

ENGINEERING FACULTY HANDBOOK



**College of Engineering
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1226**

Approved: April 30, 1997

Amended: June 4, 1999

Amended: September 4, 2001

Editorial Changes: September 24, 2002 (see Engineering College Advisory Council minutes of 9/24/02)

Amended: February 12, 2004

Amended: April 14, 2006

Amended: May 6, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A—Faculty Development Guide

Introduction	A-1
Faculty Activities	A-2
Teaching and education	A-2
Research and other aspects of scholarship	A-2
Public service	A-3
Institutional service	A-3
Evaluation Standards for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion	A-4
Guidelines for time in rank	A-4
Terminology	A-5
Standards	A-5
Faculty Evaluation Criteria	A-6
Teaching and education	A-6
Research	A-7
Public service	A-8
Institutional service	A-9
Faculty Mentoring	A-10

PART B—Faculty Evaluation Operating Procedures

Introduction	B-1
Review Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion	B-1
Steps involved in the review process	B-1
Timetable	B-2
Composition of the department peer rating committee	B-3
Composition of the college rating committee	B-4
Faculty review criteria	B-4
Faculty review package	B-4
Faculty member's role in developing review package	B-5
Affirmative action issues	B-5
Grievance procedures	B-5
Procedures for College Rating Committee and Academic Administrators Group	B-5
College rating committee	B-6
Academic Administrators Group (aka the Chairs Group)	B-6
Procedures for the Annual Review of Faculty Members	B-7
Rationale	B-7

PART C—Miscellaneous Documents, Forms and Guidelines

Introduction	C-1
Reporting and Recording Faculty Load, Activities, Achievements, and Plans.....	C-2
Introduction	C-2
Operating Principles	C-2
Faculty involvement.....	C-2
Labeling activities	C-2
Annual report format.....	C-2
Outside Work for Pay/Overload Pay.....	C-5
Introduction	C-5
Faculty Involvement in Professional Societies	C-6
Faculty Awards.....	C-7
Introduction	C-7
University Distinguished Professor.....	C-7
University Distinguished Faculty Award	C-8
University Teacher-Scholar Award.....	C-9
MSU Alumni Club of Mid-Michigan Quality in Undergraduate Teaching Award	C-9
College Excellence in Teaching Award	C-9
College Distinguished Scholar Award	C-10
Dean’s Award for Exceptional Service	C-10

PART A—Faculty Development Guide

*This College of Engineering **Faculty Development Guide** serves several complementary purposes with the goal of building a progressively stronger faculty and for rewarding faculty achievement in support of the mission of the College. First, it delineates faculty activities in three categories—teaching and education, research/scholarship, and service; next, it sets forth evaluation standards of faculty candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and, finally, it presents the criteria on which faculty candidates are to be evaluated when they are being considered for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, a merit salary increase, and/or an award. This guide will assist individual members of the faculty as they plan activities, establish priorities, and develop strategies for near-term and long-range professional growth. This guide will also be used by peer rating committees as they evaluate faculty candidates. Finally, this guide will be used by academic administrators as a basis for making/recommending specific personnel actions.*

Introduction

Michigan State University is a land-grant, research-intensive university of international scope whose mission is to advance knowledge and to transform lives through innovative teaching, research, and outreach. As such, the College of Engineering is committed to quality undergraduate and graduate education, research, and public service and, moreover, aspires to improve continuously. This goal to improve continuously requires that academic personnel decisions build a progressively stronger faculty. This process begins with rigorous, effective recruitment and selection of new faculty, followed by systematic mentoring, encouragement, and facilitation of the professional growth of these faculty members, followed by the application of demanding standards and the use of rigorous evaluation procedures [MSU Faculty Handbook]. Thus, College of Engineering policies, procedures, criteria, and decisions on recruitment, reappointment, award of tenure, promotions, and salary increases must be guided by the goal of increasing the academic excellence of the College of Engineering. The future academic quality of the College will be determined in large measure by these decisions.

The standards that are to be applied in the evaluation of faculty candidates and members are related to the mission of the College of Engineering, which is to

- provide an experience that inspires students to reach for the highest level of accomplishment and personal growth throughout their lives;**
- provide an environment that enables students and faculty to make lasting contributions to the advancement of knowledge and the creative practice of engineering;**
- share the fruits of our efforts in order to enhance the public's understanding of technology and to facilitate its use on behalf of society;**
- create and maintain a diverse, collegial community that recognizes and values the contribution of each individual; and do all the above with integrity.**
- The accomplishment of our mission is a shared responsibility of each member of the College community.**

Faculty Activities

This section of the **Faculty Development Guide** identifies and categorizes activities that comprise faculty load. Three principal categories are identified: **Teaching and education**, **Research and other aspects of scholarship**, and **Service** (disaggregated into **Public Service** and **Institutional Service**).

Teaching and education

- **Scheduled teaching:** Teaching of any courses for credit (excluding individualized instruction courses such as undergraduate research, master's thesis research, and doctoral dissertation research) and of any offerings for certificate or degree programs. Note: Scheduled teaching includes direct contact with students, course preparation (including other offerings such as noncredit courses, workshops, colloquia, and so on), course administration, and course evaluation.
- **Unscheduled teaching:** Supervising individualized instruction such as independent study and undergraduate research and advising graduate students on thesis and dissertation-related activities. However, this does not include the direct supervision of dissertation research or thesis preparation since these activities are covered under research.
- **Lifelong education teaching:** Providing offerings such as noncredit courses, workshops, colloquia, and so on for other than degree and certificate programs.
- **Course development:** Developing new or revising existing courses (including other offerings such as noncredit courses, workshops, colloquia, and so on). This includes establishing objectives, teaching methods, and evaluation procedures, and securing reviews. This also includes the securing of funding in support of course development.
- **Curriculum development:** Developing new or revising existing curricula. This includes developing evaluation procedures and securing reviews. This also includes the securing of funding in support of curriculum development.
- **Instructional materials development:** Developing courseware, such as course notes, software, videos, and experiments. This also includes the securing of funding support of instructional materials development.
- **Advising and counseling:** Helping students (students enrolled in academic programs at MSU or participating in lifelong education opportunities through MSU) to handle educational and professional issues that are related to their careers as students. This includes advising on offerings to take, counseling on time management, registering students, career counseling, and writing recommendations. Technical supervision of graduate research is not included here since it is covered under scholarship.
- **Other teaching activities:** Activities related to teaching which are not included above such as planning, preparing, administering, grading, and evaluating qualifier and comprehensive examinations.

Research and other aspects of scholarship

- **Research program development and management:** Developing and managing resources required to conduct research. This includes writing proposals; assembling, maintaining, and upgrading laboratory and computing (including software) resources; hiring and supervising people; and collaborating with colleagues.
- **Conduct of research:** Planning, managing, and conducting theoretical and experimental investigations; evaluating results; providing technical leadership for graduate research; preparing administrative and technical reports related to the research; reviewing the literature; attending technical meetings, seminars,

and so on, for the purpose of enhancing one's knowledge and skills in a particular area of research; talking and corresponding with colleagues in the field.

