Provost after recommendation has been made by the tenured Faculty in the individual's department, the Department Head (or Dean in the absence of a Head), and the Dean of the appropriate School. The candidate should be promptly notified once the final decision is made. These recommendations will consider input from selected internal and external peers and from students.

Non-Tenure Faculty will be considered for promotion at reasonable intervals consistent with the corresponding intervals for Tenure Faculty. Promotion decisions should be made based on the educational attainment level appropriate for the particular profession as a whole. The criteria for promotion should follow the criteria for tenured Faculty promotion outlined below adjusted by weighting for teaching, service, and scholarship established in the appointment letter. The content and format of the promotion case is modeled after the content and format of a promotion and tenure case for Tenure Faculty.

3.1.3 Promotion — Criteria

The three principal classifications of activities evaluated for promotion of Tenure Faculty and Non-Tenure Faculty are scholarship, education and service. All are important to a promotion decision but are not equally weighted. Evidence of excellence in scholarship is paramount to the goals of Rensselaer and is of primary importance for Tenure Faculty. It is important to emphasize that each promotion case must be judged on its own merits. The criteria listed below are only general criteria.

EXAMPLES OF CRITERIA BY RANK:

**Assistant to Associate Professor.** Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor requires that the candidate demonstrate, in accordance with established criteria:

a) emerging national or international recognition for scholarly activities;

b) a high degree of quality in education with an emphasis on teaching and advising;

c) service to the department, Rensselaer, and the appropriate profession.

**Associate Professor to Professor.** In general, promotion from Associate to Full Professor requires that the candidate demonstrate, in accordance with established criteria:

a) an established national and international recognition for scholarly activities;

b) sustained high quality in education with a focus that includes teaching, advising, and curriculum development;

c) sustained service to the department, Rensselaer, and significant external service to the appropriate profession.
EXAMPLES OF CRITERIA BY AREA OF ACTIVITY:

**Scholarship.** Scholarship is represented by the advancement of knowledge in a particular discipline and the dissemination of that knowledge in an appropriate form. Scholarship is generally demonstrated by:

a) Quality and quantity of publications in refereed journals, papers, or books, and other creative works widely recognized within a particular discipline;

b) Evidence of continuing self-development and scholarly interaction with others in the profession with the ability to create and sustain a program of high quality scholarship in a particular discipline;

c) Recognized stature in a particular discipline or field;

d) Other factors such as, professional accomplishments of former students and dissemination of knowledge to non-specialists.

**Education.** The purpose of education is the transmission of knowledge and the stimulation of students' intellect. Education is generally demonstrated by:

a) Long-range educational impact on students; lasting contributions to the professional and personal growth of those students;

b) Quality of the presentation of course material, and the ability to effectively communicate knowledge to students in a variety of modes, as reflected by, but not limited to, student evaluations;

c) Participation in course curriculum and program development at all instructional levels;

d) Direction of advanced study through thesis supervision;

e) Effectiveness of personal interactions with students through advising and career counseling.

**Service.** The purpose of service is Faculty participation in the accomplishment of the goals of Rensselaer. Service is generally demonstrated by:

a) Service to the Institute that includes service to the School and Institute-wide committee activities and administrative participation, as well as, service to the community and public in one's professional capacity as relevant to the goals of Rensselaer;

b) Service to the department that includes service on departmental committees, mentoring of Faculty, and other tasks as defined by the Department Head;

c) Service to the profession that includes service to professional societies in the appropriate discipline.
3.2 TENURE

3.2.1 Introduction

Tenure Purpose. The tenure system fosters academic freedom at Rensselaer, including protection from hindrances to the search for knowledge and hindrances to the dissemination of knowledge. The tenure system consists of rules and procedures that establish an essentially self-regulated body of scholars enjoying the continuity of existence and economic security within which academic freedom is both fostered and protected. The protections of academic freedom are extended to all members of the Tenure Faculty (including both tenure-track and tenured), during their terms of appointment.

The concomitant responsibility of Tenure Faculty members, benefited and encouraged by the tenure system, is to use the opportunities thus provided for the advancement of the purposes of Rensselaer and of the communities it serves. These purposes include scholarship, education and service. Members of the Tenure Faculty are obliged to share in the teaching mission so that their students may advance in learning. They are also obliged to push forward the frontiers of knowledge through scholarship and education. These activities go hand in hand, for scholarship is unavailing if its results are not communicated, and a lively stimulus to learn is best imparted by one who is adding to our store of knowledge.

Tenure Definition. Tenure provides a means of ensuring academic freedom in scholarship, education and service. Tenure is granted by the Board of Trustees and is defined as the assurance of academic appointment unless terminated by retirement, resignation, death or for causes as outlined in this Handbook. The granting of tenure must follow the guidelines established in this Handbook.

Tenure is granted to scholars with an appropriate advanced degree and outstanding professional achievements who have, on the basis of past performance, demonstrated high potential for continuing contributions to the goals of Rensselaer. The granting of tenure, although based on demonstrated potential for being a mature scholar, also depends upon Rensselaer's needs and priorities in the Tenure Faculty member's particular field of endeavor.

Tenure candidates are apprised of Institute priorities and their personal tenure prospects through the annual Performance Appraisal. Tenure does not apply to administrative appointees and may be granted only in the ranks of the Tenure Faculty.

3.2.2 Tenure Period

Pre-Tenure Period of Six Years. The process for awarding tenure should be completed no later than the end of the equivalent of the Faculty member’s sixth year at Rensselaer with the exception of approved leave periods as described below (“Pre-tenure Period”). No individual may remain as a full-time member of the Rensselaer Tenure Faculty for longer than the Pre-tenure Period plus one-year's notice, unless granted tenure. The period of service starts at the beginning of the first full academic year of the appointment. For example, the period of service for a Faculty member hired during the middle of an academic year will start at the beginning of the following academic year.
Approved leaves of absence do not count towards the pre-tenure period of service.

A one-year extension to this Pre-tenure Period shall be automatically granted to a parent in recognition of the demands of caring for a newborn child or a child under age five newly placed for adoption or foster care. The request for the one-year extension should be made by the Faculty member within one year of the child’s arrival in the family.

An extension of the Pre-tenure Period may also be approved on a discretionary basis for other extenuating non-professional circumstances that have had a significant impact on the Faculty member’s productivity, such as a serious personal illness; major illness of a member of the immediate family; or other health or personal or family matters that impose special and arduous burdens and responsibilities upon the Faculty member.

Faculty members so affected may request a postponement of tenure review with a concomitant extension of the existing contract. It is not necessary to take an unpaid leave in order to invoke an extension to the Pre-tenure Period.

In rare instances, extraordinary professional circumstances not of the Faculty member’s own making may provide sufficient justification for extension of the Pre-tenure Period. In the case of exceptional delays in providing critical equipment, laboratory renovations, or other elements of the committed start-up package essential to establishing a viable research program that substantially impair the Faculty member's ability to carry out the full range of his or her academic responsibilities, a period commensurate with the delay shall, upon the request of the Faculty member and/or the Department Head, be excluded from current service. The request shall be submitted, with the recommendations of the Department Head and the Dean, to the Provost for a final determination regarding the appropriateness of the extension, as well as its duration.

Faculty members who benefit from an extension of the Pre-tenure Period are expected to fulfill their normal responsibilities during the extension unless they have been also granted a period of modified duties. Pre-tenure Period extensions are granted in one-year increments and cannot exceed a cumulative total of two years for any combination of reasons. Requests should be made within a year of the qualifying event or extenuating circumstance. Exceptions to these limitations may be approved by the Provost.

Requests for a Pre-tenure Period extension should be submitted in writing to the Department Head, the Dean, and the Provost. Documentation of medical reasons and/or other extenuating circumstances are required prior to approval by the Department Head, Dean, and Provost for Pre-tenure Period extensions. The Faculty member may appeal denial of the request to the next higher level.

All individuals and committees participating in tenure reviews must understand that individuals who have received extensions to their Pre-tenure Periods must be held to the same standard—not a higher or more stringent one—to which other candidates without such an extension are held.

Pre-Tenure Period Reductions. Faculty who have held academic appointments at other academic institutions, or who have extensive and relevant non-academic experience, during which time the individual held an appropriate doctoral degree or recognized terminal degree for the profession, may qualify for a reduced Pre-tenure
Period. This reduction may be specified in writing at the time of appointment at Rensselaer.

**Pre-Tenure Period Leaves.** Rensselaer provides a variety of leave opportunities which are subject to approval, including sabbatical, parental and other leaves as described in Part 7 of this Handbook. With written approval of the Provost and the Dean obtained in advance of the leave, a Faculty member may exclude a leave period from the Pre-tenure Period.

**De Facto Tenure.** The failure in any part of the tenure procedures will not automatically result in the granting of tenure, thereby bypassing the important evaluation process, nor do years of service confer tenure, absent compliance with the tenure procedures outlined herein. Rensselaer does not confer or support automatic or de facto tenure.

3.2.3 Tenure Criteria

**General Criteria.** The same three principal classifications of activities evaluated for promotion of Tenure Faculty and Non-Tenure Faculty (scholarship, education and service) and all specific criteria listed above for promotion decisions also apply to tenure decisions, though the relative importance of these may vary among academic departments and Schools. Promotion and tenure, however, represent significantly different commitments by Rensselaer. Promotion is recognition of outstanding achievement; tenure, although based on achievement, is a guarantee of academic freedom. The granting of tenure is based on demonstrated potential for becoming a mature scholar, but also depends on Rensselaer's needs and priorities in the Faculty member's field of endeavor. Rensselaer recognizes that each tenure case must also be judged on its own merits. The appropriateness of each criterion must be decided at each level of review.

**Uniformity of Criteria & Procedures.** The diversity of professions and disciplines within the academic community of Rensselaer and the several Faculties preclude wholly uniform procedures for appointments and promotions at the School level. The primary responsibility for developing and maintaining a high quality Faculty rests with the individual discipline.

A principal objective of Rensselaer is recruitment, development and retention of a distinguished Faculty. While the means to this end may vary, particularly in some of the professional Schools, generally the objective will be met by stressing intellectual leadership as the chief criterion. The relative weight given to the scholarship, education and service varies from case to case and should be determined by the individual Faculties.

Each School shall adopt procedures for the review of Appointment Proposals, promotion, and tenure within the Faculty that are in accord with this *Handbook*. Uniform procedures should be followed when appointments, promotions or tenure are considered at the Institute-wide level under the aegis of the President and Provost.

Upon initial appointment, each new Faculty member shall be provided with a copy of this Faculty Handbook as well as with other available documentation on criteria and procedures used in promotion and tenure.
3.3 DEPARTMENT AND SCHOOL REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS

The procedure for promotion of tenured Faculty and/or the granting of tenure to a tenure-track Faculty member is typically initiated at the Department level (School level in the case where no departmental structure exists) and then progresses to the School level before evaluation by Rensselaer’s three Institute-wide Committees (i.e., Faculty Committee for Promotion and Tenure, Committee of Deans, and Joint Committee for Promotion and Tenure).

All cases of promotion or tenure of Faculty must be reviewed following the guidelines described below. These include decisions regarding (1) all internal candidates for promotion or tenure who have received positive recommendations from their departments and Schools, (2) all internal candidates who are electing to follow the appeals process as described in Part 6.2 of this Handbook, and (3) all candidates for initial appointments at the Associate Professor and Professor level who have received positive recommendations from their departments and Schools, if immediate tenure is to be granted. The dossiers for all candidates for initial appointments to Chaired Professorships and administrators who are members of the Faculty are also to be reviewed for the purpose of granting tenure. The dossier of all initial appointments must be reviewed before a contract is issued by the Institute. The required procedures and responsibilities follow:

3.3.1 Department-Level Review

The Department Head (the Dean in a School without departments) has the following responsibilities:

**Communication of Standards.** The Department Head will regularly inform each Faculty member of Rensselaer's standards for promotion and/or tenure as they apply to the department.

**Nomination of Candidates.** The Department Head will create a list of candidates to be nominated for each level of promotion and/or tenure. The Department Head must nominate for tenure evaluation all Faculty members who will complete the maximum Pre-tenure Period during the current academic year.

**Advising on Dossier.** The Department Head will assist all candidates in gathering the factual material to be placed in his/her dossier. This is to include an updated version of the usual "Biographical Sketch" and any additional information that demonstrates the scholarship, education and service achievements of the candidate.

**Convening the Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure (DCPT).** The Department Head will convene the appropriate Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure to review the dossiers, minus external peer reviews, of all candidates within the department and decide which cases should proceed to the solicitation of external peer reviews.

**Soliciting External Review.** If the decision of the DCPT is positive, or if the case is under appeal, the process proceeds to the solicitation of external reviews. The Department Head will solicit, receive and log the results of no fewer than six (6) external
peer reviews for the purpose of providing outside expertise that is independent and objective. The log should include information on letters that were solicited but not issued, including records of any written or oral reaction volunteered by the reviewer explaining why the letter was not produced.

External reviewers are chosen as follows:

a) The members of the appropriate DCPT and the candidate shall each submit to the Department Head a list of potential external peer reviewers. In order to achieve independent lists, the Department Head should first obtain a short list of names from the candidate and then obtain an independent list from the DCPT.

b) The candidate must be given the opportunity to review the list of selected reviewers before letters of solicitation are sent, and to comment in writing on the appropriateness of these reviewers for his or her particular case. Any such written comments are to become a permanent part of the dossier.

c) The Department Head shall solicit, and strive to obtain an equal number of reviewers from each list and shall strive to receive an equal number of responses.

d) The Department Head shall prepare a log which lists the names of the external peer reviewers, the dates on which letters were sent soliciting reviews, the dates on which responses were received, and a sample of the solicitation letter. Biographical information concerning each reference and a brief description of his or her past and present relationships with the candidate (e.g., thesis adviser, co-author of papers, sponsor of the candidate's grants), will also appear on the log. This log becomes a permanent part of the dossier.

e) If the number of external reviews received is less than the required number of six (6), steps (a) through (d) are to be repeated until at least six (6) external reviews are received. In order to make the case for promotion and/or tenure as strong as possible, reviews should be solicited broadly. References from several different major universities, international references, and prominent figures in the candidate's field should be considered when preparing the selection of external reviewers. The weight of different kinds of references will vary depending upon the discipline represented. When the review is for the purpose of granting tenure, all reviewers from academic institutions should hold tenured positions. To the greatest extent possible, review letters should be from tenured Full Professors.

**Soliciting Student Input.** The Department Head will solicit, receive and log the results of evaluations and letters of recommendation from former students, preferably both undergraduates and graduate students. The procedures to be followed are identical to those listed above for external peer reviews including the minimum requirement of six
letters.

**Soliciting Internal Letters.** The Department Head will solicit internal letters that will be considered as part of the dossier for the purpose of clarifying scholarship, education and service.

**Handling of Letters.** No solicited letters that are received shall be excluded from the tenure and promotion portfolio.

**Convening the Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure (DCPT).** The Department Head, or the Dean of a School without departments, will convene the appropriate Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure to evaluate the external peer reviews and student evaluations, and to provide a recommendation as to whether each case should continue to go forward. The recommendation of this Faculty committee shall be in writing to the Department Head or Dean and shall contain a summary record of the vote of the committee (for, against, abstain or absent) on each candidate, which becomes a permanent part of the dossier. The appropriate Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure consists of:

(a) **PROMOTION:** For promotion, the minimum membership is all tenured Faculty who hold the proposed after-promotion rank, or higher, in the department. Each department, at the Head’s discretion, may extend this committee to include all Faculty members who hold the proposed rank, or higher, with or without tenure.

(b) **TENURE:** For tenure, the minimum membership is all tenured Faculty at the candidate's rank (or at the candidate after-promotion rank if tenure is proposed simultaneously with promotion), or higher, in the department. Each department, at the Department Head’s discretion, may extend this committee to include all tenured Faculty members, regardless of academic rank. The Department Head, or the Dean of a School without departments, shall serve as the *ex-officio* nonvoting Chair of each promotion and tenure committee.

**Making a Decision.** The appropriate Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure will meet, with the Department Head chairing the meeting, and will make a decision by majority vote. After receiving the recommendation of the appropriate Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Department Head shall decide whether the case merits submission to the next level of review. A written decision by the Department Head is required and becomes a permanent part of the dossier, and must be shared with the members of the appropriate Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure. In this written decision, the Department Head, or the Dean of a School without departments, will include the results of the Committee’s vote, and, if not unanimous, will include the arguments of the Faculty who were in the minority.

**Informing the Candidate.** The Department Head, or the Dean of a School without departments, shall inform the candidate of the recommendation of the Faculty committee and the Department Head’s decision. In the event of a negative decision, the Department Head shall inform the candidate, in writing, of the decision, the reasons for it, and of the candidate's right to appeal (as described in Part 6.2 of this Handbook).

**Forwarding the Dossier.** The Department Head, or the Dean of a School without departments, will forward the dossier of the candidate receiving a positive decision to the
Dean of the School.

**Updating the Candidate.** Department Heads, or the Dean of a School without departments, must report back to the candidate in a timely fashion on the final votes at each level of review, up to and including the recommendation from the Dean, as the case goes forward.

3.3.2 School-Level Review

It is the responsibility of the Dean of the appropriate School to ensure that the review is conducted as follows:

**Evaluation by School Committee on Promotion and Tenure (SCPT).** In the cases of Schools having Departments, the Dean of the School will select and convene the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure to determine whether additional external peer reviews are desired for the candidates brought forward from the departments within that School. In the cases of Schools which do not have Departments, the SCPT will act as DCPT, following all the procedures described for the DCPT in Part 3.3.1, with the SCPT step described here being skipped; in this case, the Dean of the School will serve as the ex-officio, non-voting Chair of each Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Evaluation by External Peers.** The Dean of the School may direct the Department Head to solicit additional external peer evaluations for candidates brought forward from the departments, based on the recommendations and analysis of the SCPT. A log of the solicitations shall be maintained in a manner similar to that described earlier for the Department Head, including review of the list of external reviewers before solicitation by the candidate and the opportunity for the candidate to comment on this list in writing. The log and written comments, if any, must remain as a permanent part of the dossier. If additional letters are added, the dossier shall be reevaluated by the DCPT.

**Recommendation of the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure Committee (SCPT).** The Dean of the School will convene the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure to evaluate the dossiers of all candidates and to provide a recommendation as to whether each case should go forward to the next level of review. The recommendation of the committee shall be in writing to the Dean, and shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) taken on each candidate. This written recommendation must remain a permanent part of the dossier. The School Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall consist of the Associate Dean(s), the Department Heads of the appropriate School, and representative(s) of the Faculty, as determined by the Dean.

**Decision of the Dean of the School.** After receiving the recommendation of the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Dean shall decide whether the case merits submission to the next level of review. A written decision is required and becomes a permanent part of the dossier and must be shared with the members of the SCPT. If the decision is positive, or if the case is under appeal, the process proceeds to the next level of review. In the event of a negative decision, the Dean shall inform the candidate, in writing, of the decision, the reasons for it, and of the candidate's right to appeal. In the case of an appeal, as described in Part 6.2 of this Handbook, the Dean prepares a written
decision which, whether positive or negative, goes forward to the next level of review.

**Dean of the School’s Decision to Provost.** The Dean of the School will forward the dossiers of all candidates receiving a positive decision, and the dossiers of all candidates following the appeal process, to the Provost. This written communication must become a permanent part of the dossier, and must be shared with the members of the SCPT.

**Dean’s Reports.** Deans must report back to Department Heads in a timely fashion on the final votes at each level of review, up to and including the recommendation from the Dean.

### 3.4 INSTITUTE-WIDE REVIEW

#### 3.4.1 Institute Committees

There are three (3) committees at the Institute level which conduct evaluations of Faculty performance for the purposes of promotion and tenure. This committee structure is intended to provide a system of checks and balances so that the interests of all parties concerned are represented. These committees are:

- Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FCPT)
- Committee of Deans (CD)
- Joint Committee on Promotion and Tenure (JCPT)

The recommendation of the JCPT is advisory to the Provost who in turn makes a recommendation that is forwarded to the President. The decision of the President of Rensselaer regarding promotion is forwarded to the Board of Trustees for informational purposes, and the decision of the President regarding tenure is forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Institute review is initiated by the Provost in concert with the Institute Committees in accord with the following procedures. The composition, responsibility, and required documentation for each committee are described below.

#### 3.4.2 Duties of the Provost

It is the responsibility of the Provost to review all dossiers to assure that they are complete and prepared in accordance with the tenure and promotion process as described in this section (Part 3). If the Provost finds the dossier is incomplete or not in accord with the tenure and promotion procedures, the Provost then has the option to administratively withdraw the dossier without prejudice to the candidate.

