

A Look at Representative Templates for Professionally Oriented Faculty Reward Systems in Other Service Professions

G. R. Bertoline,¹ D. R. Depew,¹ M. J. Dyrenfurth,¹ A. L. McHenry,² E. M. DeLoatch,³ P. Y. Lee,⁴
D. D. Dunlap,⁵ S. J. Tricamo,⁶ D. A. Keating,⁷ T. G. Stanford⁷

Purdue University¹ / Arizona State University East² / Morgan State University³
California Polytechnic State University⁴ / Western Carolina University⁵
New Jersey Institute of Technology⁶ / University of South Carolina⁷

Abstract

This is the second of three papers prepared for a special panel session of the National Collaborative Task Force on Engineering Graduate Education Reform that addresses the need for reform of faculty reward systems to advance professional education for creative engineering practice and technology leadership. This paper examines representative templates for professionally oriented faculty reward systems in other service professions in order to identify the commonality which should be reflected any faculty reward system for professional engineering education. As a result, three unifying themes among other professions have emerged which address teaching, professional scholarship, and service/engagement in practice.

1. Introduction

To be successful in any academic department, it is necessary to survive the promotion and tenure process. Success is based on successful growth and contributions in teaching, research, and service. Promotion and tenure at universities that emphasize theoretical research expect faculty to engage in scholarly research with the goal of finding new knowledge. This criterion is fine and has worked well in many disciplines, such as science, engineering, and social science. However, the proposed reform of engineering graduate education would change the emphasis of the work of faculty from pure research to other forms of scholarship. Although this would be a new to most engineering colleges at universities, it is not new to other service professions, such as clinical medicine and law schools. To develop a promotion and tenure system that aligns well with the goals of a reformed engineering graduate education program, it is helpful to look at other professionally oriented faculty reward systems as a possible guide to develop a system to reward faculty.

1.1 Law School Faculty Promotion and Tenure Criteria

One method of determining the promotion and tenure process that would be necessary for engineering graduate education that is more practically oriented as proposed by this reform would be by looking at other professional disciplines, such as law and the preparation of lawyers. Typically, law schools do not expect their faculty to be engaged in theoretical research in the classic sense as you would have in engineering and science. Their research might be related to law review articles for example.

1.2 Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

After reviewing a number of promotion and tenure criteria and procedure documents from law schools, there was a relatively consistent theme and criteria used for promotion and tenure. Promotion and tenure committees are not bound by limiting quantitative criteria but considered the overall quality of the teaching, scholarship and service of each person under review and the contributions of that person to the

institutional mission. There are particular factors that were taken into account in each of the areas to be considered.

(a) Teaching: The committee considered student evaluations of the faculty's teaching and they conducted periodic visits to the classrooms of each person under consideration. Satisfactory performance in the classroom is a prerequisite to reappointment, promotion or tenure. The following factors can be considered when evaluating a candidate's teaching: ability to communicate; preparation for class; breadth and depth of knowledge relevant to the fields of teaching; thoughtful organization of individual class sessions and overall course content; ability to stimulate students; ability to direct student work inside and outside the classroom; ability to devise methods of determining a student's progress and achievement appropriate to the courses taught; and accessibility to students and demonstrated interest and involvement in their welfare.

(b) Scholarship: In reviewing a candidate's scholarship, the committee considers the specific contributions to legal scholarship of the candidate's major works, the significance of the works, and the quality of their execution. The committee also takes into account the relative standing of the candidate in comparison with other scholars of the same generation who are doing comparable work. In addition, the committee considers how the candidate's work contributes to the advancement of the mission of the Law School and the University. Although scholarship may take many forms, a candidate is expected to present for consideration publications of serious independent work that constitute significant contributions to learning in the candidate's area of work as measured by national, or, where appropriate, international standards. Each candidate is expected to provide evidence of a continuing and serious commitment to the scholarly enterprise. The works to be considered may take many forms, such as books, law review articles, essays, or book reviews. Teaching materials, such as casebooks, may be considered if they contribute substantially to the teaching and development of knowledge in a particular field.