- **Publication of scholarly results:** Reporting research and the other aspects of scholarship—i.e., the scholarship of teaching/education and the scholarship of application—through articles in refereed journals, books (including textbooks and book chapters), monographs, papers published in conference proceedings, and bulletins; presenting papers at conferences, seminars, meetings, and workshops; and securing patents, copyrights, trademarks, and other publicly disclosed protections for intellectual property.
- **Other scholarly activities:** Activities of a scholarly nature which are not included above.

Public service

- **Participation in learned professional organizations/societies:** Holding offices, attending meetings, reviewing papers or proposals, planning a professional society meeting, or participating in the review of programs at another institution.
- **Consulting and advising:** Assisting in the formulation and or review of government policies and providing technical expertise to assist the private sector, when appropriate. Outside consulting for pay may be included in this category, if justified.
- **Public service program development and management:** Developing and managing resources required to conduct public service programs, such as technology transfer, lifelong education, cooperative extension, and international public-service programs. This includes writing proposals; assembling, maintaining, and upgrading physical resources; hiring and supervising people; and collaborating with colleagues. Note that teaching for lifelong education activities is covered under teaching. However, the conceptualization and design of these activities in response to public needs is covered here under public service.
- **Conduct of public service programs:** Reviewing the literature; attending meetings, seminars, and so on for the purpose of enhancing one's knowledge and skills in a particular area of public need; talking and corresponding with colleagues in the field; planning, managing, and conducting public service programs; evaluating results; preparing administrative and technical reports related to the programs. Note: Teaching for credit in lifelong education is excluded from conduct of public service programs since it is covered under teaching.
- **Public awareness:** Participating in activities intended to heighten the consciousness of the general public or of special interest groups to specific issues within the individual's area of expertise. This includes radio and television programs, newspaper or magazine articles, and public appearances to discuss issues and answer questions.
- **Other public service activities:** Activities in support of public service, which are not included above.

Institutional service

- **Academic governance:** Participating in academic governance at the department, college, and university level. Some activities on certain committees, such as curriculum committees and research committees, might not be included here but rather under one of the other appropriate activity categories, such as teaching and education, research/scholarship, and public service.
- **Unit administration:** Planning, managing unit resources, administering personnel policies, writing and answering memoranda, escorting visitors, and recruiting faculty and staff.

- **Student and alumni development and support:** Recruiting students, participating in orientation programs, serving as faculty advisor to student organizations, and tracking students after they leave the university.
- **Public relations:** Undertaking activities intended to enhance the public's awareness of the university's mission, programs, and achievements; marketing the university's products and services through open houses, special showings, radio and television appearances, newspaper and magazine articles, and so on.
- **Other institutional service activities:** Undertaking other activities in support of institutional service which are not included above.

Evaluation Standards for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

Guidelines for time in rank

A faculty candidate for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions shall be reviewed and evaluated with respect to teaching, research and scholarship, and public and institutional service. The time in the rank first hired is as specified in the initial appointment letter. The list of basic actions and typical timings includes the following:

- appointment as an assistant professor in the first probationary period;
- reappointment as an assistant professor in the second probationary period (time as specified in appointment letter);
- promotion to associate professor with tenure (typically six years total and after reappointment in the second probationary period);
- appointment as an associate professor;
- reappointment as an associate professor with tenure;
- appointment as an associate professor with tenure; and
- promotion to professor with tenure (typically not less than five years after receiving tenure at the associate level).

A few other unusual paths are permitted by the policies set forth in Section IV.12. (Academic Personnel Policies. Tenure System.) of the **MSU Faculty Handbook**. Actions taking less than the nominal times on the conventional paths, such as actions on the unusual paths, are possible, but exceptional. With respect to time in rank, the **MSU Faculty Handbook** specifically states: "The reasons for a reasonably long period of time in rank prior to promotion are:"

- "To provide a firm basis in actual performance for predicting long-term, high quality professional effectiveness, and"
- "To provide a firm basis in actual performance under Michigan State University standards to permit endorsement of the individual as an expert of national stature."

The procedures that shall be followed in making an initial appointment will be set forth in affirmative action plans filed when a search is initiated. The criteria for evaluating teaching and education, research and scholarship, and public and institutional service are set forth in the later section of this Handbook entitled **Faculty Evaluation Criteria**. Also, the procedures that shall be followed in conducting a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are set forth elsewhere in the College of Engineering **Faculty Handbook**.

The judgments rendered against the standards set forth in this document shall reflect a faculty member's educational background and performance as they serve to increase the quality of the departmental faculty with respect to the mission of the college and university and enhance the national stature of the department.

Terminology

The following terminology shall be used in evaluating faculty candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion:

- **Research, public and institutional service, and teaching and education** as defined in the previous section.
- **Scholarship associated with public service** emphasizes the scholarship of the application of knowledge, as well as the methodology and pedagogy for delivering public service activities.
- **Education** includes the scholarship of the teaching of knowledge. Also, as previously mentioned, teaching is a component in the larger domain of education.
- **Appropriate** is a qualifier for institutional service which implies that there is evidence that the indicated performance is consistent with that expected for a faculty member at that rank—e.g., for an assistant professor, membership and participation in department committees would be appropriate; for an associate professor, active leadership roles in some committees would be appropriate; and for a full professor leadership should be the norm.

The intent of these definitions is that each action should result in a higher quality faculty and a department with greater national stature.

Standards

The **basic standard** for all actions is the determination that the candidate's achievements have increased the quality of the candidate's department and raised its stature, are comparable to those of the candidate's peers, and are consistent with the expectations of the candidate's department and the College of Engineering. How standards vary by rank is outlined below.

- **Appointments and actions for assistant professors** require that the candidates demonstrate reasonable expectation that the basic standards will be met and that current performance is likely to result in timely promotion and awarding of tenure. The primary objective at this level is the development of a viable program in research and related scholarly activity. The foundation of good teaching and appropriate service must also be evident.
- **Promotion to, or appointment as, associate professor and/or tenure** requires the determination that the basic standards have been achieved and that it is likely that such achievements will continue over the course of the candidate's academic career. The primary objective to be considered at this level is professional distinction in research and scholarly activity. Contribution to and effectiveness in teaching as well as appropriate public and institutional service are also necessary.
- **Promotion to professor** (and appointment at that rank) requires the determination that the basic standards have been achieved over an extended period of time and that this performance is likely to continue. The primary objectives include sustained professional distinction in research and scholarly activity, clear evidence of ongoing contribution to and effectiveness in teaching, and appropriate public and institutional service. It is further expected that candidates show leadership in each of these areas. In some instances, exemplary contributions to teaching and/or service and the scholarship associated with these domains can be the basis for the promotion.

Exceptions to typical appointments or promotions shall be based on similar standards and as stated in initial appointment letters.

Faculty Evaluation Criteria

A faculty candidate for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and/or a merit salary increase shall be evaluated according to the following lists of criteria, titled **points considered by raters** and **significant types of evidence**. The lists are not necessarily comprehensive—other points and evidence may be relevant in some cases. The term “raters” refers to those faculty at the department and college levels who are involved in evaluating candidates for the aforementioned actions.

The overarching concern in evaluating faculty is the extent and level of the candidate's overall activity and reputation in the profession. For example, is there evidence of professional distinction and leadership in research/scholarship, teaching/education, and/or service; is there evidence of demonstrated progressiveness in the development and/or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems?