Otherwise, the Provost proceeds as follows:

- Makes all dossiers forwarded by the Deans available to the members of both the FCPT and the CD.
- Receives all dossiers of candidates who choose to follow the appeals process and forwards them to the appropriate department.
• Convenes the FCPT and participates, upon request, to clarify pertinent Policy in effect. The Provost also meets with the FCPT to receive a recommendation on each case. The recommendation of the FCPT shall be in writing to the Provost, and shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) to serve as a basis for deliberation in the JCPT.

• Convenes the CD to evaluate the dossiers of all candidates and to provide a recommendation on each case. The recommendation of the CD shall be in writing to the Provost, and shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) to serve as a basis for deliberation in the JCPT.

• Convenes and chairs the JCPT to review the recommendations of both the FCPT and the CD and the reasons for these recommendations and obtains a final recommendation on each case. This recommendation shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) taken on each candidate and becomes a permanent part of the dossier.

• Arrives at his or her decision on each case after considering the recommendation from the JCPT. This decision must be shared with the members of the JCPT. If the Provost does not concur with the recommendation of the JCPT, the Provost shall reconvene the JCPT to inform them of the reasons for the decision. If the decision of the Provost is negative, the Provost shall inform the appropriate Dean, who shall inform the candidate of the decision, the reasons for it and of the candidate's right to appeal. The procedure to be followed in the case of an appeal is described in Part 6.2 of this Handbook.

• Forwards positive recommendations for promotion and tenure to the President.

• Reports back to Deans in a timely fashion on the final votes at the Institute level, the recommendation of the President, and the action of the Board of Trustees.

• Reports back to the candidate on the final decision in a timely manner.

3.4.3 Action by the President

After considering the recommendation of the Provost, the President shall make his or her decision on each case and forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Promotion decisions are submitted for information; tenure recommendations are submitted for the final approval of the Board. The President shall inform the Provost, who shall inform the candidate of the Board’s decision in a timely manner. If the decision of the President or Board is negative, the reasons for it shall be conveyed to the candidate by the Provost along with information about the candidate's right to appeal. The procedure to be followed in the case of an appeal is described in Part 6.2 of this
3.4.4 Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FCPT)

**Composition:** The FCPT is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate reporting to the Faculty Senate and the Provost. It consists of eight Full Professors with tenure serving three-year terms. There is one member from each School and two members at large elected by the active Tenure Faculty. The two at-large members cannot be from the same School. In addition, there is one member, a Full Professor with tenure, who is elected annually by the Students during Grand Marshall Week. All are voting members.

So that there is continuity and institutional memory, the terms of the seven members representing the Faculty are for three years, staggered such that at least two new members take office at the beginning of each academic year. The Faculty member representing the students serves a term for one year. Members are elected by the Faculty from a slate of candidates presented by the Election Committee of the Faculty Senate according to the procedures outlined in the Faculty Senate Constitution. When a member is unable to assume office or to complete a term, the person will be replaced for the duration of that term by the next ranking nominee for that position in the last-held election. If no ranking nominee is available to serve, the constituency has the obligation to fill the seat. Procedures for securing a replacement from the Faculty are specified in the Faculty Senate Constitution.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be selected from the members of the Committee, usually as the last order of business for the academic year so that there is a clear responsibility for FCPT duties that may occur over the summer. The chair’s role is to facilitate decisions, move them along in a timely and orderly fashion, schedule meeting times (usually through the Provost’s office), make inquiries on behalf of the committee, report results of these inquiries to the committee, take notes from each meeting so there is a record of the discussion, and prepare the required documentation, described below, for the Provost.

The chair is also responsible for communicating with Deans concerning the quality of dossiers the FCPT has received. The chair also reports to the Faculty Senate on a regular basis throughout the year and prepares an annual report for the Faculty Senate of the FCPT’s activities at the end of the year.

**Responsibility:** It is the responsibility of the FCPT to make recommendations to the Provost on all cases of promotion or tenure of Faculty. The FCPT must see the dossier of all initial appointments with tenure before a contract is issued by the Institute.

**Documentation:** The report of the FCPT to the Provost shall be in writing and shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) taken by the committee on each candidate. This written report shall remain as a permanent part of the dossier.

3.4.5 Committee of Deans (CD)

**Composition:** The CD consists of the Deans of the Schools of Architecture, Engineering, Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, Management, and Science, who all serve as voting members. The Provost serves as the ex-officio, nonvoting Chair.
Responsibility: It is the responsibility of the CD to make recommendations to the Provost on all cases of promotion or tenure of Faculty.

Documentation: The report of the CD to the Provost shall be in writing and shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) taken by the committee on each candidate. This written report shall remain as a permanent part of the dossier.

3.4.6 Joint Committee on Promotion and Tenure (JCPT)

Composition: The JCPT consists of the eight Faculty members of the FCPT, and the Deans of each of the Schools, all who serve as voting members. The Provost serves as the ex-officio, nonvoting Chair.

Responsibility: It is the responsibility of the JCPT to review the separate recommendations of the FCPT and the CD and the reason(s) for these recommendations, and to provide the Provost with a final recommendation concerning the merits of these cases and the overall objectives of the Schools and Rensselaer.

Documentation: The recommendation of the JCPT to the Provost shall be in writing and shall contain a summary record of the vote (for, against, abstain or absent) taken by the committee on each candidate. This written report shall remain a permanent part of the dossier.

Recommendations on academic promotions and the granting of tenure are extremely important to both the individual Faculty member and to Rensselaer. Procedures, therefore, must be well-defined and adhered to in all cases. However, given the desired diversity of the Schools, it is also important that the procedures remain flexible enough to reflect these individual differences. It is also important that the departmental and School contexts of each case be recognized, considered, and respected at the Institute-wide level of review.

3.5 TERMINATION

This Section describes the process for the termination of tenured appointments. Termination of tenure-track appointments and Non-Tenure Faculty appointments is contractual in nature and governed by the conditions of the appointment made with Rensselaer. Appointment criteria and term of notification requirements for tenure-track Faculty and Non-Tenure Faculty appointments are covered in Section 2.3.

(a) Termination of Tenured Appointments for Administrative Reasons. The appointments to academic ranks carrying tenure may be terminated by Rensselaer, at its discretion, for administrative reasons such as financial exigency that necessitates the discontinuance of a program or department. In every case of the discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, the Faculty members concerned will be given notice as soon as possible, never less than an academic year.

(b) Termination for Lack of Adequate Performance or Misconduct. Appointments to academic ranks carrying tenure may be terminated by Rensselaer for reasons related to lack of adequate performance, misconduct or dereliction of duty, exemplified by, for example, commission of a crime that calls into question the Faculty
member’s suitability for continued employment; neglect of regular and punctual performance of work; failure to maintain the level of training, knowledge, experience and contacts necessary to keep pace with developments in the individual's field; failure to perform assigned duties; failure to observe academic or professional ethics; and/or violation of policies of the Institute concerning Faculty performance and inappropriate professional misconduct, such as but not limited to sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual violence.

(c) Termination for Misconduct in Scholarly Activities (Scholarly Misconduct).

Faculty members who have committed scholarly misconduct pursuant to the processes in Part 6.3 of this Handbook, may be terminated. The findings of Scholarly Misconduct made by the Investigation Panel (defined in Part 6.3.3) convened pursuant to section 6.3 and forwarded to the Provost will be conclusive. The Investigation Panel’s conclusions will, in their entirety, be submitted to and binding upon the Hearing Panel considering termination convened pursuant to this section and will not be subject to re-examination by any person at the termination hearing. The sole authority of the Hearing Panel convened pursuant to this section (c) will be to determine if the findings and recommendations of the Investigation Panel are sufficient to warrant termination.

Termination Procedures. Any cases of proposed termination by Rensselaer excluding those under paragraph (a) but including those under paragraphs (b) and (c) above that cannot be resolved by mutual consent between the Faculty member and the administration, will be considered by a Hearing Panel formed by three Faculty members for recommendation to the President. One member will be chosen by the Faculty Senate, one by the Provost, and one by the President. Before such a hearing, the involved Faculty member shall be informed by the administration in writing of the reasons for the proposed termination of appointment. The Faculty member shall have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense and shall be permitted to choose a Faculty advisor who may act as counsel. A record shall be made of the hearing and a copy filed in the Office of the Provost.

The Hearing Panel, after due consideration of the matter, shall make recommendations for action to the Institute administration.

PART 4. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Rensselaer Faculty are members of a learned profession whose actions reflect on the character of academia and the institution of which they are a part. As such, they are entitled to full freedom of scholarship, including the freedom to openly express their thoughts and ideas and disseminate the results of their scholarship and opinions. They are free to speak with others at a time and place of their choosing, including their own offices, provided it does not interfere with their routine duties. Notwithstanding, when Faculty speak or write as individuals, they should endeavor to make it clear that they do not speak for the Institute.

Responsibilities of Faculty members include: constantly seeking the truth and
becoming more proficient in their areas of competence; conveying to their students a respect for knowledge and a deep awareness of its uses; continually seeking to improve methods of transmitting knowledge to students and helping them learn to develop new knowledge independently; sharing their expertise with their colleagues, when needed, so that the concept of a community of scholars will be enhanced; and while maintaining their individuality, exemplifying in their conduct the professionalism, the ethics, and the generosity of spirit which typify the ideal scholar.

4.2 DUTIES AND EXPECTATIONS

Expectations of a Faculty member will vary as a function of his or her title, position and letter of appointment. In assigning workload, the academic Dean and Department Head will consider academic activities in all areas of scholarship, education, and service.

4.2.1 Classroom Responsibilities

The Provost’s Memorandum regarding the Academic Calendar and Regulations is distributed each semester and outlines, in detail, the dates, information, policy and procedures pertinent to teaching activities. All Faculty members should be familiar with the academic regulations of Rensselaer and the relevant content of this Handbook.

Course Management. For each course, the Faculty is expected to: (1) provide a course syllabus at the beginning of each semester with specified learning outcomes, assignments, grading and attendance policy; a statement of academic integrity; office hours and other particulars, such as exam dates, so that students will understand what is expected of them; (2) provide timely and relevant feedback to students on their performance; (3) perform and document an assessment of student learning outcomes including suggestions, if any, to improve course content to fulfill learning outcomes; and (4) provide course structure and instruction that is consistent with Rensselaer’s policies and procedures.

Faculty will provide students, included as a statement in the syllabus, with information on academic integrity that is consistent with Rensselaer Policy and Procedures Regarding Academic Dishonesty.

This statement should outline the procedure for addressing a violation of academic integrity and include consequences for its violation in the course. In cases where the Faculty member decides to apply an academic sanction, the case must be reported by the Faculty to the Department Head, or Dean in a School without departments, and the Dean of Students.

4.2.2 Dissemination of Scholarly Works

The Institute encourages members of the Faculty to produce and disseminate works that are scholarly, academic, pedagogical or artistic in nature, regardless of their form of expression. Such works reflect the research and creativity of the author and are valued and considered as evidence of professional advancement or accomplishment. The Institute encourages the production of such works which may be used at the Institute and may be adopted for use elsewhere.
Scholarly works are works of copyright, regardless of the form of expression, the nature of which may constitute original expression and may represent the personal or scholarly ideas and beliefs of the Faculty author. Such works include but are not limited to, scholarly papers; journal articles; articles in conference proceedings; research bulletins and reports; monographs; textbooks; books; edited collections; translations; and, artistic, literary, design, curatorial, and digital works.

In accord with academic tradition and subject to The Rensselaer Intellectual Property Policy, there is a presumption of ownership by the author of scholarly works that are the result of independent academic effort, that is, where the Faculty author rather than the Institute, determines the subject matter, intellectual approach, direction, and conclusions.

4.2.3 Service

In addition to teaching and research responsibilities, all Faculty members are expected to provide service to their Department, School, Institute, Community, and the Profession.

4.3 PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

All members of the Rensselaer Community, regardless of position, should share the common values that nurture the development and wellbeing of themselves, each other, the students, employees, and the Institute. In addition, it is expected that no one – especially Faculty in privileged positions of leadership and power – would inappropriately misuse their position for personal advantage. Because of a power asymmetry, a Faculty member should exercise extreme care before entering into other types of relationships with a student or staff member, especially one in which a less powerful partner can be easily compromised. Examples of such relationships are consulting associations and business partnerships. Rensselaer policies explicitly prohibit consensual sexual or romantic relations between a supervisor and subordinate, which applies (and extends) to Faculty-student relations.

Moreover, in accord with Institute-wide employee policies, discrimination and harassment in all its forms, including sexual harassment, are considered to be serious offenses that are prohibited at Rensselaer, not only as a matter of policy, but as a matter of Federal and State law.

In an academic institution the application of the concept of intellectual integrity is closely linked to the principle of academic freedom, which gives a great deal of freedom and responsibility to individual Faculty members. This principle is based on the premise that the intellectual integrity and vitality of our institution is best maintained by minimizing institutionalized constraints associated with the development and exchange of knowledge.

4.4 CONSULTING

Faculty have the privilege to undertake consulting work of a type which will advance their professional standing, provided it does not interfere with their Institute
duties. To this end, during the academic year, they may participate in consulting activities up to one day per week on average. All consulting activities in excess of the average one-day-per week limit must be specifically approved in advance by the Provost. Additionally, Rensselaer policy requires that Faculty file an annual disclosure form with their appropriate administrative officer concerning their outside consulting activities. Deans will report their consulting activity to the President.

Prior to signing intellectual property agreements with companies for whom they intend to do consulting, Faculty should submit such agreements for approval by the Institute Office of General Counsel. A decision by the Office of General Counsel is expected in a timely manner. This process will assure that the Faculty member’s proposed agreements will not be in violation of Rensselaer’s Intellectual Property Policy or other agreements which they have signed with the Institute.

Where Institute facilities are used extensively in these professional or consulting activities, they will, in general, be considered as Institute research and conducted by contract with Rensselaer itself.

4.5 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

With respect to conflicts of interest involving consulting work, refer to The Rensselaer Policy on Financial Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment.

PART 5. RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROGRAMS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This section (Part 5) describes Institute policies regarding research and other activities that are supported, in whole or in part, by external sponsors, such as agencies of the government, foundations, corporations or other institutions. Procedures and practices which should be followed in applying for and administering contracts and grants related to research and sponsored programs could be obtained from the Office of Research Administration and Finance. Questions and suggestions concerning either policies or procedures for sponsored research should also be addressed to this office or the Vice President for Research.

5.2 GENERAL POLICY

The Institute encourages members of the Faculty to devote their talents to scholarship, which may result in sponsored programs. Programs at Rensselaer, whether internally or externally sponsored, originate from the ideas of Faculty members interested in engaging in research and sponsored programs as part of their normal professional activity. Faculty should discuss proposed research with their Department Head or Dean to assure availability of space, equipment, staff, time commitments and related support for research. Interdisciplinary research and multi-source funding are especially valuable and are elaborated upon below.

**Interdisciplinary activities** are encouraged and generally well received by
proposed sponsors. Special arrangements may be necessary, and they should be carefully worked out with the various groups to be involved before extensive proposal writing takes place.

**Funding sources vary widely.** Often the source is a government agency, but funding is also obtainable through corporations, foundations, or other private entities, while some programs are internally sponsored. Faculty members who seek sponsored funds or resources for a sponsored project shall submit such proposals through the Office of Research Administration and Finance.

**Inadvertent co-mingling of funds or resources from separate sponsors** is a concern when multiple sponsors are involved. Inappropriate co-mingling of funds or resources is a primary cause of intellectual property fragmentation, which may jeopardize or limit the rights available to each sponsor or engender conflicting obligations. It is essential that the Faculty become familiar with risks associated with fragmentation and Rensselaer’s contractual obligations when multiple sponsors are involved. The Office of Research Administration and Finance can provide guidance on the use of obligated funds and resources. The Office of Technology Commercialization can assist in the identification of intellectual property that is subject to third party obligations (see also *The Rensselaer Intellectual Property Policy*).

**Establishment of Organized Research Units and Centers** requires certain approvals. In general, Faculty establish individual research programs in their own departments individually or in collaboration with colleagues. However, major research programs involving several Faculty members with complementary research interests may be organized into official research units. Such organized research units require approval by the Dean or Deans of the respective Schools, the Vice President for Research, and the Provost before they can be officially recognized.

### 5.3 RESEARCH SUPPORT

Organizations sponsoring and supporting research and other programs at Rensselaer do so through grants, contracts, and special agreements or understandings, which are entered into with the Institute rather than with an individual Faculty or staff member. Although informal Faculty contact with sponsors, before or during the term of the contract, is encouraged, any commitment on the part of the Institute must be made through the Office of Research Administration and Finance.

#### 5.3.1 Sponsored Research

Faculty should contact the Office of Research Administration and Finance as early as possible after departmental approval of their proposed research to ensure smooth communication and to follow normal institutional procedures. In cases where institutional cost-sharing is required, Faculty must obtain approval at the appropriate level.

#### 5.3.2 Gift Supported Research

The distinction between gifts and grants is important. If a Faculty member receives funding from a donor who does not impose contractual requirements and who provides the funds irrevocably, such funding is termed a gift. If funding involves
provisions for audits by the grantor, or directions to satisfy particular requirements, deliverables or a detailed report of results or expenditures, or other such characteristics, such funding is generally termed a grant or research contract. The appropriate category is determined by applying the guidelines established by Rensselaer in conformance with Institute procedures. For further information, contact the Office of Institute Advancement (see also Rensselaer Policy on Gifts, Grants, Memberships and Private Foundation Awards).

Activities that are the result of department, School or center initiatives that are broad in nature and for which no specific deliverables or administrative actions are required, are often supported by corporations and private foundations through gifts. Rensselaer aggressively solicits gifts of this nature through the Office of the Institute Advancement, especially in areas of major research focus. Faculty members should coordinate with the Office of the Vice President for Advancement and the Office of the Vice President for Research to insure coordinated communications through one of Rensselaer's many corporate or foundation partners.

5.4 RENSSELAER RESEARCH DILIGENCE

5.4.1 Government Classified and Proprietary Research

Rensselaer accepts only those sponsored programs that enhance the educational process. The results of these programs (theses, technical papers, etc.) must be publishable in the open literature within a reasonable time period. This policy does inhibit, but does not entirely prevent government classified or industrial proprietary research or projects on campus that result in classified output or proprietary information.

In the event subsequent classification of an investigation is imposed by a government agency, the matter will be coordinated by the Office of Research Administration and Finance on a case-by-case basis.

Faculty members are not precluded by this policy from access to classified materials necessary to their work. Access to and storage of classified materials and documents and the securing of necessary personnel security clearances are coordinated through the Office of the Vice President for Research in accord with Rensselaer policies and procedures.

5.4.2 Contractual Responsibilities

The Institute acknowledges acceptance of a grant or research contract through the execution of a formal legal document by an individual with officially designated Institute-wide signature authority. Through this contract the Institute assumes an obligation to perform and report findings of specified research work and to adhere to the terms and conditions of the grant or contract. Faculty are expected to adhere to established procedures designed to fulfill the terms and conditions of a grant or contract.

5.4.3 Recognition of Authors and Inventors

The title of principal investigator is primarily a designation of institutional responsibility for the conduct of a research project. As such, the title does not necessarily
represent the authorship of a proposal document or inventorship of an intellectual property. Therefore, it is important that the authentic author(s) and inventors are appropriately given attribution in all documents.

5.4.4 Conflicts of Interest or Commitment

To identify, prevent, or manage real or perceived conflicts of interest or commitment when Faculty members engage simultaneously in sponsored programs, as well as consulting activities and other endeavors, the *Rensselaer Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest/Conflicts of Commitment* shall apply. Prior to the implementation of any revisions to the *Rensselaer Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest/Conflicts of Commitment*, the Chair of the Institute-wide Conflict of Interest Committee will inform the Chair of the Faculty Senate of any proposed changes.

All Faculty members are required to complete a Conflict of Interest and Commitment report each year, and to modify this as conflicts arise during the course of the year. When such conflict is identified, a plan to eliminate or manage the conflict should be developed and implemented in conjunction with the Division of Human Resources.

5.4.5 Rensselaer's Intellectual Property

The Office of Technology Commercialization seeks to protect and commercialize intellectual property consistent with Rensselaer’s policies and procedures. Where successful commercialization results in intellectual property revenue, the revenue is shared with the inventors and or authors (creators) in accord with *Rensselaer’s Intellectual Property Policy* and other relevant policies and procedures.

Compliance with the *Rensselaer Intellectual Property Policy* is a condition of employment by Rensselaer. Prior to the implementation of any revisions to *The Rensselaer Intellectual Property Policy*, the Faculty Senate shall have the opportunity to review and provide its recommendations on proposed changes.

5.5 DELINEATION OF RESEARCH RESPONSIBILITIES

5.5.1 Principal Investigators

The principal investigator of a sponsored research project is responsible for both the technical aspects of the program and for adherence to the administrative and financial terms of the research contract. The principal investigator will expend contract funds in accordance with the contract budget, will certify the time and effort of research staff, will observe established Institute procedures regarding purchasing of materials and supplies, and will provide to the appropriate offices all information necessary to assure proper administration of the contract or grant.