Illustrations of appropriate forms of scholarship include the following: books; articles; monographs; book reviews of significant length and scope; research project reports such as those under the auspices of the American Bar Foundation or under contract research; publications of learned societies such as ALI, ABA, bar associations, the AALS, or the various judicial and administrative conferences; publications resulting from professional service, including the briefs in law reform litigation as might result, for example, through participation with legal aid or similar welfare services, the conduct of arbitrations, court appointments, or acting as a master; publications stemming from governmental appointments; and teaching materials that are substantial and original.

(c) Service: The committee also will consider each candidate's service to the Law School, to the University, and to the Profession through, for example, work on committees and as a member of professional organizations. The University's central mission is academic in nature and for purposes of reappointment, promotion, or tenure the review of service should focus on activities that support or advance the mission.

The most common examples within the institution are: service on Law School and University committees, service as an advisor to student organizations, assistance to co-curricular activities, and participation in Law School and University sponsored programs and organizations. Outside activities will be evaluated on those that draw on one's professional abilities in service to the community and the profession. These may be manifested through activities of a bar association or another professional organization or governmental or community organizations.

2.0 Clinical Medicine Promotion and Tenure Criteria

Another professional-based discipline to evaluate for their promotion and tenure process is clinical medicine. This field of study in many cases requires the faculty to teach in addition to their normal

patient load. The clinical track differs from the academic track in that excellence in teaching and clinical service may be weighted more heavily than achievement in research.

An example of how clinical faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure is found in the guidelines created for clinical faculty at New York Medical College. At New York Medical College, to be successful, the medical school must have a faculty that excels in research, education, and professional service. Full-time faculty members are evaluated for promotion, and in two of the four career tracks for tenure, by four sets of standards. These standards are designed to recognize and reward faculty performance and career development in the four areas of importance to the school: education, research, clinical and community service, and professional leadership.

3.0 Conclusions

In reviewing a number of promotion and tenure procedure documents for professionally oriented faculty from a wide variety of public and private and large and small universities, the promotion and tenure procedures are fairly uniform. Most procedures include the appointment of a faculty committee to review the candidate's documents using guidelines outlined in the criteria for promotion and tenure. It is expected that faculty are good classroom teachers based on student evaluations and observations of their teaching by their colleagues, they exhibit some amount of service to their discipline through professional or public service, and they engage in scholarship by engaging in studying, criticizing, and extending knowledge in their special field of competence. In all three areas, assessment takes into account both performance to date and prospects for continued excellence and growth.

References

Emory Law School *Procedures and Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*, June 1, 1997, http://www.emory.edu/PROVOST/tenurepromotion_files/tp_law.htm

Washington and Lee University, *Law school faculty appointment, tenure, and promotion procedures*, <http://thecollege.wlu.edu/administration/handbook/law-pt.asp#Evaluation>

Wayne State University Law School *Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Factors*, January 10, 1996, <http://www.law.wayne.edu/docs/p-t-factors-law.pdf>

New York Medical College, *Faculty appointment, promotion and tenure*, <http://www.nymc.edu/fhp/Faculty/online/fapt.asp>

Biography

GARY R. BERTOLINE is professor and associate vice president of information technology, Purdue University.

DENNIS R. DEPEW is professor and dean of the school of technology, Purdue University.

MICHAEL J. DYRENFURTH is assistant dean of graduate studies of the school of technology, Purdue University.

ALBERT L. McHENRY is dean of the college of technology and applied sciences at Arizona State University East, and former Chair of the Engineering Technology Council of the American Society of Engineering Education.

EUGENE M. DELOATCH is dean of the school of engineering, Morgan State University, and a past president of ASEE and member of ASEE Board of Directors.

PETER LEE is dean of the college of engineering, California State Polytechnic University.

DUANE D. DUNLAP is professor and department head of engineering technology, Western Carolina University, and Secretary/Treasurer ASEE-Graduate Studies Division

STEPHEN J. TRICAMO is professor of industrial and manufacturing engineering, and former dean of engineering and technology, New Jersey Institute of Technology.

DONALD A. KEATING is associate professor of mechanical engineering, University of South Carolina, and program chair ASEE-Graduate Studies Division.

THOMAS G. STANFORD is assistant professor of chemical engineering, University of South Carolina.