Teaching and education

Points considered by raters:

- Command of subjects taught
- Ability to create a learning climate within a class
- Ability to organize and present material
- Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and stimulate advanced students to do creative work
- Capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationships between disciplines
- Spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's teaching
- The extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance and advising of students
- Continuous growth in knowledge of the field
- Scholarly achievements and their impact in the field; national and international reputation
- Continued productivity of high quality and significant scholarly results

Significant types of evidence related to teaching and education:

- Courses taught, including lifelong education courses
- Summary and analysis of student opinions
- New courses developed and taught
- Extramural course and program development proposals and support
- Awards and honors received for teaching
- Development and implementation of new and effective techniques of education
- Overall evaluation in comparison with other faculty in the department

- Peer evaluations of teaching through consideration of (a) reviews of course content, examinations, homework, and syllabi; (b) the candidate's preparation of students in prerequisite courses; (c) class visitations; (d) attendance at public lectures given by the candidate
- Number and caliber of students (a) guided in research by the candidate and (b) attracted to the campus by the repute of the candidate as a teacher (overlaps with research)
- Opinions of graduates
- Textbooks and other educational materials developed by the candidate
- List of scholarly publications in journals and conference proceedings and copies of these publications
- Intramural and extramural letters of support evaluating scholarly publications
- Extramural funding and other support and proposals for scholarly activities
- Awards and honors received for scholarly activities
- Appraisals of publications and other work in the scholarly and critical literature
- Evaluation of the candidate's contribution to collaborative co-authored publications
- Assessment of work in progress
- Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Research

Points considered by raters:

- Impact of research achievements on the candidate's field; national and international reputation; achievements in the field in comparison with others of the same academic rank and years of professional experience
- Continued productivity of high quality and significant results
- Originality and significance of contributions in research or, alternatively, originality, scope, richness, and depth of expression in creative achievements

Significant types of evidence related to research:

- List of research publications and copies of these publications
- Intramural and extramural letters of support evaluating research publications
- Extramural funding and other support and proposals for research activities
- Numbers of completed M.S. and Ph.D. theses supervised
- Number of completed M.S. projects supervised
- Involvement of undergraduates in research

- Involvement with post-doctoral fellows
- Awards and honors received for research
- Appraisals of publications and other work in the scholarly and critical literature
- Evaluation of the candidate's contribution to collaborative co-authored publications
- Assessment of work in progress
- Number of citations/references to candidate's work and publications
- Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Public service

Points considered by the raters:

- Scope of involvement in learned professional organizations/societies
- Scope of (a) participation in technology transfer, such as through pro bono consulting and small business opportunities, and (b) advising to government bodies and in the private sector
- Participation in the design of continuing education activities/programs (but not in the delivery of any courses for credit or of any offerings for certificate or degree programs)
- Participation in extension service activities
- Impact of scholarly achievements on the candidate's field; national and international reputation; achievements in the field in comparison with others of the same employment status and years of professional experience
- Continued productivity of high quality and significant scholarly results, as they impact external audiences

Significant types of evidence related to public service:

- Peer review and evaluation of specific public service activities
- Written testimonials supplied by the constituents served by the candidate's activities
- Awards and honors received for public service
- Extramural public service support and proposals
- List of service-related scholarly publications in journals and conference proceedings and copies of these publications
- Intramural and extramural letters of support evaluating service-related scholarly publications
- Extramural support and proposals for scholarly activities related to public service
- Awards and honors received for scholarly activities related to public service

- Appraisals of service-related publications and other work in the scholarly and critical literature
- Evaluation of the candidate's contribution to collaborative co-authored publications
- Assessment of work in progress
- Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Institutional service

Points considered by the raters:

- Extent of actual participation
- Quality of service in terms of effective and imaginative contributions
- Candidate's willingness to participate in academic governance in the formulation of department, college, and university policies

Significant types of evidence related to institutional service:

- Service as an administrator
- Service in the formal aspects of academic governance
- Service on administrative committees
- Awards and honors received for administration or academic governance
- Other significant types of evidence not otherwise listed above.

Faculty Mentoring

The College of Engineering believes that effective mentoring is important to the professional development and advancement of new faculty members. Traditionally, departmental chairpersons have provided mentoring through articulation of expectations and performance reviews. However, other responsibilities inherent in the faculty-chairperson relationship may interfere with the open and frequent communication needed for effective mentoring.

The College of Engineering therefore recommends that each department develop a formal process by which new tenure-track faculty will be mentored by one or more senior faculty members, other than the chairperson. The mentor(s) should provide independent advice, active support, and timely information across all areas of professional activity—research, teaching, and service.

The College of Engineering recommends that each department explicitly document its mentoring program, indicating how mentors will be assigned and what their responsibilities will be. A mentor should be familiar with both the new faculty member's professional sphere and the performance standards likely to yield favorable action from evaluation committees. Mentors are expected to commit at least two years to the effort, which should be reported annually as a service activity and appropriately recognized by the department and college. Formal assignment of a mentor to a faculty member should not discourage other faculty members from also offering professional advice. However, all mentoring discussions should be considered privileged.

Conversation regarding suitable mentors should begin at the time of hire, and the mentoring process should begin soon thereafter. While mentoring activities are expected to vary, mentors should be available to meet frequently with the candidate and assist in the following ways:

- Serve as a collegial confidant and, upon request, as a liaison to administrators
- Clarify department and college expectations for promotion and tenure, and discuss strategies for success in evaluation processes;
- Encourage submission of proposals and papers, and help critique drafts
- Advise on development of new research collaborations
- Advise on recruitment and retention of graduate students
- Assist with procedural details of laboratory and infrastructure development
- Offer suggestions on course preparation, classroom delivery, examinations, TAs, and grading
- Help identify appropriate service activities and other professional opportunities
- Advise on optimal time allocation across research, teaching, and service missions
- Provide periodic, off-the-record reviews of professional progress

PART B—Faculty Evaluation Operating Procedures

Introduction

The **Faculty Development Guide** (Part A of this **Faculty Handbook**) is a delineation of faculty activities; the standards for evaluating faculty candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and, finally, the criteria for evaluating faculty. The **Faculty Evaluation Operating Procedures** (Part B of this handbook) is addressed to the operating procedures that should be used in evaluating faculty. Three specific classes of operating procedures are considered: review procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure; procedures for the college rating committee and the academic administrators group; and, finally, procedures for the periodic review of faculty members whose primary appointment resides in the College of Engineering.

Review Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

This portion of the **Faculty Handbook** contains the general procedures to be used throughout the College of Engineering for the review of faculty members for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These procedures provide an equal opportunity for each faculty member to present the best possible case for review of his or her activities and achievements while respecting the uniqueness of each case. It is important that each faculty member be made aware explicitly of the procedures in place within the College of Engineering. Therefore, copies of this document, as well as the **Faculty Development Guide**, are to be distributed to new faculty members, initially to all faculty members, and kept on file in the department offices and the Dean's Office. Current materials are also maintained at the college web site. It is intended that one set of credentials shall be generated as a *Faculty Review Package* for both the department and college-level review processes. Should a conflict exist between the guidelines described here and those established by the University, the University guidelines shall be followed.