The management of a research contract or grant is the direct responsibility of the principal investigator named in the contract. This responsibility includes supervision of the technical aspects of the project and also management of staff, accounting for expenses, and fulfillment of reporting requirements as specified in the contract or agreement. Additionally, the principal investigator must exercise due diligence in
managing research and contractual obligations consistent with other relevant Rensselaer policies and procedures.

Principal Investigator Eligibility. In order to maintain a careful balance between scholarship and education, the responsibilities of being principal investigators is primarily reserved to the Faculty. As a result, the policy of Rensselaer is that Faculty can serve as principal investigators on sponsored programs as defined in Part 2.4 of this Handbook. The responsibility for setting the direction of Rensselaer research rests squarely with the Faculty, who are primarily responsible for the quality of the research and the reputation of the Institute.

5.5.2 Research Staff and Other Project Participants

As part of the Rensselaer community, research staff and project participants are in a position of trust with a responsibility to manage Rensselaer projects and resources in a diligent manner for the purposes for which they are designated and in compliance with Rensselaer’s obligations to third parties. The Division of Human Resources should be consulted for complete information concerning retirement, health, disability, and other policies and benefits which may apply to research staff and other employees.

Student-Initiated Sponsored Programs. Certain sponsored programs have as their purpose the support of graduate and/or undergraduate education or research through student-initiated projects, (e.g., doctoral dissertations, pre-doctoral research fellowships, undergraduate research projects). For these student-initiated sponsorship programs, the following conditions apply: (1) A Faculty member, as identified in Part 2.4, must serve as Faculty Advisor;

(2) The Faculty Advisor shall retain the responsibilities of a principal investigator for these programs;

(3) The student shall be responsible for the intellectual conduct of the project within the oversight of the Faculty Advisor; (4) The proposal to the sponsor may name the student as key personnel, as long as a Faculty advisor is named as the responsible individual. The proposal should acknowledge the student's authorship of the proposal, as appropriate.

5.5.3 Office of Research Administration and Finance

The Office of Research Administration and Finance (RAF) is responsible for all administrative, financial, and compliance matters relating to sponsored research. These include, but are not limited to: proposal submission; the negotiation and processing of awards; financial cash management, billing, reporting and compliance as well as indirect cost recovery and audits. The Office of Research Administration and Finance is responsible for implementing all research administrative and financial policies and procedures, and has signing authority to accept and terminate research awards on behalf of Rensselaer. The responsibility for regular internal reporting of research and financial activity in accordance with defined metrics and associated statistical analysis, detailed financial record keeping, and external reporting to sponsors and government agencies as

1 Research Scientists and Engineers are also allowed to serve as principal investigators.
required, also rests with this Office. The Office of Research Administration and Finance works in concert with the Faculty and research staff, the School and departmental financial managers, the Vice President for Research, and the Office of Technology Commercialization on issues involving sponsored research activity.

5.5.4 Office of Technology Commercialization

The Office of Technology Commercialization and the Office of Research Administration and Finance will coordinate efforts related to the transfer of technology, particularly in the case where there is ongoing research on a licensed intellectual property. The Office of Technology Commercialization will investigate and determine any contractual obligations or restrictions on intellectual property at the point of its receipt of an intellectual property disclosure. (See also *The Rensselaer Intellectual Property Policy*).

5.5.5 Department Heads and Center Directors

Department Heads and Center Directors are responsible for the administration of research activities conducted by the Faculty of the department or center. Department Heads and Center Directors will assist Faculty in selecting appropriate research projects; confirm the availability of Institute facilities; and recommend the appointment of research staff to the Deans with the concurrence of the principal investigator.

5.5.6 Deans

The Dean of each School is responsible for supervising the administration of research activities conducted by the Faculty of the School and approving the general nature and direction of research at the Institute.

5.5.7 Vice President for Research

The Office of the Vice President for Research coordinates major research themes and programs through interdisciplinary research centers. The office provides infrastructure and resource support for the development of research programs and projects. Support services are offered for Faculty seeking research opportunities, research proposal and budget preparation, and guidance on research management. The website of the Office of the Vice President for Research provides overviews of research centers and major research projects and information on research policies, guidelines, infrastructure, and sponsor constraints.

The Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice President for Research, in conjunction with the Deans, share responsibility for establishing research direction, policy and guidelines, encouraging Faculty participation in research and sponsored program activities, serving as information liaison between sponsoring agencies, communicating pertinent information to Faculty regarding areas of research potential, setting compensation rates and allowable dates for supplemental employment of academic personnel, approving research proposals, and administering research cost sharing.

PART 6. RESOLUTION PROCEDURES
6.1 INTRODUCTION

This section (Part 6) outlines procedures which ensure fairness in the resolution of conflicts which may arise under the provisions of this Handbook. The Appeals, Grievance and Misconduct procedures outlined herein are intended to provide a method of recourse that fosters constructive deliberation on actions taken by the Institute and its Faculty. Resolution procedures related to termination are discussed in Section 3.5.

6.2 APPEALING PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE DECISIONS

Part 6.2 applies to Tenure Faculty only as defined in this Handbook. If a candidate receives a negative decision concerning promotion or tenure at any level, he or she has the right to appeal the decision. In making an appeal, the candidate shall choose an advocate whose role is as follows:

The Advocate. The Advocate is to be selected by the individual whose case is to be appealed. The selection is to be made from among the tenured Faculty at Rensselaer. The advocate may be the Head of the appellant's department, may be an individual within the department, or may be an individual outside the department. Before accepting the role of advocate, the individual chosen shall be apprised of his or her rights and responsibilities in this role by the Chair of the FCPT, particularly concerning the obligation of confidentiality. The advocate may also review the case with the Provost.

The Process. After reviewing the written comments concerning the reasons for the original negative action, the Advocate shall have the responsibility of reviewing the appellant's dossier, suggesting improvements and additions, and assembling any pertinent clarifications and additions.

In general, added documents should be in response to omissions, alleged bias, procedural errors, and other circumstances identified by the Advocate, where the additional document helps clarify the case presented within the timeframe of the original dossier. Any material presented outside of the original timeframe must be designated as such and explained by the candidate and/or Advocate. The written result of the Advocate's review is added to the candidate's dossier, and a copy of the dossier, from which all confidential material has been removed, is transmitted to the appellant.

a) The Advocate shall then submit the revised dossier to the Provost for resubmission through the entire review process, with the stipulation that it be forwarded with written comments at each level of review, regardless of the recommendations or decisions at each point.

b) The Advocate may be requested to appear or may request to appear before any of the committees involved in the tenure and promotion process and the Provost.

c) In cases where all members of the FCPT vote for a candidate following the appeal process, but the Provost does not concur with this recommendation, the Provost shall explain the reasons for this decision to the FCPT. The FCPT has the right to request that the Provost appoint an ad hoc committee to reexamine
the case. The executive committee of the Faculty Senate shall present a slate of five (5) names to the Provost who will select three (3) to serve on the ad hoc committee. This committee shall review the dossier for the candidate and report its recommendation, in writing, to the Provost.

d) The Provost shall arrive at a final recommendation and forward that to the President.

6.3 MISCONDUCT

6.3.1 Introduction

It is the responsibility of the Institute to create conditions that protect and encourage the Faculty in its scholarly pursuits. Rensselaer requires that those engaged in scholarship be dedicated to the highest ethical standards. Misconduct in scholarship by any member of the Rensselaer community threatens the Institute as well as the individual. In addition, universities that receive support from federal agencies are required to develop procedures for investigating incidents of misconduct. Section 5.3 describes the Rensselaer policy and outlines the steps to be taken in response to allegations of misconduct. The process applies to all Faculty, including the Tenure Faculty, and Non-Tenure Faculty, as defined in this Handbook and provides for an objective examination of pertinent facts, protection of individual rights, and integration with other relevant review procedures, all under the general supervision of the Provost as the senior academic administrator.

6.3.2 Scholarly Misconduct

Scholarly Misconduct means:

a. Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, inappropriate allocation of authorship credit, or other serious deviation from accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, or reporting technical results and expenditure of funds from research, educational or other scholarly activities; or

b. Retaliation of any kind against a person who has not acted in bad faith and who reported or provided information about suspected or alleged misconduct; or

c. Failure to comply with Federal requirements affecting specific aspects of the conduct of research, e.g., the protection of human subjects and the welfare of laboratory animals.

Scholarly Misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of scholarly matters. If the alleged misconduct is not substantiated, the Institute will undertake diligent efforts to restore the reputation of those under investigation. Should either the inquiry or the investigation show that the allegations of misconduct were not made in good faith, those making the allegations will themselves be subject to disciplinary action.
6.3.3 Other Misconduct

Beyond the issues of scholarly misconduct as defined above, it is important that Faculty members adhere to a code of conduct that is compatible with their position at the Institute. Disciplinary action may be taken against a Faculty member for dereliction of assigned duties, participation in harassment (sexual or otherwise) or other unlawful activities, and violation of other Institute policies, as more fully described in Section 3.5(b) above.

6.3.4 Misconduct Policy

Decisions regarding alleged misconduct procedures, both of a scholarly and non-scholarly nature, should yield a just decision based on the best, and most complete, information available. Any decisions should be based on the expert judgment of individuals qualified in the respective scientific field, using scientific interpretations and standards of proof, with a minimum of procedural complications. At the same time, however, the process must be fair and afford all parties an equal chance to present their best arguments. The confidentiality of all parties in a dispute must be preserved to the extent consistent with Rensselaer's obligations to research sponsors and to the scientific community. Acrimony and recriminations are undesirable, so adversarial interactions should be avoided to the extent possible. Yet in an open society it is essential that the respondent has the opportunity to respond to the complaint.

The process should move speedily, in accord with the reporting requirements of the sponsoring agency, yet haste and error must be avoided. Guided by these principles, Rensselaer has established a policy with four procedural stages, a description of which follows.

In the screening stage an accusation is brought to the Provost who will examine the charges to ensure they describe potential violations of Institute policy and, if so, to pass the case along to an Inquiry Panel.

The inquiry stage evaluates the merits of the case, determining whether there is sufficient evidence of misconduct to merit a full investigation.

The investigation stage entails a detailed examination of the case to resolve the facts ("Was this or was this not an instance of misconduct?"). Ascertaining whether or not misconduct occurred is a judgment about collegial conduct that should be resolved on its merits. If at any stage in the process it becomes evident that there was no misconduct, vigorous efforts must be made to minimize and remedy any adverse consequences for the respondent’s career and reputation.

If misconduct is established, then the case is referred to the disciplinary stage.

Screening Stage. Initial reports of alleged research misconduct must be brought to the attention of the person with administrative responsibility for the individual whose actions are in question. That person must in turn report the allegations to the Provost. Should this reporting not occur, the Provost may be contacted directly. Care must be taken to protect the privacy of those who report apparent misconduct. The Provost will promptly examine the case, taking no more than 30 days to determine if the case falls under the Misconduct Policy. If so, the inquiry stage will be followed.
**Inquiry Stage.** The Provost will immediately inform the respondent in writing of the accusation and that an inquiry has been initiated. The Provost will prepare a list of proposed members for the Inquiry Panel. The respondent may challenge the inclusion of specific individuals to this panel by stating his or her objections in writing. The Provost will then select the Inquiry Panel.

The inquiry will be conducted by an Inquiry Panel consisting of two Tenure Faculty and one academic administrator with rank of Associate Dean or higher. The Panel will choose its Chair. The Panel should take no more than 30 days to conduct its inquiry and determine whether or not there is a reasonable basis to conclude that misconduct occurred. During this discovery stage, the only persons who may be present during fact finding sessions are the respondent, the complainant, Inquiry Panel members, and any consultant called by the Inquiry Panel. The respondent will be permitted to be present during fact finding sessions and have the right to respond to questions as they arise. If the respondent is not available to attend, the Provost will fairly resolve the conflict between timeliness and the respondent’s right to be present.

If a majority of the Inquiry Panel finds there is reasonable basis to conclude that misconduct may have occurred, then the matter must proceed to the investigation stage. The Inquiry Panel reports the results of its inquiry to the Provost. The Provost will advise, in writing, the respondent and the complainant of the Inquiry Panel outcome.

If there is to be an investigation, the Provost must advise the respondent in writing of the specific charges to be investigated. At that time, any collaborators and sponsoring agencies involved must be informed of the allegations.

**Investigation Stage.** Investigation of alleged misconduct will be conducted by an Investigation Panel appointed by the Provost. The Panel will be comprised of a minimum of three specialists in the subject area of the respondent and will include one individual from outside Rensselaer. The Provost will prepare a list of proposed members for the Investigation Panel, which may include persons who served on the Inquiry Panel and will forward this list to the respondent. The respondent may challenge the inclusion of specific individuals by stating any objections in writing. The Provost will then select, and appoint, the Investigation Panel. The Panel will elect its own Chair.

The Investigation Panel will determine whether there was academic misconduct. The Panel will follow the procedures for dealing with charges brought against a Faculty member as described herein and will seek to provide factual information in a manner that is fair to all parties. The Investigation Panel should take no more than 120 days to complete the investigation and prepare a report of its findings including a recommendation on the disposition of the case. The Panel should follow pertinent regulations of the agency or agencies that sponsored the research under investigation. The Investigation Panel will submit its report to the Provost, who in turn may notify the sponsoring agency of the findings of the investigation.

**Disciplinary Stage.** For individuals found to have committed misconduct, the Provost may take one or more of the following actions: individuals may be (1) given a letter of reprimand; (2) monitored regarding their work performance for a specific period of time; or (3) removed from a specific research project. Other, more severe, penalties are possible. Individuals may be (4) prohibited from conducting sponsored research, (5)
reduced in rank, (6) suspended for a fixed period of time, or (7) terminated. Termination
shall be in accord with procedures specified in section 3.5 of this Handbook. However,
the findings of misconduct made by the Investigation Panel convened pursuant to this
section as described above and forwarded to the Provost will be conclusive, in their
entirety, and not subject to re-examination by any person at the termination hearing. The
sole authority of the Hearing Panel convened pursuant to section 3.5 will be to determine
if the findings and recommendations of the Investigation Panel are sufficient to warrant
termination.

If there is a finding of misconduct, the Provost must also take the following
actions if applicable: (1) All pending abstracts emanating from the fraudulent research
should be withdrawn and editors of journals in which previous abstracts and papers
appeared should be notified of the findings of the investigation; (2) Institutions and
sponsoring agencies with which the investigated individual has been affiliated should be
notified that there is reason to believe that the validity of previous research might be
questionable.

6.4 GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

6.4.1 Introduction

The majority of Faculty concerns can be settled informally through effective
communication with colleagues. Therefore, before filing a grievance, Faculty must have
exhausted the other avenues available to them. The prospective grievant must have
attempted to resolve the issue with the involved individual, with the individual’s
immediate supervisor, and with the prospective grievant’s immediate supervisor. If these
attempts fail, then the Faculty member may turn to the grievance process.

A grievance is a charge that a decision or action has been improperly or unfairly
made or taken, that the decision or action adversely affects the grievant, and that there is
a dispute between the grievant and the person who made the decision. This person may
be an administrator or the grievant's fellow Faculty member.

Grievances will be handled by the Committee on Grievances. The Committee on
Grievances will have five members, comprised of Full Professors, one from each School,
who will be appointed by the Provost on three year staggered terms of service. The Chair
of the committee will be chosen at the beginning of each academic year.

6.4.2 Grievable Issues

A grievance shall be defined as a charge alleging a violation or incorrect
application of an Institute policy, procedure, or practice which is not covered under
another Institute grievance or appeal mechanism (e.g., promotion of a Non-Tenure
Faculty). Some examples of "grievable issues" include: salary adjustment, teaching
assignments, facilities and space issues, reduction in rank, suspension for a fixed period
and disputes among Faculty over intellectual property.

6.4.3 Non-grievable Issues

The following issues are not grievable issues: (1) promotion and tenure of a
tenured or tenure-track Faculty; (2) non-reappointment; (3) Affirmative Action and EEO complaints; (4) sexual harassment; (5) broad areas of fiscal management, staffing or structure of the Institute; (6) issues pertaining to differences in Faculty salaries and benefits that are based upon labor market factors such as availability of Faculty or demand for a particular academic discipline; (7) retirement and employee benefit issues that are subject to applicable New York State and Federal laws or that are covered by other Institute appeals procedures; (8) any matters falling exclusively within the jurisdiction of other Institute appeal procedures, as defined in either the Faculty Handbook or the Human Resources Policy Guidelines; and (9) decisions or actions resulting from other Institute appeal procedures referenced in this Handbook.

6.4.4 The Grievance Procedure

If informal attempts to resolve a grievance have failed, the aggrieved may choose to file a formal grievance. At this time, the grievant shall inform the appropriate administrator (e.g., Department Head, Dean, Provost), or the grievant’s direct supervisor, that he or she is filing a formal grievance with the Committee on Grievances.

Filing a Grievance. The grievant will submit a written complaint to the Committee on Grievances. In order to be timely, a grievance must be filed within six months after discovery of the event or action that is the basis for the grievance. No concurrent legal action is allowed. If such action is started, the grievance process will be immediately terminated. The complaint will include the following: (a) the date that the grievant discovered the decision/action that resulted in the problem; (b) the name of the person against whom the grievance is directed, the respondent; (c) the nature of the grievance; and (d) evidence of any measures that have already been taken to resolve the problem.

The Committee on Grievances will inform the respondent of the complaint and will provide him/her with a copy of the grievance. The respondent will provide a written response to the complaint to the Committee and the grievant within ten working days of receiving this notice. The Committee will then decide whether or not the grievance appears to warrant further consideration. If the grievance does not warrant further consideration, the matter will be considered closed. If it does warrant further consideration, the grievance will move to the mediation step. In either case, the Committee on Grievances will notify the grievant and respondent of its recommendation promptly upon receiving the response from the respondent.

Mediation. The Committee on Grievances will make an effort to mediate the dispute before it proceeds to a hearing. The Committee on Grievances also will attempt to informally and confidentially resolve the differences between the two parties. The Committee on Grievances may make a recommendation to achieve a voluntary resolution of the dispute, but will not be allowed to make a binding recommendation. The Committee on Grievances should, when possible, begin the mediation process within ten (10) working days of receiving their charge.

Before beginning the mediation process, the Committee on Grievances will receive a briefing from the Provost. This briefing will include dissemination of a copy of the complaint as well as the response of the respondent. The Provost will also review the
grievance procedure, clarify time limits, and answer questions regarding the procedure. The Provost will not be allowed to discuss specific aspects of the complaint or express personal opinions concerning its merits.

The Hearing and Hearing Committee. If a dispute cannot be resolved through mediation, a hearing may be requested by the grievant. The Provost shall appoint an ad hoc Hearing Committee composed of three voting members of the tenured Faculty, not previously involved in the case. The Hearing Committee is subject to approval by the grievant, the respondent, and the Provost. The grievant and the respondent may each veto one member of the Committee. If this veto power is exercised, another Faculty member will be chosen, and no further veto shall be allowed. In no event shall a member be allowed to serve if he or she has a conflict with the grievant or the respondent. Individuals who have had previous involvement with the grievance (e.g., at the mediation stage or through the informal resolution process followed prior to filing the grievance) will not be allowed to participate as a member of the Hearing Committee. In addition, individuals having made a decision relating to matters involving the grievance will not be allowed to serve.

The final Hearing Committee will elect a Chair, who will be allowed to vote. Before beginning the hearing, the Hearing Committee will receive a briefing from the Provost. This briefing will include dissemination of a copy of the complaint as well as the response of the respondent. The Provost will also review the grievance procedure, clarify time limits, and answer questions regarding the procedure. The Provost will not discuss specific aspects of the complaint or express personal opinions concerning its merits.

a. The hearing will be presided over by the ad hoc Hearing Committee. If possible, the hearing shall be held within thirty calendar days of the day that the hearing was requested.

b. The hearing is not a legal proceeding, and strict rules of evidence do not apply. The Hearing Committee may admit and consider any relevant evidence. Personnel information, including salary data, performance evaluations, and student evaluations, will not be available unless released by the grievant or respondent.

c. Both the grievant and the respondent may have a Rensselaer colleague, other than an attorney, to assist in the presentation of their case. Only Rensselaer employees shall serve in that capacity.

d. The hearing will be private. Individuals present will include the Hearing Committee, the respondent, the grievant and his/her chosen colleagues, and any witnesses as requested by the parties and directed by the Hearing Committee. A representative of the Administration may also be allowed to attend the hearing if the Hearing Committee determines the Administration may have information relevant to the grievance. Attorneys other than Rensselaer Faculty members will not be allowed to attend the hearing.
e. Under directions from the Hearing Committee, each party shall give to
the other party such advance notice of its intended witnesses, and such
advance copies of, or a list of its intended exhibits, as may be
practicable. The goal shall be to expedite the proceedings and to
minimize the element of surprise as an advantage to either party.

f. During a hearing, both parties shall have the following rights: (1) to call
and examine witnesses; to introduce written evidence; (2) to cross-
examine any witnesses on any matter relevant to the grievance; (3) to
challenge any witness; and to rebut any evidence. The grievant and
respondent may testify and may be requested to answer questions posed
by each party and the Hearing Committee. The personal appearance of
each witness normally will be required to assure the opportunity for
cross-examination and examination by the Hearing Committee. In
extraordinary circumstances, the Hearing Committee may receive an
individual's sworn written statement or other form of proof in lieu of a
personal appearance.

g. A copy of each exhibit reviewed by the Hearing Committee shall be
supplied to the other party by the offering party.

h. After all oral and written evidence and argument has been presented, the
hearing shall be closed. The Hearing Committee shall conduct its
deliberations privately.

**Hearing Committee Report.** Within a reasonable time after the closing of the
hearing, but in no event to exceed sixty calendar days, the Hearing Committee shall make
a written report, based on evidence presented during the hearing, with findings and
recommendations.

**Decision of the President of the Institute.** The President of the Institute or
designee shall consider the report of the Hearing Committee, but the President shall make
the final decision. The President's written decision shall be sent to each party and the
members of the Hearing Committee and the Committee on Grievances within sixty
calendar days of receiving the Hearing Committee's report.

**Confidentiality and the Right to Privacy.** The work of the Committees described
above requires a high level of sensitivity to the privacy of all concerned. Thus, all
members of the Committee on Grievances, Hearing Committee, grievant, respondent, and
Institute colleagues are required to maintain confidentiality with respect to all oral
proceedings and written documents produced during the case.

a. After the proceedings have concluded, the Hearing Committee shall
forward all records and documents produced in the case to the Provost
for storage in a confidential file.

b. If during investigation of the grievance, individuals are questioned about
the complaint, they shall be informed of the confidentiality of the
information provided and of their obligation to maintain confidentiality about their participation in the investigation.

c. Any violations of the confidentiality obligation will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

PART 7. FACULTY BENEFITS AND LEAVES

This handbook only highlights the terms of the Institute’s employee benefit plans. The actual terms of the various employee benefit plans are stated in, and governed by, the formal plan documents.

While Rensselaer intends to continue each of the benefit plans, Rensselaer reserves the right to modify, amend, suspend or terminate any plan at any time, and for any reason without prior notification. Original Participants will be notified of any changes to the plans and how they affect employee benefits, if at all. The benefit plans are governed by insurance contracts and plan documents, which are available for examination upon request.

While Rensselaer attempts to make explanations of the plans in this manual as accurate as possible, should there be a discrepancy between this manual and the provisions of the insurance contracts or plan documents, the provisions of the insurance contracts or plan documents will govern.

As employees of the Institute, Faculty members are provided with comprehensive benefits and leave programs. Among some of the benefits offered are retirement and tuition benefits and medical, dental and life insurances. Among the types of leaves offered are leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, parental leaves and military leaves. There are specific criteria that determine if an employee is eligible to participate in a particular benefit or leave program. The Vice President for Human Resources will inform the Faculty Senate of any proposed changes to benefits programs that affect current or retired Faculty whenever possible.

Some key points of Rensselaer's current benefit and leave programs are highlighted in what follows. The terms of these programs are subject to change or termination in the sole discretion of Rensselaer. The actual terms of the various plans are stated in the formal plan documents and are subject to eligibility and other limitations. For complete, up-to-date program documents, or for any other information about Rensselaer benefit and leave programs, contact the Division of Human Resources.

In addition, The Rensselaer Human Resources Benefits Guide is available from the Division of Human Resources. This publication provides a reliable source of information about benefits and is updated regularly. Enrollment applications and booklets describing individual plans are available upon request. Several publications and forms are provided online at www.rpi.edu.

7.1 RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Retirement Plan: Under each of Rensselaer's retirement plans, eligible employees
may choose from several retirement payment methods that can provide continuing income to a spouse or other beneficiary after the employee’s death. The actual terms of the programs are stated in and governed by official program documents. Participation in Rensselaer retirement programs is voluntary and contingent upon receipt by the Division of Human Resources of the applicable completed enrollment applications and forms.

**Defined Contribution Retirement Program:** The Defined Contribution Retirement Program provides a retirement benefit based on a combined contribution by Rensselaer and an eligible employee.

**Defined Benefit Retirement Program:** Faculty employed prior to July 1, 1993 may have participated in the now discontinued Defined Benefit Retirement Program. Questions regarding this program should be referred to the Division of Human Resources.

**Supplemental Retirement Program:** In addition to participation in the retirement plans described above, eligible employees may divert part of their earnings (on a pre-tax basis) into the Supplemental Retirement Program, thereby reducing the amount of W-2 earnings on which State and Federal income taxes are paid. These contributions will be taxed later upon distribution, e.g., at retirement.

### 7.2 LIABILITY PROGRAM

For the protection of eligible employees, the Institute carries General and Professional Liability insurance on behalf of employees for activities arising out of the scope of employment. The Institute's liability insurance indemnifies all Faculty, staff and volunteers when their endeavors are related to Institute business and consistent with Institute policies. The actual terms of the coverage are stated in the formal insurance policies and are subject to eligibility and other limitations.

### 7.3 TUITION BENEFIT PROGRAM

**Faculty Tuition:** All Faculty as defined in this Handbook who are eligible under Rensselaer’s Human Resources policies may register for up to two courses per semester offered by Rensselaer, with the approval of the Office of the Provost. All other cases regarding educational opportunities and benefits for Faculty are subject to the approval of the Office of the Provost after a recommendation is made by the appropriate Department Head and Dean of the School concerned.

In addition, tuition benefits are available for spouses and dependent children of eligible Faculty.

### 7.4 LEAVE PROGRAM

**Leave of Absence:** Faculty may be granted a leave of absence for a specified period, subject to approval. Normally such leaves of absence are without financial aid. However, in certain instances wherein granting of such a leave may be considered of benefit to the Institute, the payment of financial aid with regard to certain fringe benefits may be extended. Such instances may be, but are not limited to, service with the National Science Foundation; a Congressional Fellowship; and service as technical advisor to
government agencies, both domestic and international. In such instances the offices of the appropriate Department Head, Dean, and Provost shall determine the advisability and extent of such aid, with the approval of the Provost. Contributions to the fringe benefits program may continue in the event that the salary from outside sources does not meet the total contractual compensation from salaries and fringe benefits that would have been received from Rensselaer during the period of the leave. (See also, Section 3.2.2 on Pre-Tenure Period Extension).

**Sabbatical Leave Plan:** Faculty are strongly encouraged to take advantage of this plan at least once every ten years. Eligible Faculty may request sabbatical leaves for purposes of professional development through study, research, scholarly activity or experience in government, industry, universities or consulting in the practice. All requests for sabbatical leave require the approval of the Department Head and the respective academic Dean, prior to approval by the Provost. To receive full consideration, completed requests for sabbatical leave should be processed through the appropriate channels and filed with the Provost no later than February 15th. Response will be made as soon as possible, usually within two weeks.

a) **Non-Tenure Faculty:** All individuals holding titles among the Non-Tenure Faculty are eligible for up to six months of unpaid sabbatical leave with continuing benefits, upon completion of twelve consecutive semesters of service.

b) **Tenure Faculty:** All individuals holding titles among the Tenure Faculty are eligible for the following: (See also, Part 3.2.2 on Pre-Tenure Period Extension).

   i. Leave for one semester, with half salary, may be given upon completion of six consecutive semesters of service.

   ii. Leave of two semesters with half salary, or one semester with full salary, may be given upon completion of twelve consecutive semesters of service. Two semester leaves should normally start July 1.

When a Faculty member is granted sabbatical leave, the Institute will continue to contribute its respective portion of the cost of fringe benefits. The Division of Human Resources should be contacted for complete details.

While on leave, the Faculty member is eligible for any merit based salary adjustments available to the Faculty. Any member of the Rensselaer Faculty who accepts a sabbatical leave is obligated to return to Rensselaer for at least one complete year of service and to submit to the Provost, through normal administrative channels, a report covering professional activities during his or her absence. Faculty members for whom sabbatical leave has been approved may receive additional remuneration from:

1) Normal consulting or lecturing arrangements, provided these do not conflict with the purpose and spirit of the sabbatical program.

2) Fellowships and other grants, provided the sum of the sabbatical salary and additional fellowship or grant does not exceed the full-time salary rate for the period of leave.
3) Grants to defray family travel and nominal cost-of-living allowances provided they are not for personal remuneration in addition to fellowship and other grants.

4) Charges to research contracts provided the research contract allows and the sum total of remuneration during this period does not exceed the amount of salary scheduled for this period.

**Parental Leave:** The Tenure Faculty, as well as Non-Tenure with a minimum of a two (2) year appointment, will be granted relief from teaching duties for parental leave for one semester with full pay, and they may elect to take an additional semester of teaching relief at half pay for parental leave. Faculty members granted relief from teaching duties under this Policy, except as entitled under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), will continue to be responsible for normal non-teaching duties such as research commitments, professional development, advising and committee assignments. The Faculty member’s teaching duties will be assumed by a temporary replacement who will be paid jointly by the Office of the Provost and the School of the Faculty member.

Leaves granted under this Policy will be counted towards the Faculty member's leave entitlement under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) in accordance with Rensselaer policies applicable to all employees.

Parental leave for Faculty is defined as leave to give birth to a child, to adopt a child or to care for a newborn or newly adopted child. All parental leaves of absence under this Policy must be taken and completed within twelve months of the date of birth or adoption.

Insofar as possible, the commencement of a parental leave at full or half pay should coincide with the beginning or end of a semester. A parental leave which commences after the beginning of an academic semester will be counted as a leave for one full semester under this Policy. When the need for a parental leave is foreseeable, an eligible Faculty member electing to take such a leave must submit a written notice to the Department Head (the Dean in a School without departments), with a copy to the Provost, at least 30 days prior to the beginning of the semester during which the leave is to be taken. In the event it is not possible to provide 30 days advance notice, a Faculty member must submit his or her written notice as early as possible, but in no event less than two business days before the leave is to commence. In all cases, written medical documentation or a certificate of adoption must be provided by the Faculty member to the Division of Human Resources.

A one-year probationary period extension shall be automatically granted to either parent (or both, if both parents are Tenure Faculty members) in recognition of the demands of caring for a newborn child or a child under five newly placed for adoption. The Faculty member may choose to opt out of this provision. For additional information on extensions of the pre-tenure period, see Section 3.2.2.

Rensselaer currently has policies on Family and Medical Leave, Military Leave, Sick Leave, Bereavement Leave and Vacation Leave. Consult the Division of Human Resources for details.
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INTRODUCTION.

This Guide to Promotion and Tenure at Rensselaer gives an overview of the formal promotion and tenure process at Rensselaer. We intend it as a supplement to the Faculty Handbook, not as a substitute for it.

Anyone involved in the process of promotion and tenure at Rensselaer should become thoroughly familiar with the sections of the Faculty Handbook regarding promotion, tenure, and appeal, whether you are a candidate or administrator or faculty colleague in a departmental promotion and tenure committee.

The granting of tenure is the single most significant gesture of faith Rensselaer makes toward a faculty member, and it represents the most significant investment of resources. From the viewpoint of the candidate, it can be a life-altering turning point. A former Provost of Rensselaer called tenure "our million dollar decision." In the time since then, inflation has certainly raised that figure.

The Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FSCPT), by publishing this Guide, wishes to disseminate a basic understanding of how the process works. We also wish to make a clear statement of established procedures in order to ensure continuity from one Department Head to another and from one Dean to another when these positions change hands, as well as to ensure uniform practices among all Departments and Schools at Rensselaer.

We view this Guide as provisional and advisory. In an era when the size, composition, and responsibility of faculty are changing, when "normal" career paths are diversifying, and when new paradigms of publication, research, scholarship, creative work, teaching, collaboration, and service are coming into play, any document such as this will naturally require frequent revision. We invite future FSCPTs to revise this document to reflect changes in the profession, and we invite our colleagues to suggest changes and corrections.

Knowledge of the process should help candidates for promotion and tenure to prepare their own cases. We especially hope this Guide will be read carefully by Department Heads and the Deans of the Schools so that they, too, can prepare the best possible cases for each candidate and aid the FSCPT to make these important decisions in the most judicious and objective fashion. A sufficient number of poorly-prepared dossiers have reached the FSCPT over the past few years to warrant a clear statement of what the FSCPT views as "best practices." We hope Deans and Heads will measure their own practices against the FSCPT's expectations in guiding a candidate through this lengthy process.

To the candidate, Heads and Deans who are responsible for assembling the dossier, and to all faculty, we offer simple advice. The watchwords for an excellent dossier are attention to detail, honesty, completeness, objectivity, and freedom from influence. In short, the values for judging the merits of promotion and tenure cases are the same as the values treasured in our scholarly work and teaching and, indeed, are built on these foundations of integrity in academia.
1. COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE FSCPT.

The FSCPT is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate reporting to the Faculty Senate and the Provost. It is composed of eight tenured full professors elected by their constituencies as follows:

- One from each School
- Two at-large
- One by the student body

The Faculty Senate and Student Senate solicit nominations for tenured full professors and then the entire constituency in each category votes. The seven members representing the faculty serve three year terms, staggered so that there is continuity and corporate memory of FSCPT practices. The faculty member representing the Student Senate serves a one year term.

In the instance of a committee member who goes on leave during his/her time of service on the FSCPT, the constituency has the obligation to fill the seat for the remainder of the term. Generally, the runner-up in the original election is asked to do so, but sometimes a special election is required.

The duties of the FSCPT are chartered by the Constitution of the Faculty Senate: to make recommendations to the Provost on all cases of promotion and tenure of faculty and to hear appeals by faculty members. It is also responsible for reviewing candidates for appointment to faculty positions at the level of Associate Professor or above, and/or with tenure. These include administrators—Heads, Deans and Vice-Presidents of academic units, and Presidents—who are de jure members of the faculty.

Each year, the FSCPT elects a chair from among its eight members, usually as the last order of business for the academic year so there is clear responsibility for FSCPT duties that may occur during the summer and so the chair can plan his or her service schedule for the subsequent semester. The chair's role is to facilitate discussions, move them along in a timely and orderly fashion, schedule meeting times (usually through the Provost's office), carry out extra charges of the committee (e.g., seek more information from faculty or department heads), report results of these missions to the committee, and record the votes in order to report them to the Provost. Generally, the chair also takes notes from each meeting so that there is a record of the discussion. The chair is also responsible for communicating with Deans regarding the quality of dossiers the FSCPT has received in the interest of suggesting to Deans ways in which case preparation can be improved. The chair also gives a report of the FSCPT's activities to the Faculty Senate at the end of the year.
2. HOW THE FSCPT OPERATES.

Many faculty who have served on the FSCPT over the years have said that it is one of the most effective committees in the Institute. It is the only standing committee where faculty and Deans make recommendations with an equal voice. It is certainly a committee that is charged with very serious decisions, and individual members often spend hours reading each dossier, generally taking extensive notes.

The rules of objectivity and clear evidence hold sway in FSCPT discussions. As a result, it is very difficult for biases of individual faculty members from either within the committee or outside it to unduly influence the final decision. The FSCPT has a strong tradition of protecting both individual faculty members' and the Institute's interests from undue interest or pressures in any direction, pro or con. The primary function of the FSCPT, then, is to safeguard the standards of Rensselaer and to ensure fairness.

The FSCPT meets several times in each semester. During the first meeting the committee sets the calendar. The meetings begin soon after the deadline for the submission of dossiers to the Provost’s office. The committee can meet six or seven times in a semester, and these meetings can last for several hours. The committee will also meet on an emergency basis to vote on candidates who are joining the faculty as Associate or Full Professors with or without tenure; these often require very quick responses by the Institute.

In preparation for meetings, the Chair of the FSCPT asks one individual to prepare a written summary of a given dossier and present the case orally, but it is the responsibility of every committee member to be familiar with every dossier. Then, in typically long and detailed discussion, members compare notes and formulate an emerging opinion about each case. No point is too small to warrant a discussion. In certain exceptional cases, when members sense that there might be positive unanimity, the committee may agree to take an early straw poll to avoid protracted and unnecessary discussion. If there is any objection by any member, or an inquiry about any point, then the dossier is given a full discussion. Difficult, ambiguous, or potentially negative cases tend to receive extra attention.

Unfortunately, incomplete or ambiguous dossiers occasionally reach the FSCPT for consideration. The committee may also find issues in a dossier that require clarification, including such significant matters as whether a decision represents early tenure, or what contractual agreement a candidate had with the Institute when hired, or apparently trivial matters such as a missing recommender's biographical blurb. In these cases, the FSCPT asks the Provost to go back to a Department Head to request additional information, either from the Head directly or from a candidate via the Head. In rare cases, such as when there is an obvious mismatch between the apparent value of a candidate's record and a department's vote, the FSCPT has asked that the Department Head or a member of the department meet with the FSCPT to clarify the matter. These fact-finding meetings are informational and are held only in circumstances when every other route to clarify an issue has been exhausted or there is no more expedient route, since feedback between the FSCPT and the department is sensitive, and the FSCPT wishes to avoid raising alarms or giving undue influence to a Department Head's voice in the committee.

After discussing each dossier the members of the FSCPT take an interim vote on a scale
ranging from -2.0 to +2.0, with 0.5 point increments (i.e., -2.0, -1.5, -.5, 0, +0.5, +1.0, +1.5, and +2.0). This vote is not final and is used to express the current position of each member. The Chair of the FSCPT is obliged to report the vote of the FSCPT to the Provost so that there is an official record of the FSCPT's recommendation on each case.

In an extensive meeting with the Provost the FSCPT again discusses each case, informing the Provost in detail of the arguments pro and con, problems with the dossier, and the results of the interim vote of the FSCPT. The FSCPT also will make comments about the quality of the preparation of the dossier, since the Provost is the proper route for information to flow back to Deans and Department Heads and then to the faculty candidate. Sometimes opinions shift between the last FSCPT meeting and the FSCPT meeting with the Provost. The Provost also has a meeting with the committee of Deans during which they inform him of their discussion. Finally, the FSCPT, the Provost and the Deans meet to discuss each case yet again. The faculty and Deans vote together. This meeting, chaired by the Provost, might appear redundant, but it is actually crucial for formulating a clear understanding of the value of a candidate to the institute and his or her profession. Every time a vote is taken, it is a new vote and supersedes any previous vote.

The Provost formulates his/her position based upon the recommendation of the Deans and the FSCPT and makes a recommendation to the President. The President makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees and the Board of Trustees makes the final decision.
3. SCHEDULING AND DEADLINES.

From the time the dossiers leave the schools, the decision process usually takes about eight weeks and so the FSCPT meetings begin well before the middle of each semester. As implied by the discussion above, the entire schedule for reviewing a professor's candidacy is driven retroactively by the meetings of the Board of Trustees late in the Fall (December) and Spring (May) semesters. The FSCPT and Deans make their separate recommendations to the Provost about a month before the Trustees meet, and then the Deans, FSCPT, and Provost must vote, and the Provost must make his/her recommendation to the President, who in turn must advise the Board. (See Table 1 on page 9).

Since there can be twenty candidates or more in a semester and some dossiers will require hours of discussion, the Provost mandates deadlines very early in the semester (Early October and Early February) for receiving the dossier from the schools. Consequently, the candidate, departments, and schools have to prepare even further in advance. A rushed dossier serves neither the interests of the candidate nor of the process.

Normally, a Department should be prepared to make its decision in the first month of a semester. That means that the process of assembling the dossier, especially external reviews, should have been nearly completed at the very latest by the beginning of the semester in which the candidate wishes to be considered. Consequently, if a candidate wishes a decision in Spring of one year, s/he should have prepared the dossier by the beginning of the Fall semester of the previous year.

Candidates and Department Heads should discuss the promotion and tenure process at least once a semester and have a detailed discussion the semester before the process has to begin, and choose whether they will target the Fall or Spring Trustees meeting. For a tenure decision, this discussion should be the culmination of a probationary period that is no longer than six years (or in cases where a leave has been granted, seven years), in which the candidate has had annual reviews with the Head of his/her department and a three-year review. These reviews, which require written feedback to the candidate, are important steps in preparing the candidate for consideration for tenure and promotion. All evaluations and mentoring should be performed with an eye to advising and preparing the candidate to make the best case possible.

The Department Head should give the candidates a firm deadline well in advance for submitting his/her parts of the dossier to the departmental committee. These include

- the Rensselaer 23-page biographical sketch form, available from the Provost's office.
- depending on the discipline selected publications, records of exhibits, performances, installations, etc.
- any additional pertinent information for which there is no room on the bio-sketch
The Department Head or mentor chosen by the candidate and the Head from among the senior faculty of the candidate's Department should also help the candidate assemble the bio-sketch, and then review it rigorously and critically, looking for all the points noted in Section 3 below and recommend changes, additions, and deletions.