Steps involved in the review process

- The **MSU Faculty Handbook** states that chairpersons (or directors) are responsible for unit level recommendations concerning personnel actions. The chairperson will normally discuss required, or possible, reviews at the annual faculty evaluation meetings with individual faculty members. On the basis of these interactions, the chairperson will provide the department peer rating (or review) committee a list of faculty members he or she knows must be, or believes should be, reviewed. The chairperson shall make the list available to the faculty members in a timely manner so that individual faculty members have the opportunity to add or remove their name before the review process proceeds to the next step.
- A *Faculty Review Package* must be prepared by each candidate to be considered for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. (Note, however, that some parts of the package are the responsibility of others and are confidential—see the later section entitled **Faculty review package**.)
- Each department shall have a peer rating committee. (See the later section entitled **Composition of the Department Peer Rating Committee**.) This committee shall review and evaluate the credentials of faculty candidates going through the process. This committee shall evaluate each candidate's *Faculty Review Package* and provide a rating of each candidate in the areas of research, teaching/education, and public and institutional service and, most importantly, a recommendation on the action being considered. Department-level votes on candidates should be by secret ballot. The peer rating committee shall forward its report, including a review and a recommendation, to the chairperson and the department's tenured faculty concerning each candidate. Any departmental bylaws concerning these actions must conform to College bylaws, these guidelines, and the University regulations and requirements on such matters. In particular, as required by the University policy on non-tenured faculty in the tenure system [**MSU Faculty Handbook**], faculty members may confer at their discretion with the departmental peer rating committee before its recommendation is determined.

- The department chairperson will notify each candidate in writing regarding the unit-level recommendation on each candidate.
- The *Faculty Review Package* for each candidate shall be finalized for submission to the Dean and consideration by the College rating committee. The final elements of the package shall be the departmental peer rating committee report and the recommendation of the chairperson, including the rationale for the recommendation. Each candidate's package must be comprehensive and stand alone.
- The College shall have a college rating committee. (See the later section entitled **Composition of the College Rating Committee**.) This committee shall evaluate each candidate's *Faculty Review Package* and provide a rating of each candidate to the Dean of Engineering in the areas of research, teaching/education, and public and institutional service and, most importantly, a recommendation on the action being considered.
- The Dean shall consult with the Academic Administrators Group (aka Chairs Group), consisting of the dean, the chairpersons, and the assistant/ associate deans, concerning each candidate. As required by the University policy on non-tenured faculty in the tenure system [**MSU Faculty Handbook**], faculty members may confer at their discretion with the Academic Administrators Group before its discussion of candidates is completed.
- The Dean of Engineering shall decide which faculty members will be recommended to the Provost for appropriate action and will notify each candidate in writing regarding that recommendation.
- Thereafter, the Provost recommends to the President which faculty members will be considered for appropriate action. The President will make the final decision in all matters, which do not include the granting of tenure. The President will recommend action to the Board of Trustees in cases which include the granting of tenure. The President will notify the Provost of the decisions. The Provost will notify the Dean who will then notify the respective chairpersons. The chairpersons will notify their affected faculty member(s). The candidate should be informed of the status of the decisions at every step in a timely fashion.

Timetable

The approximate timetable for the review of faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion is given below. The dates listed below for College and University personnel actions are a general guide and may vary from year to year. Candidates should be kept informed of progress.

- **Early September**—The Office of the Dean distributes to departments in the College of Engineering (1) the forms and materials that it is expected will be required in completing pending personnel actions and (2) a preliminary schedule of personnel action deadlines.
- **No later than late September**—When needed, requests for reference letters should be sent out by the chairpersons or appropriate department committee.
- **September-November**—The candidate with appropriate assistance from the department chairperson and/or department committee prepares the *Faculty Review Package*.
- **Early November**—The Office of the Provost specifies the forms and materials to be used for personnel actions in the current year and provides a schedule of important university dates, including deadlines. The Dean then makes any necessary adjustments to the preliminary schedule and previously distributed forms and materials for personnel actions.
- **Early November**—All required reference letters should be secured and a reminder letter should be sent to those who have not yet responded. Departments should meet and consider and vote on their candidates.

- **Early January**—The department chairpersons submit their recommendations on personnel actions to the Office of the Dean and notify the candidates of their recommendations.
- **Early January to Early February**—The College Rating Committee meets and rates each candidate.
- **Mid-February**—The Dean consults with the Academic Administrators Group concerning each candidate. The consultation is a comprehensive discussion of each candidate based upon (1) the candidate's *Faculty Review Package* and (2) the ratings and recommendation for each candidate provided by the College Rating Committee.
- **Late February**—The Dean submits the following forms and documents to the Office of Academic Personnel Records: (1) Form A: *Tenure System Reappointment Recommendations*; (2) Form B: *Promotion List*; and (3) Form C: *Documentation of the Annual, Written, Tenure System Faculty Review*. (4) Form D-I: *Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure Action* a completed form for each faculty member listed on Form A and Form B is delivered to the Office of Academic Human Resources. At this time, the candidate is also informed of the dean's recommendation.
- **Mid-to-Late March**—The Dean confers with the Assistant Provost/Assistant Vice President for Academic Human Resources and the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.
- **Late-April**—The Provost notifies the Dean of recommendations accepted for recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.
- **Early May**—The Dean sends notices to the appropriate chairpersons and directors of recommendations forwarded by the Office of the Provost. They, in turn, notify the concerned faculty members.
- **Early May**—Form G: *Affirmative Action Report on Faculty Promotions* are prepared and submitted to the Office of Academic Human Resources.
- **Mid-May**—The Office of the Provost prepares lists of faculty candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and forwards them to the President for action. The President forwards his recommendations on those cases involving the award of tenure to the Board of Trustees.
- **Mid-June**—The President and the Board of Trustees act on the recommendations that each must consider.
- **Mid-June**—The Dean is notified through the Office of the Provost of the actions taken by the President and the Board of Trustees and informs the appropriate chairpersons and directors. They, in turn, notify the concerned faculty members of the action on their cases.

Composition of the department peer rating committee

The department peer rating committees may be defined differently for each department. This flexibility is acceptable within the University regulations as outlined in the **MSU Faculty Handbook**. In the broadest sense, two models are suggested by the University Committee on Faculty Tenure:

- **Model A** (more restrictive): The duly constituted group for advising on judgments concerning non-tenured faculty under the tenure system shall be a committee of full professors elected by the tenured faculty.
- **Model B** (less restrictive): The duly constituted group for advising on judgments concerning non-tenured faculty shall consist of all tenured faculty or an elected committee of tenured faculty.

Neither the University nor the College specifies a definitive model for peer rating committees for action on tenured faculty.

Composition of the college rating committee

There shall be a College of Engineering Rating Committee that will advise the Dean of Engineering in matters relating to the promotion and tenure of faculty. The committee members shall be selected from tenured full professors from the college faculty. The Engineering College Advisory Council shall assure that, exclusive of the committee chairperson, each department has two representatives on the committee. Each department chairperson in the college appoints one member from his/her department to the committee. The Dean of Engineering, in consultation with the Engineering College Advisory Council, appoints one additional member of the committee from each department. Appointments are made from a pool of candidates who are self-nominated or nominated by department advisory committees. These appointments by the dean are intended to ensure balance within the committee across the several aspects of the mission of the faculty. The term of each member shall be three years. No member may serve more than two consecutive terms (six consecutive years). The terms of the members shall be staggered, so that approximately one-third of the committee is replaced each year. In the event that one of the members cannot complete the three-year appointment, a substitute will be appointed to complete the three-year term by the appropriate department chairperson or the dean depending on who made the initial appointment for the member being replaced. The Dean of Engineering, in consultation with the Engineering College Advisory Council, selects a tenured college faculty member to serve as Committee chairperson for a one-year period. The chairperson may be asked to serve for not more than three consecutive one-year terms. The role of the committee chairperson is to moderate the discussion leading to an evaluation of the candidates. All committee members are afforded full voting privileges with the exception of the chairperson. The chairperson may participate in the deliberations of the committee, but is excluded from voting.

Faculty review criteria

The department peer and college rating committees shall use the faculty evaluation criteria outlined in the latest version of the College of Engineering's **Faculty Development Guide** (part A of this **Handbook**).

Faculty review package

Each *Faculty Review Package*, exclusive of any supplemental materials, should be assembled and submitted (not three-hole punched or stapled) to the Office of the Dean. The original and one copy of the *Faculty Review Package*, including the supplemental materials, should be submitted.

The *Faculty Review Package* should be assembled by completing the University Form D-I entitled *Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure, Action*. For this form see page C-1 of this document. The formatting should be consistent with the *College of Engineering Addendum*. For this form see page C-1 of this document. Though not expected, candidates may submit supplemental materials, such as class notes, books or book manuscripts, a sample of tapes of video-based courses, research/scholarship proposals and (optionally) reviews, and so on. An annotated list of such supplemental materials shall accompany the submission. The annotation shall describe the importance and significance of the material for forming a judgment in the case. Note that submission of supplemental materials is the **exception**, not the expectation, in the representation of a candidate's qualifications.

The package shall include a set of reviews by disciplinary peers, except in the case of reappointment at the level of assistant professor. As a general rule, five reviews shall be provided. An exception could include the instance where it appeared that a review might not be received in time and an additional review was solicited only to receive the first review, bringing the total to six. All reviews that are solicited and received shall be made part of the package. The faculty candidate may recommend as many as five potential reviewers, from which the department peer rating committee may recommend as many as two. Referees shall be highly qualified leaders in their field who can judge the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions. Selection of referees holding a rank less than full professor should be justified based on evidence of national stature (e.g., recipient of a national award). Reviewers should be from peer, or better, institutions, although distinguished scholars and professionals from outside the university community may be included. Collaborators must not be asked to write an external evaluation. Individuals are considered to be collaborators if they have worked with the candidate in any intellectual capacity (e.g., joint papers/proposals/co-supervising students) within the past four years. Moreover, letters will not be solicited from

faculty who served on the equivalent of the candidate's guidance committee when the candidate was a graduate student. If an external referee declines to submit a letter of evaluation, this information shall be recorded and, if a reason is provided, it shall become part of the candidate's package. If a candidate is evaluated in two consecutive years, the referee-selection policy is either (1) all referees from the previous year shall be used, or (2) all referees shall be new.

The department chairperson, with the possible assistance of the department's peer rating committee, will solicit the reviews using college-approved letter templates. Each review in the packet shall be accompanied by a copy of the letter requesting the review and a justification of why the reviewer was chosen. It should be borne in mind that the purpose of these reviews is "...to ensure that individuals recommended have an achievement and performance level which is comparable with faculties of peer institutions." [MSU Faculty Handbook]. Only the chairperson, or the chairperson's designee for this purpose, is authorized by the Dean to solicit the reviews. Templates for letters requesting the reviews are provided in Appendix B to this document. These templates have been reviewed by the University's attorney.

Unsolicited letters shall not be included in the package. External letters must be submitted by regular mail on institutional letterhead and carry the reviewer's signature. If timing becomes critical, a letter may be submitted electronically, but must be followed by a mailed original. Candidates shall not contact prospective or actual reviewers in regard to the reviews being sought.

The contents of candidate's package cannot be modified after it has been submitted to the College. However, new or corrected information (e.g., a very recent publication acceptance) may be placed in a separate folder with the package. Deadlines for adding such information are (1) for the College Rating Committee, the date of the Committee's first meeting; and (2) for the "Chairs Group," the date of the Group's first meeting.

Faculty member's role in developing the review package

It should be recognized that the development of the *Faculty Review Package* is primarily the responsibility of the faculty candidate. However, the chairperson, department peer rating committee, and/or other selected faculty are encouraged to provide assistance and counsel. Thus, the faculty candidate is not only allowed to see the *Faculty Review Package* except as noted below, but he or she must take the lead in seeing that it is assembled so as to present the best possible case. However, the candidate shall **not** be allowed to see any confidential external letters of review, which will become part of the *Faculty Review Package*. Objective written statements by the departmental peer rating committee and the department chairperson shall be accessible to the candidate. The *Faculty Review Package* must be a comprehensive presentation of the candidate's case and be sufficient to stand alone without further interpretation during committee discussion at both the department and collage level.

Affirmative action issues

Affirmative action matters related to personnel issues are outlined in more detail in the **MSU Faculty Handbook**. It is encouraged that department and college-level rating committees, to the extent possible, reflect consideration of gender, race, and ethnicity.

Grievance procedures

If a candidate believes that the decision not to reappoint, tenure, or promote has been made in a manner that is at variance with the established evaluation procedures, the candidate may initiate an appeal at the administrative level where the decision was made. At all levels, appeals must be handled in a manner consistent with the Faculty Grievance Procedure as outlined in the **MSU Faculty Handbook**.

Procedures for College Rating Committee and Academic Administrators Group

The College Rating Committee and the Academic Administrators Group of the College of Engineering are each responsible for assessing the credentials of a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The assessment of the credentials shall reflect the evaluation criteria which are presented in the *Faculty Evaluation Criteria* and the

evaluation standards which are set forth in the document *Evaluation standards for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion* (in Part A of this Handbook)

College Rating Committee

The College Rating Committee is charged with examining and evaluating all three domains of a candidate's credentials—research, teaching and education, and public and institutional service. The committee is also charged with examining and evaluating each candidate's record holistically as an integrated statement of professional accomplishment. The committee shall assess and comment upon both the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate's record.

In each of the three domains, the committee members shall rate a candidate as being: well below average, below average, average, above average, or well above average. "Average" is defined as that performance which, in the considered judgment of the committee member, is, on average, exhibited by those in the discipline receiving a favorable decision on the action. In general, the candidate's achievements should have increased the quality of the candidate's department and raised its stature, be comparable to those of the candidate's peers in the professional discipline, and be consistent with the expectations of the candidate's department and the College of Engineering. Further statements regarding the standards for various ranks are contained in the "standards" section of Part A of this **Handbook**. In addition, and most importantly, the committee shall also vote on whether the candidate is recommended for the action—e.g., the equivalent of a yes/no vote on whether the candidate should be promoted to associate professor with tenure. The ratings of a candidate and the vote on the recommendation by the committee members are to be secured by secret poll.