Department Heads should leave plenty of time between the candidate's deadline and their own deadline for making a recommendation to their respective Schools, since the Departmental committee must have time to mail out and receive back the dossier to internal and external evaluators, read the dossier and vote. In turn, the Deans should set a deadline well in advance of the FSCPT deadline for receiving all promotion/tenure cases from the departments, since the School executive committee must read the dossier and vote on the case. The school executive committee generally consists of Heads of Departments and Associate and Assistant Deans.

Department Heads must report back to the candidate in a timely fashion on the decision at each step in the process.

Any negative decision of the Head, Dean or Provost based on the recommendations they receive stops the process. In the case of any negative decision at any step in the process, the candidate has the option to appeal, which may involve re-assembling the dossier, adding more evidence, soliciting the help of an advocate, and beginning the case over again (See Section 7 below). A negative decision requires written explanation to the candidate from the person that made the decision.

Any positive recommendation is advisory to the next level in the decision-making hierarchy at every step. The Department Head is not bound by the vote of the Department committee. The Dean can make a recommendation that is different from the vote of the Department or the Executive Committee of a school. The FSCPT recommendation may not agree with the recommendation it receives from the Dean. The Provost reserves the right to form his/her own judgments and make recommendations to the President which may differ from the determination of the joint committee of Deans and faculty. And the President can do the same based on the Provost's recommendation. Finally, the Board of Trustees can formulate its own decision. The Provost is responsible for reporting to the FSCPT (and the Deans) about the outcome of each case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time before Board of Trustees Meeting</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ 6-7 months</td>
<td>Candidate assembles bio-sketch, sample publications, and list of internal and external evaluators to the Department Head. Candidate and Head discuss selection of external and internal evaluators and the procedures and the deadline for submitting the dossier. Department Head makes initial phone or e-mail contacts to determine availability of evaluators and then sends out dossier to evaluators and chooses some evaluators not recommended by the candidate (half from candidate, half not).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 14 weeks</td>
<td>Early in the semester, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent body) reviews and votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Department Head. If the Head's recommendation is positive, s/he forwards the dossier and a written recommendation to the School. If negative, the Head informs the candidate formally, including the candidate's right to appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~12 weeks</td>
<td>The Executive Committee of the School reviews and votes on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 10 weeks</td>
<td>If the Dean makes a positive recommendation, s/he forwards the dossier with a written recommendation to the Provost before the deadline of the target semester, Fall or Spring (usually October and February, respectively). If the Dean's recommendation is negative, s/he informs the candidate formally, including the candidate's right to appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 10-5 weeks</td>
<td>The FSCPT reviews and votes on the candidacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 8-5 weeks</td>
<td>The Deans of the schools review and vote on the candidacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 5 weeks</td>
<td>The FSCPT take a final vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 5 weeks</td>
<td>The Deans of the schools take a final vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 4 weeks</td>
<td>The FSCPT and Deans meet together to vote on the candidacy as a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 4 weeks</td>
<td>The Provost makes a recommendation to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board of Trustees make a final decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. THE DOSSIER.

The dossier is the primary instrument used to make the promotion and tenure decision. As many as sixty or seventy people will review a candidate's dossier during the process: a dozen external evaluators, the departmental P&T committee, the School’s executive committee and Dean, the FSCPT, the Deans of the Schools, the Provost, the President, and, in executive summary form, the Board of Trustees. Many of these readers in the audience will have little or no knowledge of the "local conditions" or specific details of a candidate's career and circumstances, nor of the canons of judgment that apply in a Department, School, or academic discipline. As a result, it is necessary that the dossier represent in as complete and clear way any information that pertains to the career of a candidate. More explanation, within reason, is generally better than less. Little should be left to the imagination, and it should not be assumed that all reviewers will be able to judge the value of a candidate's contributions in the classroom or in the lab or in the profession at large.

4.1 Assemble the bio-sketch and supporting materials early.

The candidate for associate professor should start assembling his or her dossier at the time of hire and start to package it as early as six months before forwarding it to the Departmental P&T committee. Normally, each faculty member has kept the records on which the dossier is based, through a carefully-prepared and current curriculum vitae.

The standard long biography form or bio-sketch is the central item in the dossier (see recommendations about it in Section 4.2.3, below). We strongly urge each faculty member to examine this form in the first year of his/her appointment to a position at Rensselaer. Department Heads should give each new professor a copy upon hiring and discuss with the candidate professor the process and career issues involved. The Department Head should also remind the candidate at each annual review to update the bio-sketch.

Candidates should also give early and serious thought to the list of outside evaluators whom they will offer to the Department Head, who will then solicit some from among the list of the candidate's choices.

4.2 Parts of the dossier with FSCPT recommendations for best practices.

The dossier is a complex document, made up of various parts. Together, these parts should provide a clear picture of the candidate’s accomplishments.

The dossier is also a document reviewed by many people with many different interests: colleagues or future colleagues, professionals and peers in the field, Department Heads, Deans, faculty from other schools in the Institute, Provost, President, Trustees. In what follows we specify and describe each part of the dossier as it traditionally arrives at the FSCPT, and we make special note of common difficulties, offering hints and advice about how to avoid common pitfalls and optimize the process of judgment. Below we list the parts of the dossier in the order in which they are viewed by the FSCPT and Deans, not in the order of their assembly. In each section, we explain the practices and pitfalls that accompany each part based on our collective experience of the decision-making process.

4.2.1. The Dean’s letter.
The Dean's letter records the Dean’s decision on the candidate and provides a detailed explanation of the decision.

It should include:

1. **An account of the vote** of the executive or chairs’ committee of the school. It is expected that the Dean will interpret or explain any unusual circumstances surrounding that vote.

2. **A review and evaluation** of all aspects of the candidate's career, focusing on items and accomplishments of special interest.

3. **A statement of the dean’s view** of the value of the candidate to the school.

4. An explanation of any deficiencies in the candidate’s file. For example, if a candidate has a poor teaching record in an otherwise stellar career, this needs to be addressed and justified in the letter.

Many Deans excerpt highlights (e.g. direct quotes) from the external review letters in addition to giving their own opinions and judgments. It is also crucial that, the Dean's letter not ignore problems brought out in the letters; rather, these should be addressed directly, placing them in context.

**4.2.2. The Department Head’s letter.**

The Department Head’s letter gives the Head's decision and provides a detailed explanation of his/her recommendation. It should include

1. The **vote** of the department's P&T committee, including an interpretation or explanation of the vote if there are any ambiguities, and a definition of the composition of the committee, since it changes from department to department.

2. The **chair's evaluation** of all aspects of the candidate's career, focusing on outstanding qualities but also placing in context how the university should understand the value of the candidate's research, teaching, and service to the department. Special effort to explain the meaning of a candidate's research within the discipline and the importance of the candidate to the department,—the "fit"—since the department head is most likely to be in the best position to give this view. In addition, the committee generally relies on the Department Head's letter to clarify the relative value of publications, both by the number of publications, the originality of their contribution, the coherence of the candidate's research or scholarly program, and the prestige of the journals, since standards vary widely from discipline to discipline.

3. The committee also relies on the Department Head's letter to interpret the value of external evaluations, picking out high points and explaining weak ones.

4. **An explanation of any special circumstances** in the candidacy, including
   - whether it represents an early decision and why that is justified;
   - an assessment of (not an excuse for) poor teaching evaluations and especially light or heavy teaching loads;
   - an explanation of the research effort, especially an apparently low research and/or publication effort;
• a description of efforts, especially service efforts, over and above what
the biographical sketch shows or the recommendations explain.

4.2.3. Candidate's Biographical Sketch.

Assembling the Biographical Sketch is the candidate's responsibility. It is the key
document on which all the other recommendations and decisions depend. The FSCPT
assumes that the candidate has selected and reviewed everything in it for accuracy and
detail. In itself the dossier is read as a token of the candidate's ability to take the process
seriously and attend to detail, so the FSCPT is especially interested in the completeness
and accuracy of every datum.

The candidate should assume that the bio-sketch is a working template in the sense that
not all categories in it must be filled, and not all the categories that represent a candidate's
career appear on the standard form. Therefore, the FSCPT strongly urges candidates to
include material for which there is no obvious category. If you feel that there is
significant information about yourself that is not covered by the listed categories, make
the necessary additions. This is preferable by far to trying to squeeze an aspect of your
career such as extraordinary service or fieldwork, a non-traditional publication or other
accomplishment into a category to which it doesn't belong. But please take care to label
new or additional categories clearly, completely and unambiguously: i.e. "Refereed
electronic journal publications"; "Installation of original work"; "Conferences chaired," "Educational software design," etc.

In what follows, we list the categories in the bio-sketch and give our advice about
what to include or not include (when it isn't obvious):

I. Identification: Name Current rank Department School, Year and rank of first
academic appointment at Rensselaer Dates and rank for subsequent promotions

Educational Preparation:
(1) Baccalaureate and graduate degree(s) with Institution and date
(2) Non-degree preparation

II. Professional Experience: Include here not only academic experience but other
professionally relevant employment, including military service, corporate
research, sabbatical appointments, employment during leave of absences,
etc.

III. Teaching: The candidate’s teaching record is a critical component of the dossier and
it is important that this is well documented. Teaching is not limited to evaluation scores,
but includes innovations in education and mentoring.

A. Courses

It is most helpful if the candidate provides the following information in a table
format with courses divided according to the semester and year:

- Name and course number listed by semester, summer session
Number of students who completed each course

Name of colleagues with whom you taught the course and percentage of your responsibility for the course if it was team-taught

Teaching evaluation score for each course

Independent studies, special projects, etc. Include titles, dates.

Selected positive and negative student comments should be included as an appendix to the bio-sketch

B. Student Thesis Supervision

1. Thesis completed
   a. Bachelors
   b. Masters
   c. Doctoral

For each category above indicate the student's name and year of completion (already completed or expected), and the title of the student's thesis.

2. Thesis Committees: Under a separate listing, include committees in which you've participated but not chaired or supervised.

C. Curriculum design

Include the names of new courses designed or old courses re-designed, including collaborative or team-teaching, introduction of instructional technology, software designed, or new pedagogical methods. It is appropriate to include new syllabi in an appendix.

D. Advising

1. Undergraduate Student Advising and Counseling (number and year)
2. Graduate Student Advising and Counseling (number and year)

List numbers of students advised each semester. Many departments have asked faculty to take on student advisees formally or informally. While few faculty members keep lists of all their advisees, please estimate the numbers of students you have advised in each semester.

IV. Publications, Performances and Exhibitions

When listing publications, follow the normal style for bibliographic entries. Give complete list of coauthors, title, journal, volume, issue, date, paging. List articles in reverse order of publication from most recent. Include articles not yet published but accepted or under review, but indicate the status clearly and unambiguously (e.g. identify each as “submitted” or “accepted for publication”). List adaptations, translations or re-publications of your original work in other forms (i.e. conference proceedings republished as book chapters or journal articles) clearly and not as separate entries.

It is important that some method be used to designate the role of the candidate in the author list. Each discipline has its own traditions (e.g. advisors are often major authors,
but listed last) and these should be clarified. One example is putting student names in italics and corresponding or major authors marked with an *. This is up to the candidate, but whatever method is used should be defined at the start of the section.

The values of different kinds of publications vary widely among disciplines and genres. Textbooks are distinguished from monographs (sustained works about a coherent subject) and both vary in perceived value from discipline to discipline. In some disciplines, a single journal article may weigh more heavily than a book, and in some disciplines a conference proceedings at a prestigious conference has more impact than a journal publication. It is therefore of great importance that the Department Head and the Dean explain the perceived value of publications and other professional work within the profession of the candidate and that the dossier distinguish clearly among different sorts of publications.

A. Books, Monographs, Published Recordings

1. Single author books, recordings
2. Contributor, books, recordings

A brief description of each item if it is not a book is helpful (one or two sentences). If it is a textbook or an edited volume, indicate so to distinguish it from a monograph. A distinction should be made between an edited volume of original essays or chapters and an edited proceedings of a conference. If you edited a volume, include any chapters or introductions you wrote. Similar suggestions apply for published recordings.

B. Patents and Patent Applications

Give patent number, dates, names of collaborators and co-holders, and explain the device or object patented, including its significance.

C. Journal articles

1. In refereed journals (articles which are reviewed by peers in the field prior to publication.)
   a. Major articles
   b. Abstracts, Letters of Correspondence, Book Reviews, etc.
   c. Short articles, Interviews
   d. Conference Proceedings

2. In non-refereed journals
   a. Major articles
   b. Abstracts, Letters of Correspondence, Book Reviews, etc.
   c. Minor articles, Interviews
   d. Conference Proceedings

3. Catalogs and exhibition publications

Be very clear in distinguishing the publication of conference proceedings from refereed journal publications, and refereed from non-refereed journals or conference proceedings.
The candidate is free to add clarifying information about the degree of rigor of each of these, especially in published conference proceedings, since having a paper accepted at some conferences is as prestigious and as important a contribution to the field as some journal publications.

**NOTE: The dossier should include, in an appendix, copies of 3-4 of the candidate’s best papers or works (chosen by the candidate). This list may also contain articles accepted but not yet in print and those submitted but not yet reviewed.**

### D. Exhibitions, Performances and Recitals

1. Major (national and international level) Solo Exhibitions, Performances, Recitals and screenings
   
   (Give title, venue and dates. Describe the nature and significance of the presented work. Enclosed documentation.)

2. Minor (local level) solo exhibitions, Small Scale Musical or Video Works
   
   (Give title, venue, and dates)

3. Group Exhibitions and Performances, Ensemble Recitals
   
   (Give title, venue and dates. Detail your contribution and enclose documentation.)

### E. Major Research Archives or Databases

(If you wish to list archives or databases, give indication of scope and distribution of the work.)

1. Design of Research Archives or Databases

2. Inclusion in Research Archives or Databases

### F. Other originally authored computer software or systems

(If you wish to list computer software or systems, give indication of scope and distribution of the work.)

### G. Published Reviews, Descriptions of Work and Interviews

### H. Artistic Residencies

1. Commissions
V. Research Contracts and Grants:

A. Proposals Approved and Funded
List all co-authors and co-principals, other researchers or investigators; the title of the grant; dates; granting agency; monetary amount. A brief narrative description of the nature of the grant and its accomplishments is desirable but not required. Show multiple grants for the same project clearly.

Given the increasing number of large multi-investigator grants it is important to identify what portion of the project is supporting the candidate.

B. Proposals Submitted and Not Funded, or Still Pending, with Current Status
List all co-authors and co-principals, other researchers or investigators; the title of the grant; dates; granting agency; monetary amount.

C. Candidate's Account of Research
This is an important — and often underestimated — opportunity for the candidate to explain his or her career to the more general audience who will review the dossier and to express any larger vision the candidate may have. Consequently, the candidate should take this section most seriously. It is the only opportunity for the candidate to "speak" to his/her audience and to indicate any personal flavor or distinction in the candidate's career. Good accounts of research are:

- well-written and grammatically and mechanically correct
- define terms clearly and avoid jargon
- explain aspects of the career that may not be clear from the data elsewhere in the dossier, while avoiding defensiveness
- take into account the generalized audience who will read them (i.e., colleagues from many different disciplines)
- explain the significance of contributions
- place research in the contexts of the Institute, the profession, and perhaps even the world at large
- describe a large plan or vision of the research project(s), offer a sense of conviction and coherence.

Explanations of the coherence and future plans of a research program and its ties to teaching are most impressive.
VI. Editorship of Journals, Review of Manuscripts, Books, Research Proposals, Curating, and Jurying of Exhibitions

(Give organization of journals, significant items reviewed, dates.)
Please include editorial positions, including advisory boards, curating and jurying of exhibitions

VII. Service

For all the following, give dates and titles of service. Indicate if position was elective or appointed.

A. Service to the University- include committees, elective positions, chairship of Institute committees, participation in Councils, retreats, special presentations to alumni, Board of Trustees, or administrative bodies.

1. University Service
2. Service to the School
3. Departmental Committees and Dates for Each
4. Other Service and Administration Activities

B. Service to the Profession

This section should include:
- Memberships in professional societies, including dates and titles of executive positions held and other service functions.
- Conferences and symposia organized
- Panels and sessions chaired at international and national conferences
- List editing of newsletters, directorship of conferences, committees within professional societies, etc.
- Service to the profession in review of grants, publications, proposals, and candidacies for tenure and promotion at other institutions.

C. Community and Public Service

(Give national, state, and local organizations; positions held; and dates.)
This section should include service to the community, including public posts in charitable organizations. Describe special initiatives and accomplishments.
VII. Profession and Public Lectures

Give list of authors, title, conference, site, location, and date for each of these. Distinguish carefully among the different sorts of talks, papers and presentations, especially as to whether they were refereed or not. International presentations, keynote or plenary speeches/papers/presentations, and invitations to present at prestigious venues represent significant contributions and should be noted clearly. The following represent some but not all of the major categories of achievement that should be noted in this section:

- Keynote speeches, plenary addresses, papers, presentations
- Invited papers, presentations, talks
- Intra-university, school or departmental colloquia
- Contributed presentations, papers, talks
- Interviews to news media, radio shows, television, etc.

VIII. Awards and honors, fellowships: List date, place, title of project, awarding agency, and explain significance and value.

IX. Sabbatical Leaves, off campus study programs, foreign and professional travel, dates and topics

X. Other activities

Other relevant activities most often includes consulting, but this category should be used to mention any miscellany or aspects of a candidate's career that don't fit neatly into any of the pigeonholes above. If you list consulting activities, include name of company and days per year and provide a sentence or two describing the nature of the consulting. You may also list here professional services you've provided including activity as expert witness or congressional testimony, advice to government agencies, etc.

XI. Miscellany

Include if pertinent, concrete evidence of teaching ability and any unusual contributions to university affairs such as curriculum advising or development, continuing education, distance learning, lab or studio design, that wasn't included under the teaching category of the bio-sketch.

4.2.4. Letters of recommendation or review.

The Faculty Handbook spells out the guidelines for assembling a list of external peer reviews of a candidate's dossier. There must be no fewer than six external reviews, with equal numbers of reviewers suggested by the candidate and the department. (However, please note that six external reviewers would generally be viewed as a very small number.). The more qualified the reviewer, the easier it will be to make clear judgments about a case. The FSCPT looks closely at each external (and internal) reviewer's rank,
institution, achievement, experience, and relationship to the candidate. Consequently, each reviewers' letter should be accompanied by a brief biography and statement of the reviewer's relationship to the candidate. Dossiers that do not have sufficient numbers of well-qualified external reviewers are difficult to judge and may reflect poorly on the candidate’s case. In specific instances, a candidate or department head may wish to elaborate on the qualifications of a given reviewer.

**It is not recommended that the candidate’s thesis advisor is one of the letter writers.**

These letters play a very significant role in shaping the FSCPT's decision. Consequently, a dossier that includes only letters from friends, collaborators, former colleagues, recommenders from non-academic settings, and colleagues of equal or lesser rank give the FSCPT very little objective, academic information on which to form its judgments. The inability of a candidate or a department to gather such information may be considered *prima facie* a weakness in the candidate's case describing evaluation of teaching, publication, and service.

The Department Head and the candidate select the list of external reviewers together and the candidate must be advised of the final list of external reviewers selected. The candidate does not have the right to veto any choice suggested by the Head, but s/he may append a letter explaining any objection to the choice. Typically, half the reviewers are ones suggested by the candidate and half suggested by the Department Head or senior colleagues from whom the Department Head requests recommendations. The Head should show the candidate his/her list first and with plenty of time for response to avoid gaining an unfair advantage. The same rules apply to internal reviewers.

**The letters need to be requested several months before the Department vote to ensure that the external reviewers have enough time to write a thoughtful letter.**

The following must be present in the dossier:

1. **List of all external reviewers**

   The Department Head must submit *a list of all external reviewers solicited*, whether they responded or not. This list should indicate whether the external reviewer was suggested by the candidate or the department.

2. **Copy of letter soliciting external review**

   The Department Head must also include a copy of his/her *letter soliciting external reviews*. The Head's letter soliciting external reviews must follow these guidelines in order to keep the dossier free from suspicion of influence:

   **The same letter should be sent to all reviewers.** It is up to the Department Head to decide whether to say in that letter if the reviewer was selected by the department or the candidate.

   The language should be neutral. The letter should avoid giving the reviewer any impression about the candidate's chances, how the candidate is viewed by the department, or what aspects of the candidate's profile should be emphasized.
The letter should include a statement of the guidelines for granting tenure or promotion at Rensselaer. A quotation from the appropriate sections of the Handbook serve this purpose well.

C. Reviewer's brief bio statement

The Department Head should solicit a brief biographical statement from the reviewer, as well as a full disclosure from the reviewer of the relationship between the reviewer and the candidate, including professional collaboration, supervision, or personal relationships.

D. External Review Letters

All external letters received must be included in the Dossier. This is indicated in the handbook. FSCPT sifts through letters of recommendation very carefully. It looks for nuances of expression that might indicate subtle judgments, since in an increasingly litigious atmosphere, negative recommendations are fewer and praise tends to be inflated. Does the reviewer understand the values and standards of academia sufficiently to make a recommendation?

E. Department Head's letter soliciting internal reviews

The same guidelines for external review letters apply to internal review letters, although the tone may be more informal and the Department Head may instruct an internal reviewer to focus on particular aspects of a candidate's career. The letter soliciting internal reviews must be neutral, however. The Head should include in the dossier a list of all internal reviewers solicited, whether they responded or not. This list should also indicate whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or the department. The expectation is that about half of the letters are chosen by the candidate and half by the Department Head or Mentor.

Some Department Heads publish a general solicitation for evaluation of a candidate's career to all members of a department or school.

F. Department Head's list of internal reviewers

The Department Head should list all internal reviewers, indicating whether the reviewer volunteered, was solicited by the Department Head or department, or by the candidate. Again a policy of half chosen by the candidate and half by the Department Head is appropriate.

G. Department Head's letter describing process by which student input was solicited

The Department Head should submit a brief statement describing how students were asked to write letters reviewing a candidate's performance as teacher, advisor, project supervisor, or thesis advisor. If a formal letter was used, the Head's solicitation letter must be neutral.

The Department Head should also include a list of all student
reviewers solicited, whether they responded or not. This list should also indicate whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or the department.

H. Student letters

Letters from graduate and undergraduate students who have worked with a professor in research or who have taken a professor's class are highly valued by the FSCPT, which recommends that a minimum of eight letters be submitted. It is expected that the letter writers cover the broad spectrum of students at Rensselaer, including both undergraduate and graduate students. It is also expected that at least two will be from female undergraduates.

It should be understood that all letters received will be included in the file and become a permanent part of the file.

5. EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS, INCLUDING DEANS, DEAN OF THE FACULTY, AND PRESIDENT.

The FSCPT must vote on external appointments to the faculty that carry tenure and/or rank of associate professor or above. This includes appointments to administrative positions that carry faculty rank, including Department Heads, Deans, Vice-Presidents and Presidents. Quite often, the role of the FSCPT in ratifying these appointments is overlooked as the complex process of search and identification for qualified candidates proceeds on a schedule that is more hasty than that for internal promotion and tenure. Nonetheless, the FSCPT must see the candidate’s credentials and dossier before the contract is issued from the Institute. In general, the FSCPT has viewed its role as aiding Departments and Deans to help the Institute secure the best candidates available.

It is the Search Committee's responsibility to assemble an adequate dossier for any candidate whom it recommends for appointment with tenure. A full dossier is often impossible, but at very minimum, the dossier should include all of the written information the search committee has gathered in its deliberations, including letters of review by faculty within the Department or School to which the new appointment will be made. At very least, this abbreviated dossier should include:

- A full curriculum vitae
- Sample of publications
- Letters of recommendation, including at least three or four NOT assembled by the candidate
- A cover letter from the chair of the Search Committee and another letter from the ranking administrator responsible for the appointment (Head in the case of faculty, Dean in the case of Department Head, President in the case of Dean) etc. This letter should outline the career of the candidate, a review of his/her profile and the reasons for the recommendation.
Any relevant application material, including letter of application from the candidate.

Departmental vote

6. APPOINTMENTS FROM OUTSIDE ACADEMIA.

Rensselaer is in the forefront of academia when it comes to appointing qualified faculty whose primary experience has been in industry. These candidates most often become highly valued and qualified colleagues. However, their candidacies often do pose challenges for the judgment of the FSCPT since their careers and records of publication, research, grants, teaching, and service all may have followed nontraditional paths. In some cases there may be only very slight or no evidence for teaching ability. In some cases, the most significant research performed by the candidate was "locked up" by corporate ownership and was never published.

Since the value of such appointments is often very clear to the departments or Heads who sponsor them, a certain eagerness may cause the sponsoring Departments and Schools to overlook or disregard traditional categories for academic judgment for tenure and promotion. Yet, the FSCPT takes primary responsibility for enforcing these standards. As a result, the Department Head and Dean must take special care to address problems in evaluating such candidates. Special care should be taken to assemble qualified external reviewers who are familiar with academic standards. If there is no evidence of teaching, perhaps it is advisable for the candidate to delay tenure until some record of teaching is accumulated. If research publication is thin because the candidate's responsibility to a corporate employer prevented publication, then some way of evaluating the rigor and value of that research must be found.
7. APPEALS.

If a candidate for promotion or tenure is rejected at any stage in the process, s/he has the right of appeal as described in the Faculty Handbook, which we recommend be consulted before proceeding with this section. The appeal should be submitted at or before the deadlines set by the Provost for other Promotion and Tenure cases to ensure enough time for proper review.

However, the Handbook leaves many grey areas about the process which have been defined more clearly by precedent. In what follows, we describe the process we feel strikes the best balance between the interests of the candidate and the Institute based on precedents that have been set in the appeals procedure.

When a candidate for promotion or tenure is rejected at any stage, the candidate has the right to choose an advocate, a tenured full professor from inside or outside the candidate's department or school but within the Institute, who will act as the candidate's representative in the process. If the candidate has received a negative ruling, s/he has the right to appeal with a strengthened dossier, which begins the entire process over again (under the presumption that a positive but mixed vote at an earlier step might have resulted in a negative vote at a later step, and an improved dossier may change a mixed but positive vote to one that is even more positive).

However, though the process begins again, the clock of the tenure decision is not stopped, so a candidate who is in the final year of a contract, or the grace year after a negative decision may have some urgency in achieving resolution of a case. For that reason, as well as the natural anxiety that attends appeal cases, appeals must take precedence over regular decision, and the FSCPT should set aside regular business to hear appeals with all due speed.

The advocate, while unable to render judgment on the case, accepts this responsibility with the commitment to do everything within her/his power to help the candidate strengthen the case for promotion or tenure. The advocate has the right to review all documents, including confidential ones and ones that are not represented in the dossier — e.g., the minutes of the departmental P&T committee or executive committee of the School — concerning the original case. At the same time, the advocate must preserve the principles of confidentiality. In short, the advocate walks a tightrope. S/he has the delicate task of sifting through confidential material in order to give advice to the candidate without revealing the names or some specifics of the origin of negative opinions and information.

The candidate should then take all steps possible to strengthen his/her case: soliciting additional evaluations of the dossier, adding explanatory material; revising statements about research; remembering and adding details, etc. The candidate may also wish to write a statement in his/her own defense that the advocate can then use as the basis of advocacy.

With this revised dossier and additional information, the advocate then brings forward the case to the new starting point. The advocate is welcome to give an oral statement about the candidate, ask questions of anyone involved in the process (Heads, Deans, committees, etc.), and expect responses, either in the form of oral or written remarks
which can be entered into the record and to which further responses by the advocate and candidate are also permitted. The FSCPT and the Committee of Deans will make time on the P&T agenda to hear any advocacy.

In the past, the FSCPT has on occasion asked that an advocate present the appeal to the committee. The FSCPT has on occasion also solicited further information from the advocate, the candidate, the department P&T committee, the school executive committee, the Head, or the Dean involved in the decision.

After hearing and reviewing all new evidence, each committee or agent (dean, chair, committee) in the process will once again deliberate on a case and deliver a formal recommendation, yea or nay. (This is in place of the -2.0 to + 2.0 rating system described previously for normal [i.e., non-appeal] cases.). The advocate does not have the right to be present for these discussions or votes. However, the advocate, on behalf of the candidate must be permitted *timely* access to all new information added at any time to the dossier, including new information that emerges in a Dean's or Department Head's letter. Any new oral testimony in the case heard by any committee or administrator must also be presented to the advocate, and the advocate must be given a timely interim in which to respond.

Unlike the original process, in an appeals process a negative opinion delivered at any stage does not halt the appeal. Instead, the dossier is passed through to the next step, through the FSCPT and Committee of Deans, Provost, President and, if positive, to the Trustees.
CONCLUSION.

“Mongst all these stirs of discontented strife O, let me lead an academic life.”

— Joseph Hall (1648)

Tenure, and to a lesser extent promotion, are two cornerstones of academic life. They ensure freedom of thought and speech and grant privilege and prestige not so much to individuals as to ideals of academic pursuit: the getting and sharing of knowledge free from restraint, free from influence, free from political pressure or monetary reward, or free even from blind self-interest. Perhaps most importantly, tenure grants faculty members the freedom to take risks and to pursue pure knowledge and truth in ways no other cultural institution can afford.

Tenure and faculty privilege are perennially under assault and increasingly so these days. This is all the more reason that all participants in the process of deciding on the fate of candidates take care and strive for utterly scrupulous rigor in gathering evidence, formulating judgments, and rendering decisions. We hope that a clear articulation of, and strict adherence to, the processes described in this document (and in the Faculty Handbook), will help to protect the candidate, the Institute, the phenomenon of tenure itself, and therefore the higher goals and interests of academia, which emphasize the unfettered search for truth.
DEPARTMENT HEAD’S ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY

Faculty Member ______________________________ Department _____________________

Department Head/Evaluator __________________________________ Date ___________________________

Faculty Member’s Mentor(s) _________________________________________________________________

On what basis have you compiled this assessment? (Please check all boxes that apply)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I have read student evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have observed in the lab, studio, or classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I have observed performances and/or presentations by the faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I have observed performances and/or presentations by the students of the faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I have reviewed publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have reviewed Digital Measures reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have reviewed the Bio-Sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have reviewed the Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHING** Percentage applied = __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Benchmark for Dept</th>
<th>Above Benchmark for Dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Effectiveness in teaching less advanced students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Effectiveness in teaching more advanced students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Depth of knowledge of the subject matter taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Currency of the subject matter taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Response of students to the faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Teaching load in comparison to others in the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Effectiveness in mentoring undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Effectiveness in mentoring graduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Participation in accreditation reporting (e.g. Digital Measures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths as a teacher:

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
110 8th Street | Troy, NY 12180-3590 USA
Phone (518) 276-6575 | Fax (518) 276-4871 | www.hass.rpi.edu
Weaknesses as a teacher:

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH

Percentage applied = __________

1. Quality of contributions to the scholarly field in forms such as journal articles, books exhibitions, or performances

2. Quantity of contributions to the scholarly field in forms such as journal articles, books exhibitions, or performances

3. Impact of contributions to the scholarly field in forms such as journal articles, books exhibitions, or performances

4. Quality of participation in and contributions to the effort to seek external funding

5. Quality of participation in and contributions to receiving external funding

6. The respect with which he/she is regarded by peers and leaders in his/her field

7. Other:

What were the greatest professional contributions of this faculty member to his/her field this year?
In what respects would a change of direction or emphasis be helpful with respect to this faculty member's professional activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Percentage applied = ______________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Benchmark for Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of contributions to the Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of contributions to the School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of contributions to the Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of contributions to the professional discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of community and public service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Effectiveness in recruiting talented students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Effectiveness in advising undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Effectiveness in advising graduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What were the most important service contributions of this faculty member?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In what ways could the service contributions of this faculty member be more effective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this person effectively and collegially contribute to the mission of the department?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Faculty Member: _____________________________________________________________

Signature of Department Head: __________________________________________________________

☐ Please check here if there are additional comments on an attached sheet.
DEPARTMENT HEAD’S ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY

Faculty Member __ ______SAMPLE___________________________ Department _____________________

Department Head/Evaluator __________________________________ Date ___________________________

Faculty Member’s Mentor(s) _________________________________________________________________

On what basis have you compiled this assessment? (Evaluator: please check all boxes that apply)

| 1. I have read student evaluations |  |  |
| 2. I have observed in the lab, studio, or classroom |  |  |
| 3. I have observed performances and/or presentations by the faculty member |  |  |
| 4. I have observed performances and/or presentations by the students of the faculty member |  |  |
| 5. I have reviewed publications |  |  |
| 6. I have reviewed Digital Measures reports |  |  |
| 7. I have reviewed the Bio-Sketch |  |  |
| 8. I have reviewed the Curriculum Vitae |  |  |
| 9. Other: |  |  |

**TEACHING** Percentage applied = __________

| 1. Effectiveness in teaching less advanced students |  |  |
| 2. Effectiveness in teaching more advanced students |  |  |
| 3. Depth of knowledge of the subject matter taught |  |  |
| 4. Currency of the subject matter taught |  |  |
| 5. Response of students to the faculty member |  |  |
| 6. Teaching load in comparison to others in the department |  |  |
| 7. Effectiveness in mentoring undergraduate students |  |  |
| 8. Effectiveness in mentoring graduate students |  |  |
| 9. Participation in accreditation reporting (e.g. Digital Measures) |  |  |
| 10. Other: |  |  |

Below Benchmark for Dept

|  |  |  |

Above Benchmark for Dept

|  |  |  |

Strengths as a teacher: (ITEM #3 in Biosketch)

1. Teaching Scores:
   - Spring 20xx
     - HIST 4750 19 students; course score: 4.5; teacher score: 4.88; Response rate: x%
     - HIST 6750 19 students; course score: 5.0; teacher score: 5.0; Response rate: x%
   - Fall 20xx
     - HIST 4750 19 students; course score: 4.5; teacher score: 4.88; Response rate: x%
     - HIST 6750 19 students; course score: 5.0; teacher score: 5.0; Response rate: x%

2. Student Advising and Thesis/Dissertation Committees:
   - UG student advising and mentoring of (disciplinary particulars) majors: 10 students
     - Dissertation Chair:
       - Student’s Name, Home Department; Title of Dissertation; Milestones (dates of candidacy exam; prospectus approved; dissertation defense).
     - Committee Member:
       - Student’s Name, Home Department; Title of Dissertation; Milestones (dates of candidacy exam; prospective
3. Curriculum Design/New Courses developed
4. Narrative summary offered by Evaluator

Weaknesses as a teacher:

List areas of improvement in teaching, advising, and/or curriculum development that you wish to work on in the coming academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH</th>
<th>Percentage applied = __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of contributions to the scholarly field in forms such as journal articles, books exhibitions, or performances</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quantity of contributions to the scholarly field in forms such as journal articles, books exhibitions, or performances</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impact of contributions to the scholarly field in forms such as journal articles, books exhibitions, or performances</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of participation in and contributions to the effort to seek external funding</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of participation in and contributions to receiving external funding</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The respect with which he/she is regarded by peers and leaders in his/her field</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other:</td>
<td>![Benchmark]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What were the greatest professional contributions of this faculty member to his/her field this year?

1. Publications, Performances, and Exhibitions: **[ITEMS #4 (a through i) and #6 in Biosketch]**
   - *Dream Life of Babies*, Fay Gold Gallery, Atlanta, GA. Juried Solo Exhibition.
2. Professional and Public Lectures: **[ITEM #8 (a through e) in Biosketch]**
3. Editorship of Journals, Review of Manuscripts, Books, Research Proposals, Curating and Jurying Exhibitions **[ITEM #6 in Biosketch]**
4. Research Contracts and Grants: **[ITEM #5 (a & b) in Biosketch]**
   - Ford Foundation: *Higher Education for Social Justice*, $350,000/four years. DECLINED.
   - John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation: *Climate Solutions*, $3,000,000/5 years. AWARDED.
5. Awards and Honors, Fellowships (date, title of project, awarding agency, significance and value) **[ITEM #9 in Biosketch]**
6. Narrative summary offered by Evaluator.

In what respects would a change of direction or emphasis be helpful with respect to this faculty member's professional
activities?
List areas of focus for the upcoming academic year.

**SERVICE**  Percentage applied = ____________

Below
Benchmark
for Dept

Above
Benchmark
for Dept

1. Quality of contributions to the Department
2. Quality of contributions to the School
3. Quality of contributions to the Institute
4. Quality of contributions to the professional discipline
5. Quality of community and public service
6. Effectiveness in recruiting talented students
7. Effectiveness in advising undergraduate students
8. Effectiveness in advising graduate students
9. Other:

What were the most important service contributions of this faculty member?  *(ITEM #7 and #8 in Biosketch)*

1. Service to the Department
   Search Committee, Fall 20xx
2. Service to the School
   HASS Council & Curriculum Committee
   HASS Executive Committee
3. Service to the University
   Faculty Senate Planning & Resources Committee, Fall 2014-present
   Academic Standing Committee, Summer 2014-present
   IRB Committee, Summer 2014-present

• Service to the Profession
  President-elect, International Society of Humanities Scholars.
  External Evaluation Panel Member, University Search Committee, Relevant Date of service.
  Conference Organizing Committee, Conference Name, Location, Relevant Date of service.

• Community and public service
  Trustee, Rensselaer County Historical Society, Fall 2005-present
  Member, American Friends Service Committee, Summer 2010-present
  Volunteer Academic Mentor, Troy Public High School, Fall 2014-present

Does this person effectively and collegially contribute to the mission of the department?

Signature of Faculty Member: _____________________________________________________________

Signature of Department Head: ____________________________________________________________

☐ Please check here if there are additional comments on an attached sheet.
<table>
<thead>
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<td>Dean's Recommendation memo</td>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Recommendation to the Dean (if applicable)</td>
<td>Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head Recommendation Memo to the Dean (including discussion of votes at the departmental level)</td>
<td>Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate's Biosketch (Including Research, Teaching and Service Statements)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>One-Page Teaching Evaluation Summary</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
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<td>Candidate</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
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<td>Internal Reference Log</td>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
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<td>Candidate</td>
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<td>Full Teaching Evaluations from RPI</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
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Teaching Statement

Since joining the faculty of the Science and Technology Studies (STS) Department at Rensselaer, I have developed skill and confidence as an educator of undergraduate and graduate students. For undergraduates, it has been my priority to develop strategies for teaching sociological ideas and research approaches to a very diverse group of learners. Teaching at the graduate level has also challenged me to become a more flexible and creative educator. In the STS department, students pursue an interdisciplinary social science degree; therefore, it is essential that I teach them sociological approaches to studying science, technology, and the environment in ways that will connect with (or pose useful challenges to) the broader set of conceptual frameworks that shape their emerging research agendas.

Commitment to Undergraduate Teaching

I am committed to effective undergraduate education because I know from experience how personally transformative the early exploration of the social sciences can be. The college years are a time of profound cognitive and personal changes, a period in which the tools of sociology and the other social sciences can be especially useful for making sense out of the complexity of social life. As an educator of undergraduates, I aim to foster critical thinking skills and, above all, encourage students to examine the connections between personal experiences and public issues.

Although the students who take my classes may go on to pursue a wide variety of professions, the skills they learn will be useful in any career and enhance their ability to participate in civic life. These skills include writing clearly and cogently; critically examining the assumptions underlying claims about science, nature, and the social world; using library resources to find information to assess and build arguments; and employing social scientific concepts to interpret personal experiences and current events. I teach undergraduate courses in environmental sociology, history of environmental ideas, and sociology of agri-food systems. In addition to the subject-related learning objectives, these courses create opportunities for students to explore their values and to become more thoughtful citizens of a complex society in a changing global environment.

Teaching Approaches

The approaches I use to achieve these teaching and learning goals are varied, in order to reach students with diverse learning styles and backgrounds. While some students work best individually, others work better in groups. Therefore, I make sure that students have the opportunity to demonstrate competencies both through individual and group work. I create a classroom culture where all students feel comfortable asking and answering questions by supplementing the traditional question-answer format of lectures with free-writing exercises and small group discussion. One of my most effective strategies is to structure class discussion around open-ended questions submitted by students either in advance of class or during a short writing exercise at the beginning of the class period. For example, in response to a set of readings about world hunger, one student posed a discussion question (handed in on a notecard) about the role of the media in shaping public responses to food crises. This question produced an extended classroom debate that challenged students to make connections across multiple course topics and personal observations. I have found that students frequently comment on the effectiveness of these methods of fostering classroom participation; in my course evaluations, students often say that my class taught them how to contribute to discussion in meaningful ways.

In constructing a syllabus, my priority is to promote understanding of the material that will remain with students once they leave the class. In classroom discussions, examinations, and writing assignments, I expect them to demonstrate a high level of understanding and critical thinking about each reading. To help students apply the concepts they learn in class to their everyday lives, I create classroom and
homework exercises based around current events, popular culture, consumer products, family experiences, and other routinely-accessible materials and observations. For instance, in my course on agriculture and food, students contribute to a public blog, relating current events and popular culture to the course material. This assignment has proven to be extremely successful and popular with the students. Indeed, students from previous semesters have continued to post articles and comment on posts long after finishing the course – in at least one case, even after graduating. What makes this an effective assignment is not only that the students enjoy doing it, but also that it challenges them to apply their knowledge to real-life situations and convey what they know to a broader audience.