Candidates are to be considered action by action, such as reappointment as assistant professor in the second probationary period. After all candidates for an action have been considered, the committee members are to be polled for their ratings of those candidates. The polling of the committee members may be done candidate by candidate or for all those candidates at the same time. The chairperson of the rating committee will determine and announce the committee's rating of each candidate in each domain and the overall vote on the recommendation.

As a practical matter, during the committee's deliberations, the chairperson may wish to conduct a (secret) straw vote to determine those candidates who will likely receive an overwhelmingly positive recommendation. This would be done so that the committee's time can be spent more fruitfully on those candidates whose record will require more detailed consideration and discussion.

For each candidate, the chairperson of the Committee shall provide to the Dean a summary statement assessing the candidate's strengths and weaknesses including the candidate's ratings in all three domains and the vote on the final recommendation on the action.

Academic Administrators Group (aka the Chairs Group)

The Academic Administrators Group, consisting of the Dean, the department chairpersons, and the assistant/associate deans, are charged with examining and discussing each candidate's credentials with respect to the standards that pertain to the action under consideration.

The academic administrators are expected to pay particular heed:

- to the blending of research, teaching and education, and public and institutional service in support of the mission and
- to the sustainability of achievement in research, education, or in scholarship associated with public service.

The academic administrators also have a special responsibility for historical consistency in the actions taken. The overall purpose of the meeting of the academic administrators is to provide the dean with their collective insights regarding the candidates. No report is made, nor are any explicit votes required to be taken. If votes are taken, they must be reported and made a part of the candidate's package.

As required by the University policy on non-tenured faculty in the tenure system [**MSU Faculty Handbook**], faculty members will be offered the opportunity to confer at their discretion with the Academic Administrators Group before the opinions of its members are solicited.

Procedures for the Annual Review of Faculty Members

Each department must have procedures for written evaluation of tenure-system faculty members at all ranks with the operating principles and guidelines for implementation described in the **MSU Faculty Handbook**. These guidelines state in part that "Each faculty member shall submit a written summary of activities for the appropriate period of time to the unit administrator in a timely manner prior to the review." This is typically due at the end of January for the year just ending in December. For faculty members in the College of Engineering, this written summary may be the faculty member's **Annual Report of Faculty Load, Activities, Achievements, and Plans**. For this form see page C-1 of this document. It is the responsibility of department chairpersons to provide timely feedback (typically within a month of the submission of the report) on the faculty member's performance and annual report so that the faculty members can plan their activities for the year.

Rationale

Periodic reviews of all faculty members provide opportunities for collegial and constructive dialogue about performance expectations and, whenever appropriate, suggestions and assistance for improving performance. Written evaluations enhance understandings of goals and expectations for each faculty member. This review process reinforces and supports opportunities for continuous faculty progress at all ranks. Performance evaluations also assist units in making decisions concerning reappointment, the award of tenure, promotion, and merit salary adjustments.

PART C—Miscellaneous Documents, Forms, and Guidelines

Introduction

Part A of this **Faculty Handbook**—i.e., the **Faculty Development Guide**—delineated faculty activities; the standards for evaluating faculty candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and, finally, the criteria for evaluating faculty. Part B of this **Faculty Handbook**—i.e., the **Faculty Evaluation Operating Procedures**—described the procedures that should be used in evaluating faculty or faculty candidates. Part C of this handbook contains the following collection of miscellaneous documents, forms, and guidelines that relate to the faculty in the College of Engineering:

Editorial Comment added 9/24/02: All copies of the forms that were once included in PART C of this document are now downloadable from links on the College of Engineering Faculty Handbook’s web index page. They are no longer included in this copy of the handbook. Hard copies are also maintained in the Dean’s office.

PART C – Table of Contents

Reporting and Recording Faculty Load, Activities, Achievements, and Plans.....	C-2
Introduction	C-2
Operating Principles	C-2
Faculty involvement	C-2
Labeling activities	C-2
Annual report format	C-2
Outside Work for Pay/Overload Pay	C-5
Introduction	C-5
Faculty Involvement in Professional Societies	C-6
Faculty Awards	C-7
Introduction	C-7
University Distinguished Professor	C-7
University Distinguished Faculty Award	C-8
University Teacher-Scholar Award	C-9
MSU Alumni Club of Mid-Michigan Quality in Undergraduate Teaching Award	C-9
College Excellence in Teaching Award	C-9
College Distinguished Scholar Award	C-10
Dean’s Award for Exceptional Service	C-10

REPORTING AND RECORDING FACULTY LOAD, ACTIVITIES, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND PLANS

Introduction

Faculty activities are reported for various reasons using a variety of forms on a generally regular basis. The University needs faculty load data on a quarterly basis to meet contractual obligations for projects in which faculty are supported by certain types of extramural funding agreements. The University must also assemble faculty load data to meet the mandatory reporting requirements of the State of Michigan. The University's Office of Planning and Budgets compiles and analyzes faculty load data so that it can provide the central administration and the Board of Trustees with information necessary to evaluate the operation of different units within the University and to plan for the University's future. In like manner, faculty load data are needed within the various colleges and departments to evaluate current activities and plan for future college and department needs and activities.

For each faculty member, there is also personal and professional significance to compiling and reporting his or her activities on a periodic basis. An individual faculty member's activities in a given period of time represent his or her **input** to the University. If this input is channeled properly, the individual will synergistically provide useful services to the department, college, and university and grow professionally. But the extent and level of an individual's overall competence and reputation in the profession is not measured by simply quantifying input (i.e., activities), but rather by assessing the individual's **output** (i.e., achievements). And these achievements become the central issue as a faculty candidate is considered for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, a merit salary increases, and/or an award. Finally, each member of the faculty can use the compiled information to perform a self-assessment in planning for his or her professional future.

Operating Principles

With these points in mind, the following operating principles should be applied when documentation is prepared, recorded, disseminated, or used regarding an individual faculty member's load, activities, achievements, and plans:

Faculty involvement

While it is the responsibility of an individual faculty member's unit administrator to prepare faculty load data, the individual should be consulted during the planning process and should receive a copy of all load data recorded and submitted by the unit administrator. This is necessary for two reasons: First, the faculty member should be a part of his or her own load planning process because of special interests or professional development needs. Second, faculty members need the load information in order to plan their actual activities properly.

Labeling activities

Care must be taken not to mislabel faculty load or activities. For example, a **public service** activity should not be classified as **research/scholarship**, and some **educational** activity should not be classified as **institutional service** (academic administration or academic governance). Mislabeling load and activities may distort the data needed for effective evaluation and planning. Moreover, the long-term acquisition and recording of mislabeled faculty load or activities data can have a pernicious impact on a faculty member's professional growth and achievements.

Annual report format

If a faculty member is required to submit an annual report, which becomes a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record, then this report should be organized as follows:

- **Load**

- ◇ *Recorded Load* -- The load data for the functions of teaching, scholarship, public service, and institutional service as recorded by the unit administrator for the reporting period should be included here.
- ◇ *Comments* -- Any noteworthy significant disparities between the recorded load (salary apportionment) and the actual load (time apportionment) should be reported here. Also, any noteworthy observations on the disaggregation of the functions, such as scholarship into research program development and management, conduct of research, publication of research, and other subfunctions should be reported here.