Graduate Teaching and Advising
I am attentive to the challenges that graduate students face when pursuing an interdisciplinary degree and have developed strategies for helping them define and develop their areas of interest and expertise. For one graduate course (Concepts in Science and Technology Studies), I developed a novel assignment that helped students identify and characterize ongoing theoretical debates. Each week, students were expected to choose one of the assigned articles for further study. They would then "read backward and forward," meaning they were expected to identify and read at least one text that formed the basis of the author’s theoretical framework and one text that cited the assigned article and advanced the scholarly conversation. Through this exercise, the students gained research skills and insights that would not have been achieved had I simply assigned the key texts in an important debate. Furthermore, they were then able to teach each other what they had learned, building confidence in their own expertise. The assignment was so successful, I anticipate adapting it to other graduate courses. For another graduate course (Institutional Approaches in STS), I developed an assignment that required students to analyze the “logic of inquiry” of two scholarly books. Through this assignment, students learned to carefully and critically analyze the research design and methods of diverse studies in their chosen field, discovering not only what "ideal" research methods look like but also how researchers in STS adapt their research strategies to the complex questions and settings that they encounter.

Advising and working with graduate students is an essential part of training new scholars in our profession, and I am committed to the success of my advisees. As a graduate student, I benefitted enormously from working continuously as a research assistant. Through hands-on work, I learned all of the stages of a research project, including writing and revising research papers. I believe strongly in emulating this model of graduate education, and I have actively sought funding to support graduate research assistants. I currently support a postdoctoral researcher and a graduate research assistant. I also chair two dissertation committees, and I am proud that both of those students have received competitive fellowships and grants for their research.

Conclusion
I have approached teaching with enthusiasm, creativity, and a sense of experimentation. I constantly revise and refine my courses and work with other professors to strengthen and enhance the broader graduate and undergraduate curricula. To me, teaching is an essential and enjoyable complement to my research and an increasingly meaningful element of my identity as a scholar.
Research Statement

I am a sociologist working in the interdisciplinary field of Science and Technology Studies. I specialize in the study of political controversies surrounding changes in the systems that produce food and energy. My research examines the unequal distribution of the negative consequences of agricultural and energy systems, as well as the varying capacity of communities and social movements to participate in making decisions about technological change.

Since arriving at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, I have pursued two major projects. The first, published as a book entitled *Seeds, Science, and Struggle: The Global Politics of Transgenic Crops* (MIT, 2012), looks at the political, scientific, and judicial venues in which advocates of sustainable agriculture challenge the worldwide expansion of genetically engineered crops. The second project, supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, examines the production of knowledge about the impacts of shale gas development, a novel form of fossil fuel extraction that may threaten the safety of drinking water and aquatic ecosystems. Research for the second project is well underway, as are plans to publish a book based on project results.

In my research, I combine a variety of research methods, including interviews, participant observation, focus groups, archival research, surveys, and spatial mapping using geographic information systems. Qualitative field research is an important part of my approach to social inquiry. I often develop specific research questions after spending considerable time in a community and learning what problems and obstacles are centrally important to participants. In my current project focused on shale gas development, for example, I am responding directly to problems identified in exploratory interviews, focus group discussions, and participant observation with rural landowners in Pennsylvania and New York.

I have a strong publication record, including a book with the MIT Press. In total, I have published ten peer-reviewed articles in highly-regarded journals (four sole authored, two of which I was the lead author). These include articles in *Mobilization, Social Studies of Science, and Rural Sociology*, which are high-impact journals in their respective domains (sociology of collective action, social research on science and technology, and sociology of agriculture, food, and rural communities). In addition, my current research project on the topic of shale gas development is poised to make a significant contribution to environmental studies. Early results from the research have been published in the *Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum*. I also co-edited a collection entitled *Controversies in Science and Technology: From Maize to Menopause* (University of Wisconsin, 2005) and published three book chapters, two book reviews, and one un-refereed magazine article. Additionally, one invited book chapter is under review (*Rural America in a Globalizing World: Problems and Prospects for the 2010s*). I am in the process of writing a second invited book chapter (*Handbook of Science, Technology and Society*) and three co-authored journal articles (each to be submitted in fall 2012).

Since joining the faculty of Rensselaer, I have given ten invited talks and fifteen conference presentations, including a talk at the AAAS annual meetings. I have been recognized with Rensselaer’s James M. Tien ’66 Early Career Award for Faculty. I was also honored to serve as a Hennebach Visiting Professor at the Colorado School of Mines in March 2012.

Early Research: Science and Social Movements

Much of my research focuses on social movements (organized collective action in pursuit of social change goals) that seek to resist unwanted technological developments or solve environmental problems, mainly in the domains of food and energy. My interest in this subject is an extension of two research projects that I pursued early in my career.
Ecologists in the United States face professional tensions when attempting to contribute to contentious debates about the environment. In two articles, published in the prominent STS journals, *Social Studies of Science* and *Science as Culture*, I examined the ways that the organizational structure of the Ecological Society of America, a professional scientific society, guided ecologists to routinely construct boundaries between their scientific work and their affinity with the environmental movement, both in the mid-20th century and the present day. The theoretical contribution of this project was to conceptualize the drawing of distinctions between science and politics as an institutionalized and habitual practice, built into organizational structure as a durable defense of scientific credibility. The findings illuminate the ambiguous role of scientists in the environmental movement, but are also highly relevant to many other contemporary debates about the role of scientists and professional organizations in politics.

In a subsequent historical project, I analyzed the emergence of diverse perspectives on the atomic bomb among intellectuals in the early civil rights movement in the United States. I found that civil rights activists interpreted and critiqued the nuclear breakthroughs of the 1940s and 50s by drawing connections to racial inequality and worldwide anticolonial struggles. The results of this research were published in the highly-regarded history journal, *Technology & Culture*.

While these two projects addressed very different sets of questions, both drew attention to unresolved tensions surrounding the role of science in struggles for social change. The conclusions of these studies led me to ask two questions: What social circumstances facilitate alliances between scientists and social movements? What kinds of organizations and political institutions enable the perspectives of social critics to be heard in highly technical debates? These sociological questions became central in my next major project, which resulted in the publication of my recent book with the MIT Press.

Research on the Politics of Genetically Engineered (GE) Crops

My book, *Seeds, Science, and Struggle: The Global Politics of Transgenic Crops*, published by the MIT Press in September 2012, examines political conflicts surrounding transgene flow, or the genetic contamination of agricultural crops and food resulting from pollen drift and seed mixing. Genetic engineering has a wide range of cultural, economic, and ethical implications, yet it has become almost an article of faith that regulatory decisions about biotechnology be based only on evidence of specific quantifiable risks; to consider anything else is said to “politicize” regulation. In this study, I turn the conventional argument on its head. Rather than consider politicization of the regulatory system, I examine the scientization of public debate about transgene flow. Advocates of alternative agriculture confront the received view that decisions about GE crops must be based on “sound science” by calling on international experts, carrying out their own research, questioning regulatory science in court, building alternative markets, and demanding that their governments consider the social and economic impacts of the new technologies.

The book focuses on social conflicts over canola in Canada and maize in Mexico, drawing out their linkages to the global food system and international environmental governance. Ultimately, the research demonstrates the shortcomings of dominant models of scientific risk governance, which marginalize alternative visions of rural livelihoods and sustainable food production.

In addition to the book, I have published seven articles about the international politics of GE crops and food. These articles contribute to two main areas of social science research: social movements and scientific governance. In 2010, I published an article in the prestigious sociology journal, *Mobilization*, developing a novel theoretical framework for understanding the relationships between activists, international agencies, and expert communities. The concept of an “epistemic boomerang” (a transnational community of experts, providing advice in support of a local community), illustrated in this case with a controversy surrounding GE crops, describes a phenomenon that has been poorly understood by scholars of transnational activism. In addition, a 2010 article in the journal *Agriculture & Human*
Values develops a typology of social movement tactics in the context of highly technical political controversies, using the case of Mexican opposition to GE maize. Several papers co-authored with Daniel Kleinman examine policy processes in the United States, the European Union, and the United Nations. Among these, I am lead author of an article published in Rural Sociology that shows that deregulation of genetically engineered seeds has been facilitated by the alignment of neoliberal policy ideas (which redefined the role of the state in relation to markets) with a widely-held faith in science as a neutral arbiter of complex problems.

Research on Unconventional Gas Development and Water Pollution

My current research examines a new controversy: debates surrounding the use of hydraulic fracturing (or “fracking”) to develop natural gas resources from unconventional sources in the United States. The study analyzes the spatial distribution of efforts to document the environmental consequences of energy production, focusing on the impacts of natural gas drilling on surface water in New York and Pennsylvania. Initial stages of this research were supported by NYSERDA, as part of a collaborative project involving engineers from Rensselaer and Texas A&M University. Today, the work is funded with a two-year grant from the National Science Foundation, which enables me to support a postdoctoral researcher, a graduate assistant, and an undergraduate assistant. The contributions of this research are threefold: theoretical insights that advance a nascent field of study of “undone science,” innovative, mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods that may be used in research on a wide range of environmental and public health topics, and research findings that document and explain a previously unknown social problem (unequal distribution of environmental knowledge).

There is an emerging body of social science research that analyzes the features and social causes of scientific ignorance, uncertainty, and knowledge gaps. This project advances this area of inquiry by developing a novel approach to studying social inequality, natural resources, and scientific knowledge. The research is designed to identify communities and watersheds that have received the most and least public investment in watershed monitoring, and to explain the reasons for this variation, using both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis. The research design involves a survey of volunteer watershed monitoring groups, key informant interviews with regulatory scientists, academic researchers, and environmental activists, and socio-spatial analysis of the distribution of knowledge investments (resources dedicated to watershed monitoring). Specifically, a geographic information system is being built that will be used to determine whether investments in water quality monitoring are associated with socio-demographic variables such as income, racial composition, and education levels. The project design also includes comparative case studies of communities where watershed monitoring is either nonexistent or intensive. In the second year of the project (2012-2013), I will examine how historical efforts to support the protection of particular watersheds, typically led by social elites, established the institutions that are facilitating present-day efforts to track and respond to the impacts of natural gas development.

In addition to answering questions about why environmental knowledge is unevenly distributed, the project critically assesses the turn to voluntary associations (or “citizen science”) as a source of environmental knowledge. Do volunteer water monitoring projects help to distribute environmental knowledge more evenly, or are these projects spatially distributed in ways that reinforce existing social inequalities? Data collection and analysis is still ongoing, but preliminary findings appear to support the latter hypothesis.

To date, results of my research have been presented in several venues. An article, co-authored with a postdoctoral researcher, Simona Perry, appears in the Spring 2012 issue of the Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum. Conference presentations include the 2011 meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, DC, the Society for Freshwater Science in May 2012, and the Multi-State Marcellus Shale Research Conference in May 2012. In addition, several publications are
planned, including at least two articles aimed at top-tier sociology and environmental studies journals, as well as a book, to be written during the 2013-14 academic year.

There are significant public policy implications of this research. The findings will be useful to regulatory agencies, funding bodies, academic research institutions, and community groups, as they assess the effectiveness of current monitoring practices and prioritize areas for future knowledge investments. Furthermore, by documenting the extent of private knowledge investments and analyzing their outcomes, this study will generate knowledge that will be essential to any efforts to strengthen the capacity of volunteer watershed groups. Therefore, in addition to conventional publishing of research findings in scholarly journals in the fields of STS, sociology, and environmental studies, results of this research are being shared in a variety of public and online venues. This project also is likely to contribute to the fields of freshwater conservation science and aquatic ecosystem studies. Several natural scientists and environmental regulators working these domains have already expressed interest in the findings.

**Future Directions**

By developing better ways to document and explain the uneven distribution of resources to support environmental science, my current research trajectory responds to the twin challenges of environmental sustainability and social inequality. In the next five years I will continue to develop the innovative set of research methods that I am now applying to the case of water pollution from natural gas development. I am seeking funding to apply this research approach to analyze the distribution of public and private investments in air quality monitoring. Additionally, I am seeking opportunities for research collaborations with environmental scientists and community groups, building on the analytical framework I have developed in my ongoing research. My aim with this type of work is to expand the definition of "environmental justice" (an idea now embraced by the Environmental Protection Agency and other government agencies) to mean not only fairness in the distribution of exposures to environmental hazards, but also equity of access to environmental knowledge.
Service Statement

I take pride in the service I have offered to my department, school, university, and discipline in the last several years. While service is not always highly visible, I find it gratifying to contribute to efforts that support and enhance the communities in which I work.

I provide service to my scholarly communities through professional associations. In particular, I served as a Council Member for the Science, Knowledge, and Technology section of the American Sociological Association, from 2008 to 2011. In my capacity as a Council Member, I participated in several paper award committees, reading and selecting papers for national recognition. I have also supported the discipline by preparing a nomination package for a candidate for the American Sociological Association's Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award in 2011. Additionally, I am a member of the New York State Sustainability Education Working Group, serving on the Expert Panel since 2011.

I also provide a great deal of service to my scholarly community through peer review. I have reviewed article manuscripts for eighteen different journals, reviewing, on average, eight manuscripts each year. I have also reviewed a book proposal for Routledge. Additionally, I regularly review proposals for the National Science Foundation. In 2011, I served on the Spring 2011 Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grant Merit Review Panel for the NSF, reviewing sixteen proposals.

I am involved in Institute-wide service. I am currently an active member of the Rensselaer Interdisciplinary Excellence in Sustainability Studies Task Force, a committee that aims to strengthen research and teaching in sustainability studies across the Institute.

I have provided the following service for the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute:

- HASS Faculty Council and Curriculum Committee, Fall 2008-Fall 2010.
- Rensselaer Interdisciplinary Excellence in Sustainability Studies Task Force, Spring 2012-present.

Highlights of this work include participation in the HASS Dean Search in 2009. As a member of the Faculty Council, I served on a committee that wrote interview questions, interviewed the candidates, and wrote up summaries of the candidates’ strengths and weaknesses. Our committee also organized a petition requesting public job talks by the candidates. When the job talks took place, we collected evaluations from the faculty, students, and staff that attended and compiled the data into reports about each candidate. Finally, I regularly write recommendation letters for students.

For the Science and Technology Studies Department, I have served on the following committees:

- Policy Exam Committee, Fall 2007.
- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Fall 2008 – present.
- Sustainability Studies Working Group, Fall 2008-present.
- Colloquium Committee, Faculty Liaison, Fall 2008 – 2011
- Ad Hoc Graduate Exam Reform Committee, 2011.
- Comprehensive Exam Committee, Fall 2011-present (currently committee chair).
- Faculty Search Committee, Spring-Summer 2012.
- Admissions Committee, 2012-2013.
- STS BS Program Steering Committee (chair), Spring 2102-present.
Highlights of this work include efforts by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, in 2010, to respond to the request by the administration that all programs carry out course-level and program-level self-assessments. I attended Institute-wide assessment meetings, tailored the course assessment form to our department, helped to compose STS program objectives, and surveyed the faculty about which courses met those objectives. In my role on the Sustainability Studies Working Group, I contributed to the effort to develop a new STS major and minor in Sustainability Studies. This work has included substantial curricular development efforts as well as student mentoring and ongoing work to strengthen the new degree program.

Additionally, in 2011, I contributed to the effort to restructure the STS graduate exam process by serving on an ad hoc committee that worked in parallel to the graduate curriculum committee and helped to facilitate a consensus on the new exam process. I am now chair of the Comprehensive Exam Committee, which reviewed six comprehensive exams in September 2012.

I assisted the effort to initiate a search for a new Department Head and junior faculty in 2012, drafting position descriptions with the input of the STS faculty. I recently was appointed to lead the Steering Committee for the STS BS Program, which will undertake a comprehensive review of the STS major curriculum. I have also agreed to serve as a member of the Graduate Admissions Committee for 2012-2013.

In summary, I am highly active in providing service, both at Rensselaer and in my broader scholarly community. I take pride in my ability to facilitate group work and build consensus. These skills have been highly useful in my contributions to advancing Sustainability Studies and other initiatives on this campus and in my discipline.
C. Briefly Describe Your Current Research Interests

I have a PhD in Science and Technology Studies and conduct interdisciplinary social science research on contemporary reform initiatives in engineering practice, engineering education, and the engineering profession. My research focuses especially on engineers’ efforts to integrate social analysis, social responsibility, and sustainability into their technical work. A key finding of my research is that socially and environmentally oriented reforms in technical professions require not only ethical commitment but also organizational innovation and epistemological transformation. My work contributes most directly to the emerging field of Engineering Studies, but also to Technology Policy and Science and Technology Studies (STS) more broadly.

My scholarship seeks to answer these broad questions:
- What material, organizational, institutional, and conceptual approaches have engineering reformers taken and why?
- How do engineering reformers understand the relationship—ideally and in practice—between technical knowledge and contextual or “social” expertise?
- How do engineering reformers identify where change is needed/possible, and what constraints do they accept as given?
- How are the institutional and professional spaces of engineering impacted by reformers’ efforts?

To answer these questions, I have studied reform efforts in a range of empirical contexts, including Sri Lanka’s energy-and-development community; engineering education in the US and abroad; the international Engineering, Social Justice, and Peace network; and most recently New York’s “clean energy technology” policymaking arena. To understand reformers’ strategies and experiences in each of these contexts, I have employed a combination of social science methodologies, including ethnography, interviews, action research, and policy analysis. I have also sought to apply and adapt insights gained through my research to re-envision and bolster reform efforts. Guided by this goal, my work is highly collaborative.

There are three main thrusts of my research agenda:

1. Engineering for Development in the Global South

My research project, *Appropriate Expertise in Sri Lanka’s Renewable Energy Community*, builds on 11 months of ethnographic research on the Energy Forum of Sri Lanka, a small non-governmental organization advocating renewable energy technologies and managed primarily by engineers. This project explores the intersection of expertise and democratization in Sri Lanka’s energy-and-development sector and develops my concept of “appropriate expertise.” Appropriate expertise recasts and updates insights gained from the appropriate technology movement by shifting the object of analysis away from specific technologies and their characteristics and toward the relationships among development stakeholders, with special attention to the roles played by technical experts (2004). A key finding of this research (2007) is that, as one moves across Sri Lanka’s energy-and-development sector, different knowledge domains (e.g., technical, financial, agricultural) have differential status, which policy interventions must counteract if they are to be effective. Another finding (2011a) is that technical experts, primarily engineers, occupy a unique position in Sri Lanka between (elite) policy makers and (grassroots) rural communities, enabling them to stake out an alternative approach to traditional top-down and bottom-up development reforms. In collaboration with a colleague doing similar research in Nicaragua, I have shown (2010a) how technological imperatives tend to displace social, economic, and political goals in engineering-for-development projects and provide a framework for thinking through and correcting this tendency. This last article was published in *Engineering Studies*, the flagship journal of the Engineering Studies community, and was picked up by dozens of academic and development websites. The article also led to an invited editorial piece (2010b) in *PE Magazine*, published by the National Society of Professional Engineers.
2. Engineering Education Reform

Another thrust of my research agenda investigates engineering education reform, primarily in the US but also in Europe, Australia, and Asia. Here, I have two projects, each of which takes a different tack on social-technical integration. The first project is Pedagogical and Curricular Dimensions of Interdisciplinary Design, which explores reforms that seek to increase the prominence of design in undergraduate engineering programs. This research area connects to my role as Director of Rensselaer’s Programs in Design and Innovation (PDI) and includes a publication assessing the PDI model (2008a) as well as several international presentations on interdisciplinary design pedagogy and curricular structures. A major finding of this project is that, while interdisciplinary design programs routinely include engineering dimensions, business dimensions, and creative design approaches, social sciences are frequently absent and most difficult to integrate. My scholarship has shown that effective integration of social sciences in engineering design requires continuous, real-time oscillation between social and technical facets of both problem and solution, which runs counter to the disciplinary division of labor prevalent in most engineering (and social science) curricula and courses. A second, related research project on engineering education reform is Sustainability for Engineering and Liberal Education Integration. This project leverages contemporary interest in sustainability among students to create an entry point for critical social analysis, showing how such skills are essential to environmentally responsible engineering. My work has shown how efforts to address sustainability issues facilitate integration of technical and social dimensions of engineering work in hands-on design-build projects (2008b) as well as through a range of curricular approaches (2009b). Sustainability thus operates as a “threshold concept” for engineers grappling to understand what STS scholars call the “social shaping” of technology (in press). The latest contribution of this project, under review, is a comparison of undergraduate engineering program accreditation requirements in four national contexts (Australia, China, Sweden, and the US), which will highlight the different ways sustainability and social competencies are articulated and mandated in each context.