- **Delineated Activities**

- ◇ *Teaching* -- The amount of academic advising, the extent of credit teaching (exclusive of individualized instruction), the scope of individualized instruction, the nature of participation in honors courses, and the character of involvement in noncredit lifelong education¹ teaching should be reported here.
- ◇ *Research/Scholarship* -- Publications, presentations, supervision of thesis students, proposals submitted, and proposals (previously submitted and) funded, continuing grants and contracts should be enumerated here.
- ◇ *Public Service* -- Participation in professional societies, development of lifelong education programs, and involvement in cooperative extension, international public-service activities, technology transfer, and professional consulting should be delineated here.
- ◇ *Institutional Service* -- Involvement in committee activities and administrative responsibilities should be specified here.

- **Other Activities**

Any other activities which are indicative of commitment to the functions of teaching, research/scholarship, public service, and institutional service should be included here. It would be appropriate to here report publications in the area of pedagogy, development of software, and issuance of patents. Activities which are outside of the traditional functions of teaching, research/scholarship, public service, and institutional service should also be included here. Professional development efforts would comprise one such additional function.

- **Achievements and Plans**

Here the faculty member might take the opportunity to embed the activities into the web of achievements over several years, cast against professional goals and attendant strategies for reaching those goals. It would be appropriate to include a needs assessment. (This section should be used by the unit administrator in planning for future unit activities and needs.)

The faculty reporting format described here should become a useful vehicle to obtain information needed to document an individual's overall load, activities, and achievements in a given period of time. Moreover, it should

¹Lifelong education is a teaching activity, which serves nontraditional students. It may also serve traditional students. It may have been originally designed for either traditional or nontraditional students, or both. It has typically been viewed as a public service activity. Within the College of Engineering, the development of lifelong education programs is viewed as a public service activity. However, independent of the genesis of an offering, the teaching of any courses for credit and any offerings for certificate or degree programs is viewed as a teaching activity. The teaching of other offerings may be viewed as a teaching or public service activity. However, the offerings should be fully reported as a teaching activity, but may be cited (with a cross-reference) as a public service activity.

provide the faculty member with an opportunity to plan for his/her own future by setting goals, developing plans, and identifying specific resources needed to achieve these goals. In fact, this document of principles was followed in preparing the form **Annual Report of Faculty Load, Activities, Achievements, and Plans**. See the College of Engineering Faculty Handbook web index page for the online and downloadable versions of this form.

Outside Work for Pay / Overload Pay

College of Engineering, Michigan State University

Introduction

Michigan State University holds to the principle that² "through consulting relationships with government, industry, public organizations and others off campus, University employees can be an invaluable resource." Consequently, "the University encourages the lending of such assistance where it does not interfere with the employees' performance of University duties and where no conflict of interests exists."

The University requires that "prior written approval of the department chairperson and dean must be obtained if the work is done during the regular employment period." For faculty members on academic year appointments the regular employment period is usually the academic year. When a faculty member is employed through the University for the summer term, the summer becomes a part of the regular employment period. The MSU form to request authorization of outside work for pay or overload pay is available from departmental offices, or in downloadable form from the College of Engineering Faculty Handbook web index page.

The total amount of time expended by a faculty member on outside activities for pay and overload pay will not exceed a total average of four (4) days a month. An annual report must be submitted to the Provost regarding the outside work for pay performed by faculty in the College. The report covers the fiscal year period and must indicate by department the number of faculty members who engaged in outside work for pay during the fiscal year, the amount of time engaged, and a summary of the nature or purpose of the outside work.

² All quoted material in this document is taken from of the **MSU Faculty Handbook** [pp.92-96].

Faculty Involvement in Professional Societies

College of Engineering, Michigan State University

Rationale

Each faculty member in the College of Engineering is strongly encouraged to become actively involved with professional-society activities at the local, state, national, and international levels. Such involvement has potential benefits to the individual faculty member, to Michigan State University, to the engineering profession, and to society at large.

The individual faculty member benefits because professional societies provide significant opportunities for lifelong learning and continuous professional growth and development over a career. Professional societies also provide an important mechanism for individuals to share their knowledge with peers and to receive recognition from peers for significant scientific, technical, and service achievements.

Michigan State University benefits because its reputation can be enhanced as faculty members share their knowledge with others, serve leadership roles within professional societies, and receive awards for their professional achievements.

The engineering profession benefits because the vast majority of professional-society achievements are directly related to the volunteer activities of its members—e.g., serving on the editorial board of a society publication, serving on the program committee for a symposium, serving on an awards committee, reviewing manuscripts, developing standards, evaluating other programs or institutions...

The society at large benefits because the engineering profession has its roots in problem solving and improving the quality of life—i.e., health, safety, and general welfare of mankind. For example, public-policy makers often look toward professional societies for advice before decisions are made on modifying existing policies or creating new policies.

Types of Professional Societies

In general, engineering professional societies fall into one of two categories—i.e., disciplinary and general. Disciplinary societies have a mission that focuses on issues related to specific subspecialties within the engineering profession—e.g., agricultural engineering, civil engineering, chemical engineering, computer science, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and material science. General engineering societies have specific missions but these missions transcend specific disciplines. For example, there are: the National Society for Professional Engineers (NSPE), the American Association for Engineering Education (ASEE), the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) and its Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), and the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE).

While there is no requirement that individual members of the College of Engineering faculty become involved in any specific societies, individual faculty members are encouraged to join appropriate professional societies and to become actively involved in their programs and sponsored activities.

Faculty members interested in becoming more involved in professional societies should seek out additional information from fellow faculty at MSU, faculty at other institutions, department chairpeople, or people in the dean's office. Active involvement in professional-society activities can be very rewarding and can instill in the individual a sense of belonging to the profession and a sense of professional pride.

Faculty Awards

College of Engineering, Michigan State University

Introduction

The University and College acknowledge exceptional performance of faculty members in teaching, scholarship, and service by the following honors:

- Designation as a University Distinguished Professor
- Selection as a University Distinguished Faculty Awardee
- Selection as a University Teacher-Scholar Awardee
- Selection as MSU Alumni Club of Mid-Michigan Quality in Undergraduate Teaching
- Selection as a College Excellence in Teaching Awardee
- Selection as a College Distinguished Scholar Awardee
- Selection as a Dean's Exceptional Service Awardee
- Selection as an Outreach Scholarship Community Partnership Awardee
- Selection as recipient of a Robert F. Banks Award for Institutional Leadership

The calls for nominations for these honors describe the honors and the least attainments expected of honorees. The procedures to be followed in submitting a nomination are also specified. For further details see the memorandum that is sent by the Provost's Office to Deans, Directors and Chairs in late February. The typical process by which the College handles University awards is given below. The Provost will send out a call for nominations by the end of February. Departmental award committees/nominees should prepare a nomination packet consisting of a CV and one nomination letter explaining the reason for the nomination. The packets will be due in the Dean's office by March 31. If March 31 falls on a weekend, the packages will be due the Friday before March 31. A subcommittee of the Engineering College Advisory Council will evaluate the nomination packets and send a final decision on the nominees to the departments by April 30. The departmental representatives will then prepare complete nomination packages and submit the packages to the Provost's office by the appropriate deadline.

The following summary descriptions of the university-level honors were derived from the current nomination forms.

University Distinguished Professor

The title, University Distinguished Professor, will be conferred on selected members of the Michigan State University faculty to recognize distinguished achievement in teaching, research, and public service. A University Distinguished Professorship will be held for the remainder of the recipient's active service at Michigan State University. (The title University Distinguished Professor Emeritus will be conferred upon retirement.) Individuals holding a University Distinguished Professorship will receive, in addition to salary, an average stipend of five thousand dollars for five years to support professional activities. Assignments for University Distinguished Professors will be arranged with the chairperson/director, dean, and the Provost. The designation will be highly honorific and consequently very exclusive. Membership in this category will reflect the diverse scholarly dimensions of Michigan State University.

In general, University Distinguished Professors will have been recognized nationally and usually internationally for the importance of their scholarly achievements. They will also have demonstrated the breadth of interest characteristically encompassed by the traditional role of professor as teacher and public servant. In addition, they will have brought distinction to Michigan State University as a result of their activities.

Specifically, a University Distinguished Professor will have achieved a record judged by peers to be superior and outstanding in preferably all, but at least two, of the areas of:

- **teaching skills**, with recognized breadth and depth in their discipline,
- **scholarship**, as represented by scholarly, creative, and artistic achievements,
- **public service**, as exemplified by the application of scholarship or creative and artistic endeavors in addressing the needs of one or more external constituencies.

University Distinguished Professors will have already achieved an outstanding record comparable to that of scholars awarded named professorships at Michigan State University and elsewhere. That record will have been recognized by the University at previous opportunities where merit is rewarded, such as merit salary increases. University Distinguished Professorships will be conferred only upon members of the Michigan State Faculty whose achievements have already been recognized by the University with the rank of Professor. (The title will not be used to recruit individuals to the Faculty.)

University Distinguished Faculty Award

University Distinguished Faculty Awards call for a comprehensive, sustained record of excellence in research and/or creative activities, teaching, and public services upon the part of awardees. Normally a combination of several of these activities is expected. Awardees have usually had at least five years of service at Michigan State University. Awards have traditionally been made to individuals who have made distinguished and widely recognized contributions to their field and who have given significant, sustained service to Michigan State University. Awardees will receive a stipend of \$3000.

The criteria by which a prospective awardee is judged are:

- evidence of exceptional research, creative, and scholarly activities in traditional, nontraditional, or emerging areas with recognition that scholarly distinction can be demonstrated in a variety of ways such as the creative aggregation, interpretation, and application of existing knowledge, as well as the discovery of new knowledge;
- evidence of exceptional teaching performance in a variety of settings, including credit and noncredit teaching, curriculum development, and academic advising;
- evidence of exceptional public service achievement in the local, national, or international settings involving such external activities as consultation and technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, and public information that build upon the faculty member's professional expertise;

and, at an attenuated level of significance,

- evidence of other service to Michigan State University.

Particular attention will be given to evidence of distinction in the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge as reflected by each prospective awardee's reputation within the appropriate external peer group within the several fields of endeavor.

University Teacher-Scholar Award

University Teacher-Scholar Awards are given to Faculty members who, early in their careers, have earned the respect of students and colleagues for their devotion to and skill in teaching. Faculty members with temporary, as well as those with tenure system, appointments are eligible for this award.

A University Teacher-Scholar Awardee must hold the rank of instructor, assistant professor, or associate professor on a paid appointment basis at the time of nomination, and must have served on the Michigan State Faculty for at least one but not more than seven academic years. Awardees will receive a stipend of \$2000.

In the judging of a prospective awardee consideration will be given to:

- effectiveness of teaching or, alternatively, its impact on students;
- use of innovative techniques and/or approaches in teaching;
- peer assessments of teaching;
- evidence of public service and of promise as a scholar.

MSU Alumni Club of Mid-Michigan Quality in Undergraduate Teaching Award

The MSU Alumni Club of Mid-Michigan Quality in Undergraduate Teaching Award recognizes teachers who take pride in and are committed to quality teaching, and who demonstrate substantial continuing involvement in undergraduate education.

All current temporary and tenure system faculty with at least three years of teaching experience at MSU are eligible for this award. Awardees will receive a stipend of \$2000.

Nominations are based on commitment to and evidence of outstanding undergraduate teaching including but not limited to 100- and 200- level courses. Criteria used in selecting recipients: exhibition of superior classroom performance; advancement of high educational standards; demonstration of well-developed, organized, and sequenced instruction that supports and explains major course concepts; encouragement of critical analysis, problem solving, and divergent points of view; promotion of writing and communication skills as part of the instruction; provision for student participation to insure active involvement in the learning process and to maximize active learning; incorporation of research in the discipline; linkage with other disciplines; appreciation of national and international diversity and concern for students in and out of the classroom.

College Excellence in Teaching Award

Annually, an Excellence in Teaching Award is presented to one faculty member from each department in the College of Engineering. The awards are under the **John D. and Dortha J. Withrow Endowed Teacher-Scholar Awards Program**. The awardees are presented with a medallion, a certificate, and a modest one-time stipend to support professional activities.

Nomination documents are expected to establish the case for excellence in teaching through consideration of such matters as: command of course content; creation of an effective learning environment; delivery of course materials; availability to students; ability to elicit enthusiastic learning; and/or guidance of student organizations and projects. Evidence might be drawn from the summaries of student instructional ratings. Comments on the impact on the lives of students outside, as well as inside, the classroom might also be offered as evidence.

College Distinguished Scholar Award

Annually, a Distinguished Scholar Award is presented to up to two faculty members, one junior and one senior, in the College of Engineering. The awards are under the **John D. and Dortha J. Withrow Endowed Teacher-Scholar Awards Program**. The awardees are presented with a medallion, a certificate, and a modest one-time stipend to support professional activities.

Nomination documents are expected to establish the case for excellence in personal **and** mentored research and development. This criterion arises from two observations:

- Scholarship in engineering has traditionally been research which advances knowledge in engineering science and design. This has become an inadequate conceptualization of research by engineering scholars. The role of engineering as *the means by which technology emerges from science* suggests that technology itself must be advanced through technological innovation and development, where development is the bridge from design to manufacturability.
- Research and development at a university is distinguished by the fact that, in large measure, the university is the milieu for the intellectual development of the emerging scholar, or doctoral candidate. This makes it evident that there are two products of the established scholar, or faculty member. One is new knowledge in research and development. The other is new scholar in research and development.

Dean's Award for Exceptional Service

Annually, a Dean's Exceptional Service Award is presented to one faculty member in the College of Engineering. The award is under the **John D. and Dortha J. Withrow Endowed Teacher-Scholar Awards Program**. The awardee is presented with a medallion, a certificate, and a modest one-time stipend to support professional activities.

Nomination documents are expected to establish the case for exceptional service, including institutional service, public service (embracing professional service and technology transfer, such as through noncredit workshops under lifelong education programs, licensed patents, consulting, and extension service), and community service.