3. Reform of the Engineering Profession

A third major research thrust is on engineers seeking to reform engineering as a profession. The project, Engineering and Social Justice: Institutional and Conceptual Reform, investigates engineers attempting to challenge and change the ways engineering is practiced, understood, and institutionalized by directing attention to questions of social justice. In this project, my contributions are most diverse and include both analysis of reform efforts within the engineering and social justice community (2011c) as well as direct scholarly participation in those reform efforts. For example, a recent collaborative article (in press) extends understandings of the nature and degree of the military’s influence on engineering thinking and practice and how assumptions derived from that influence counteract efforts to open up engineering epistemologies. I have also played a leading role in institutionalizing Engineering, Social Justice, and Peace as a professional community in its own right (e.g., clarifying the organization’s mission, formalizing its structure and decision-making processes, creating a website, and initiating and editing its new academic journal). Most recently, I have extended my research on professional reform to include engineers working on renewable energy technologies and their efforts to align energy policy making with technology research agendas, particularly in response to concerns over climate change. As the new Capital District Hub Coordinator for the New York Energy Policy Institute, I have a unique opportunity to investigate how engineering researchers, policy scholars, and policy makers in New York State articulate, prioritize, and seek to align the social and technical dimensions of “clean energy technology” innovation. With this project, Technical and Policy Dimensions of Clean Energy Innovation, I plan to deepen understanding of the policy dimensions and implications of engineering professional reform efforts.
Creative Capital. Denied.

2011

Flaherty Seminar programming proposal. Denied.
Creative Capital. Denied in third round.
Anonymous Was a Woman. Nominated but denied.
Smithsonian Residency. Nominated but denied.
Eyebeam Residency. Denied.
Mead Festival. Denied.
Melbourne International Film Festival Denied.
MoMA Doc Fortnight Denied.

2010

New York State Council on the Arts (application withdrawn)
Creative Capital. Denied in final round.

2009

TOOLS book proposals submitted to publishers including Duke University Press (denied),
University of Michigan (offer made pending review), Intellect Books (a series of Chicago

2008

Creative Capital submitted proposal for Trans-Tamagotchi project. Denied in final round.
RAMP UP Career Advancement Award. Denied.
Application to UC PRESS for publication of TOOLS publication. Denied.

2007

ReNew Rockefeller Fellowship nominated for New Media grant. Denied.
Guggenheim Foundation fellowship. Denied.
New York Foundation for the Arts Fellowship. Denied.
National Endowment for the Arts TOOLS Part 2. Denied.
Creative Capital submitted proposal for Trans-Tamagotchi project. Denied.
Application to MIT PRESS for publication of TOOLS publication. Denied.

2006

ReNew Rockefeller Fellowship nominated for New Media grant. Denied.
WARHOL FOUNDATION proposal for TOOLS Festival w/ EMPAC. Denied.

2005

NYSCA application for TOOLS issue of FELIX. Denied.
Application to MINNESOTA PRESS for publication of FELIX series, and TOOLS publication.
Denied.
Creative Capital submitted proposal for wired workshop. Denied.
Interactive Gallery, proposed group installation with Sarah Smiley, Pauline Oliveros. Denied.

2004

Creative Capital submitted proposal for video production. Denied.
WARHOL FOUNDATION. Proposal submitted for FELIX. Denied.

2003

New York Foundation for the Arts Video Fellowship. Denied.
Guggenheim Foundation, NYC, NY. Denied.
Daniel Langlois Foundation Individual Artist grant. Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Denied.
Wellcome Trust and Gallery Ten for the exhibition/commission “Four Plus: Writing DNA”. Denied.
World View Residency Program through the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council for residency
in World Trade Towers, NYC. Application destroyed in Tower Seven of WTC collapse,

C. Briefly describe your current research interests

Research Statement

My research directions are twofold:

• One line of my research focuses on media art history, and the complex ways economics, culture
  and technological development have contributed to particular moments in video art and
experimental film in the United States. By looking at multiple histories, technological challenges, and networks of artists and engineers I have been able to demonstrate how particular media art tools have enabled particular types of work and moments of expansion.

- My research also focuses on questions at the intersections of art and science and in particular our engagement with and manipulation of other species and living beings. My work reflects upon the use of bodies in medical and scientific research, and the bio-politics of creating living art. Is interspecies collaboration possible and can we resolve the question of communication between animal and human? And how can we encourage new paradigms of cooperation and redirect the military ideology used in describing cellular interactions, such as with the human immune system? I use my artwork to visually provoke and stimulate the audience to think and ask about the philosophical and ethical questions surrounding these issues.

In the last few years, supported by the award of a Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship, my "bio-art" research has been focused on the materials and experimental systems used in biology and science. This work builds on my previous work in feminist documentary film focused on the pharmaceutical and medical industries, and is theoretically influenced by the philosopher/biologist Donna Haraway and the Critical Art Ensemble collective. In this new work, I directly engage with living systems, and biology, dealing with themes of life, death, and biotechnology. The work raises, and provides opportunities for audiences to reflect on complex ethical questions about death, and the ways life forms should be manipulated.

My research interests have been grounded in art, culture and technology. My formal training as an artist is in film and video production, and also in sculpture. Throughout my career, my work has explored conceptions of the body, biology, medicine and science, stimulating critical thinking about these areas. I have produced films, museum installations, performances and sculptures. I’ve also curated many collections of art; some curatorial projects have helped codify new bodies of work; others have deepened historical perspective by presenting the history of video art and experimental film, and the development of technical tools that enabled that history.

Projects

Editorial projects

I have been involved in the media arts field since the late 1970s. I studied experimental film and video with pioneers of the field including Patrick Clancy, Hollis Frampton, Steina Vasulka and Tony Conrad. It is from this involvement in early video art that I am currently in collaboration with the Experimental Television Center,

---

2 The term "bioart" refers to the practice by contemporary artists working with living systems and use biological techniques and materials to produce their art.
Owego, NY (founded 1971), editing a book publication entitled *The Emergence of Video Processing Tools: Television Becoming Ungheld* (manuscript at publisher, Intellect Books, UK -- in association with Chicago University Press, forthcoming 2013), about the development of video art imaging tools. In 2007 this project was awarded a National Endowment for the Arts grant.

*The Emergence of Video Processing Tools* examines the development of early video tools and systems designed and built by artists and technologists during the late 1960s and '70s. Based on the archival collection of the Experimental Television Center, this historically significant media arts organization was dedicated to the creation of work using new electronic media technologies, and to preserving the history of media arts. Essays examine the intersection of art and science, and look at collaborations among inventors, designers, and artists trying to create new video tools to capture and manipulate images in fascinating and revolutionary ways. The contributors include "video pioneers" who have been active since the emergence of the aesthetic, and technologists who continue to design, build, and hack media tools. The book also looks at contemporary tool makers and the relationship between these new tools and the past. Video and media production is a growing area of interest in art and this collection will be an indispensable guide to its origins and its future.

**Art Projects**

Since the 1970s I have produced experimental video works, both documentary and performative with the support of grants from the National Endowment of the Arts and the New York State Council on the Arts. In many of my works, I examine the medical/pharmaceutical industry from a feminist and personal perspective -- due to chronic illnesses of my own. Works included *I Need Your Full Cooperation* (1989), which examines women's relationship to modern medicine through its dramatic adaptation of the nineteenth-century story "The Yellow Wallpaper" by Charlotte Perkins Gilman and *Underexposed: Temple of the Fetus* (1993-94), a depiction of how our perceptions of new reproductive technologies are shaped by the media.

I also produced the commissioned project *Embracing Animal* (2005-06) a mixed media and sculpture installation with live rats, which was commissioned for the exhibition "Becoming Animal" at the Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art. In this installation I enriched the living situation for live transgenic laboratory rats, using the particular rats created to develop pharmaceutical drugs to treat the autoimmune diseases from which I suffer (http://www.embracinganimal.com).

In 2010, I was awarded a fellowship by the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation for the *Vampire Studies Group* and my artistic research in biology and art. In 2011, I was invited to participate in a tribute to SymbioticA on its tenth anniversary, by the Science Gallery, at Trinity College in Dublin, Ireland. As part of an exhibition entitled *VISCERAL: The Living Art Experiment*, I exhibited the project *Blood Wars*, in which I performed lab procedures in front of the public, inside a glass-fronted laboratory built within the gallery.
Another recent project is a video documentary entitled *Death Down Under*, documenting a SymbioticA project about death and decay, and eco-friendly or “green” burials. *Death Down Under* was shot in Western Australia and follows the collaboration of a young fashion designer/artist, Pia Interlandi, and a forensic scientist, Ian Dadour. *Death Down Under* was screened at the Experimental Media and Performing Arts Center (EMPAC) at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in March of this year, and at the International Society of Electronic Arts in September (ISEA2012: Machine Wilderness), in Albuquerque, NM. It is a project, among others, embraced by the growing field of ‘Animal Studies,’ a cross-disciplinary field that encompasses film studies, biology, anthropology, zoology, gender studies, and contemporary art. There are a growing number of Animal Studies programs now at academic institutions such as New York University, Wesleyan University, Michigan State University and other universities around the country and the world.

**Bio-art at Rensselaer and In the Troy Community**

In 2007, Robert Linhardt (PI), Glenn Monastersky, Richard Pell and myself (co-PIs) were awarded an EMPAC SEED grant to begin the “BioArt Initiative” 2007-2008 (http://bioart.arts.rpi.edu/). The BioArt Initiative at Rensselaer was a collaborative research project between Rensselaer’s Arts Department and the Center for Biotecnology and Interdisciplinary Studies (CBIS). This curatorial project explored how artists and scientists can develop collaborative work together, and foster new ways of conducting research.

Since that project, I continue to develop art and science research in collaboration with the Troy community. I have a pending National Endowment for the Arts proposal submitted through Media Alliance and The Sanctuary for Independent Media for a series of community workshops with artists to address a number of important community issues for the Troy region – such as soil remediation, river pollution, community gardening, DNA analysis of prison victims and grappling with the onslaught of synthetic biology. If this grant is awarded, a series of workshops will be conducted that would lead towards the development of a community urban nature center and bio-art lab, that would also serve as a space for do-it-yourself biology, interdisciplinary arts, physical computing development and open software.

In summary, over the past ten years my artistic and scholarly research has flourished at Rensselaer. I find the environment both supportive and intellectually stimulating. I look forward to being able to continue to develop new projects with old and new partners, presenting new challenges and questions through my efforts.

VII. **Service**

A. **Service to University**

**Service Statement**
Since I came to Rensselaer in 2002 I have been heavily engaged in service for the Institute, faculty and students. I have also offered service to the arts profession as well as the broader public to build awareness of the importance of arts and culture.

Service to Rensselaer

In 2002, I was appointed the first Graduate Director in the Department of the Arts at RPI. As a result of this Directorship – which I held for two years – I was able to immerse myself in graduate pedagogy and along with my fellow faculty members, help shape the graduate program within the department. As Graduate Director, I was a leader in establishing the protocol for graduate student admissions, and developing the guidelines for determining student excellence through biannual exhibitions and critiques of graduate student work.

Immediately after serving as Graduate Director I was appointed Head of the Arts Department from 2004-2008. As Head I led the department to a stable and fruitful future. During this period, the department developed new curricular degrees, including the PhD in Electronic Arts. We have successfully graduated four students since then, with four more in progress. The interdepartmental Games and Simulation Arts and Sciences (GSAS) degree was also developed under my leadership, along with extensive, cooperative input from the faculty. All of these activities allowed for greater development of Arts curriculum and the articulation of our interdisciplinary goals.

While Head of Arts I was able to form alliances for our department with the two new and major centers on campus, the Experimental Media and Performing Arts Center (EMPAC) and The Center for Biology and Interdisciplinary Studies (CBIS), while also furthering intellectual and creative research.

I worked closely with the staff of EMPAC as they geared up for their 2008 opening. I participated in the search committee for the first EMPAC curatorial hire of Kathleen Forde. I worked proactively to establish community links between the Arts department and the newly created EMPAC, inviting EMPAC curators to participate in our end of semester graduate critiques, organizing and hosting gatherings bringing EMPAC together with Arts faculty.

I also developed alliances with scientists in the Center for Biotechnology and Interdisciplinary Studies. During this period, Robert Linhardt, Glenn Monastersky Richard Pell and I successfully applied for and received an EMPAC SEED grant to begin the “BioArt Initiative” 2007-2008, with Robert Linhardt as PI, Assistant Professor Rich Pelland I as co-PIs. The initiative brought together RPI’s cutting-edge biotechnology resources with its world-class electronic arts community sponsoring Artists-in-Residents at the CBIS facility. For 18 months we curated rotating exhibitions, hosted “mixers” between artists and scientists, invited speakers and artist residents to CBIS. This project explored how artists and scientists can
develop collaborative work together, and foster new ways of conducting research. The artwork hanging in CBIS today was purchased from artist Patricia Olynyk to initiate the development of a permanent collection.

Service to My Profession, The Arts
I have been actively involved with the media arts professions and community since the early 1980s. While I lived in NYC I served on numerous Board of Directors for non-profit media arts organizations, which I continue to do this day. These organizations include film and video presenting organizations, such as the International Film Seminars (overseeing the Robert Flaherty Seminar) and the MIX NYC Gay and Lesbian Film Festival. These organizations support experimental film and video productions by giving a public venue for the works to be seen, encouraging dialogue around aesthetic and thematic issues brought up in the works. I have also been involved in programming independent film/video works on public television for both WNET and WMHT to establish a broad audience for independent media.

Service to the Community within University Reach
Currently I am President of the Board of Directors for “Media Alliance” which sponsors the community based The Sanctuary for Independent Media (Troy). This organization is advancing independent media through presentation series, offering hands-on media workshops that teach media production skills, and community based activities to build up the community of North Troy. As a result of their seeding efforts, other arts and community organizations, such as the Collard City Growers who work on an open community garden, and the Troy Bike Rescue, providing bikes and bicycle repair workshops to anyone in the community are developing the North Troy area. Prestigious arts projects are blossoming, with support from a National Endowment for the Arts “Our Town and Community Arts” award, as well as support from the New York State Council on the Arts, foundation funding and collaborations with WMHT, RPI and others. Because of growing connections with local groups such as the Missing Link Street Ministry, new collaborations are opening up directly on the block. The profile of the neighborhood is changing thanks to the efforts of these vital groups. Wherever I have lived, I have been committed to building a strong community of independent media makers with unique and diverse voices.

I see Rensselaer as part of a global community, and through my service practice I aspire to create situations where students, faculty and colleagues can develop networks for working together, strengthen their communication and articulate their visions and goals for the future.

1. University, school, and departmental committees and dates for each.

2012-2013

Department: iEAR Presents Committee
III. Teaching

Teaching Statement

I teach an array of courses focused on digital filmmaking, often with a topical focus on the sciences, biology and ecology. I also have developed curriculum and advised students in these areas, for undergraduate, MFA and PhD programs. The goal of my teaching is to enable students to think critically and creatively, using a wide array of conceptual and technical tools in independent research and arts production. I taught for fourteen years prior to starting at RPI in 2002, developing and expanding the video area for the Visual Arts Program at Princeton University, and teaching video production and theory at Cooper Union, School of Visual Arts, New York University, University of California at San Diego, and Pratt Institute in NYC.

In the past ten years at RPI, I have advised thirteen successful MFA graduates with another currently in progress. I have served on the committees of an additional twenty-five MFA students. Currently, I co-chair committees for two Arts PhD students, and am on the committee of one STS PhD student. I have been on the committee of three completed PhD degrees (two Arts, one Science Technology Studies). I have also mentored numerous undergraduate students. I have taken great pride in watching my students go on to garner some of the top university teaching jobs in the field, win awards, fellowships and grants, and exhibit their art works worldwide.

The video classes that I teach include all levels of video production, from introductory to advanced classes. I have developed courses on documentary, narrative and installation, as well as classes that utilize experimental synthesizing tools and editing techniques. My new courses introduce students to the growing field of bio-art. I have worked on committees for undergraduate education development such as EMAC (Electronic Media and Communication), GSAS (Games Simulation and Science), and currently am on the Rensselaer Liberal Arts Task Force to bring a unified focus and direction to the required HASS courses for all undergraduate students at Rensselaer. I served for two years as the first Director of Rensselaer’s MFA program, and was then involved in further curriculum development in the four years that I served as Department Head.
Developing Student Vision, Skills, Voice and Critical Thinking

Working with technology, art and culture has allowed me to develop a cross-disciplinary understanding of various methodologies. For example, when I teach filmmaking, we use a wide range of skills that need to be honed and developed, including team building, writing, organizing and preproduction planning, cinematography, field sound recording, editing, creating special effects, distribution, and promotion. These are all unique areas of problem solving. Assisting students to 'find their own voice' -- and vision - is key. For example, I taught a course entitled "Strategic Manifesto: Curatorial Practices" in which I asked the students to formulate ideas for exhibitions. Two of these exhibitions went on to be presented at EXIT Art Gallery in NYC, one also producing a book. I have also developed and taught a class that combines awareness of sustainable practices, biology, arts and ethics called "Eco Chic: Living Art." This class, directly related to my research, has allowed me to reach out to other disciplinary areas of the university, such as the School of Architecture and Professor Zbigniew Oksiuta, an internationally renowned artist working with "living architectures."

Teaching in an Interdisciplinary Environment

Teaching at Rensselaer in an interdisciplinary electronic arts department has given me the opportunity to interact with a unique and hybrid group of artists and students. I teach students technical and critical skills hand-in-hand, and I support a marriage of theory with arts practice. These joint skills are essential for any artist or producer to survive. Artists must learn how to write grants, contextualize their projects within the greater art and interdisciplinary fields to constantly re-evaluate their work and its effect in the world in order to genuinely communicate with their chosen communities.

I introduce my students to as many influences and resources as possible to give them the tools to ask their own questions, develop critical inquiry and to conduct original research. I encourage community engagement, looking to local communities at large for inspiration.

---

1 The student ideas were taken up and fostered by Prof. Mary Anne Staniszewski, an RPI Arts faculty member and board member of EXIT Art. Prof. Staniszewski worked with two PhD candidates: Dara Greenwald, presenting Signs of Change, and Boryana Rossa, presenting Corpus Extremus.
strongly believe in advising, and mentorship and pride myself on the fact that many of my students stay in close touch with me after they graduate, asking for guidance and advice on their life decisions and developing lifelong relationships with me as peers and colleagues. A great percentage of my former students have gone on to work in academia themselves, carrying on the pedagogical traditions introduced to them during their time at the Arts department at RPI.

A. **Courses**  
(List the number and title of each course taught and approximate number of students in each course.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Eval. Scores / No. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Science Fictions 5/out of 5 13 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-6967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-4966</td>
<td>Science Fictions 4.5/5 26 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-1962-01</td>
<td>Digital Filmmaking 4/5 26 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-1962-02</td>
<td>Digital Filmmaking 3.92/5 26 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Independent Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Intermediate Video 4.67/5 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-4968</td>
<td>Eco Chic: Living Art 5.0/5 6 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-6968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Adv. Video: Expanded Video na 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-4964/6964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-2010</td>
<td>Intermediate Video na 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No student evaluations in ARTS this semester due to an administrative error in the Dean’s office 3 Independent Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Eco Chic: Living Art 4.8/5 6 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-4968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-6963</td>
<td>Rethinking Documentary 4.8/5 15 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-4040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Speculative Fictions 4.3/5 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-6963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS-2010</td>
<td>Intermediate Video 3.8/5 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>No teaching – Sabbatical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>No teaching – Sabbatical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Teaching Evaluation

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Department of XXXX

Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number / Course Title</th>
<th>Student Evaluations (raw scores)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall XXXX</td>
<td>Responses/Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring XXXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall XXXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring XXXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate assembles dossier; compiles list of suggested evaluators; meets with Department Head to review case.

Mid-Spring Semester prior to December BoT Meeting; Late Summer/Early Fall prior to May BoT Meeting (7-9 months prior to final decision).

Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure meets to discuss case and vote to move case forward. List of recommended evaluators is generated and forwarded to Department Head.

Department Head selects and forwards list of evaluators to HASS Dean, who disseminates the dossier, contacts evaluators and disseminates dossier.

If case is not moved forward, candidate is formally notified and advised of appeals process.

Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure meets to discuss case and vote to move case forward. List of recommended evaluators is generated and forwarded to Department Head.

Department Head selects and forwards list of evaluators to HASS Dean, who disseminates the dossier, contacts evaluators and disseminates dossier.

If case is not moved forward, candidate is formally notified and advised of appeals process.

Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure meets to discuss case and vote to move case forward. List of recommended evaluators is generated and forwarded to Department Head.

Department Head selects and forwards list of evaluators to HASS Dean, who disseminates the dossier, contacts evaluators and disseminates dossier.

If case is not moved forward, candidate is formally notified and advised of appeals process.

Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure meets to discuss case and vote to move case forward. List of recommended evaluators is generated and forwarded to Department Head.

Department Head selects and forwards list of evaluators to HASS Dean, who disseminates the dossier, contacts evaluators and disseminates dossier.

If case is not moved forward, candidate is formally notified and advised of appeals process.

Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure meets to discuss case and vote to move case forward. List of recommended evaluators is generated and forwarded to Department Head.

Department Head selects and forwards list of evaluators to HASS Dean, who disseminates the dossier, contacts evaluators and disseminates dossier.

If case is not moved forward, candidate is formally notified and advised of appeals process.