I. Promotion and Tenure Policies

A. Department Responsibilities

1. The Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences assumes the major responsibility in defining criteria, specifying procedures, and evaluating each application for promotion and tenure.

2. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure committee will be sensitive to the needs of the faculty of the Department and to criteria set forth by the University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure.

B. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee Composition

1. The Chairperson of the Department shall see that the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is assembled in a timely manner. Committee members from within the Department will be elected by the Department faculty. If a sufficient number of members are not available from within the Department, the remaining Committee members will be elected by the faculty in consultation with the Chairperson of the Department. The Committee will have three members, at least two of whom are tenured faculty. The majority of the committee must be at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate. In order to operate within these guidelines, it may be necessary to select members from units outside of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences from kindred disciplines such as Nursing, Physical Therapy, Biology, etc. At such time that the number of tenured faculty in the Department exceeds three, all members of the faculty at the next higher rank(s) (i.e., all Associate and Full Professors for Assistant Professors; all Full Professors for Associate Professors) will constitute the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2. The Chairperson of the Committee, as appointed by the Department Chair, shall be a tenured faculty member in the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences at or above the rank for which the candidate has applied. In the event that a tenured faculty member in the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences is not available to serve in this capacity, the Chairperson will be selected from a kindred discipline.

3. The function of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will be to advise the candidate in the preparation of credentials, to solicit letters of evaluation from peer reviewers, to review the candidate's dossier and to prepare an objective written evaluation of it for transmission to the Department Chairperson and the candidate.
C. Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities

1. The candidate has the right to be informed about all Department and University promotion/tenure criteria, policies, and procedures and the responsibility to seek out this information. The candidate should exercise this right at the earliest possible time and should plan her/his academic development and activities with the guidelines in mind.

2. The candidate is responsible for initiating the promotion/tenure review process. She/he has the right to apply for promotion/tenure at any time, subject to the provisions pertaining to tenure as outlined in the University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure. However, tenure-track faculty in their terminal year may not apply for promotion.

3. Time-in-rank is not a criterion for promotion. Candidates must compile a record sufficient to warrant promotion prior to starting this process.

4. The candidate has the responsibility to prepare the dossier. This document should contain evidence that supports a decision for promotion/tenure. This decision is based primarily on evidence about the candidate's performance after appointment or promotion to her/his current rank.

5. The candidate submits the completed promotion/tenure dossier to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee in accordance with the established Department schedule.

6. The candidate has the right to advance or withdraw her/his dossier at any step of the promotion/tenure process.

7. The candidate must be informed in writing of decisions made at each step of the review process.

II. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

A. Review Procedures

1. Candidate submits completed dossier to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, according to the calendar established by the Department (see II B and C).
2. Solicitation of Peer Evaluations will follow University guidelines as described in the University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure (Resolution #7, Part 9, 2. Scholarship).

Solicited peer evaluations are always required for promotion. Although the number will vary by rank and department or division, every dossier should include outside peer reviews, written by individuals with established reputations in the candidate's field. These statements should analyze and evaluate critically the candidate's work and accomplishments. They also should comment on the candidate's potential for future development.

The solicitation of these evaluations must follow certain guidelines.

a. A candidate submits a list of names and addresses of potential reviewers, but the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will suggest additional names. Although the candidate must be informed of all potential reviewers and will have an opportunity to comment on them, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and not the candidate makes the final selection. The final list of names will not be given to the candidate so as to preserve confidentiality of the reviewers.

b. Candidates must not contact potential reviewers about the promotion process at any time.

c. Letters of evaluation must be confidential and peer reviewers will not be mentioned by name or affiliation in any recommendations or evaluations. Reviewers may be referred to by number.

d. The Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee solicits letters of evaluation. Letters sent to reviewers, soliciting peer review of a candidate, should also request a biographical statement describing the reviewer's credentials and relationship to the candidate. External reviewers should be individuals who can objectively evaluate the candidate’s scholarly activity and/or teaching ability and should not include individuals that have directly mentored, collaborated, and/or co-authored scientific studies with the candidate. If a candidate has collaborative works, it must be clear to the peer evaluator what the candidate’s contributions were to the finished work. Reviewers must be able to determine whether an individual can execute research in his or her own right.

3. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts a critical evaluation of the completed dossier based on the criteria set forth by the faculty of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences. It votes to recommend for or against promotion/tenure. Its written report will include the result of the vote and a summary of the reasons for the recommendation. Copies of this report are forwarded to the Department Chairperson and the candidate. Signed minority opinions will be forwarded as appendices.
4. The Chairperson of the Department will review the dossier and will either endorse or recommend against the promotion/tenure in a written notification to the candidate. The dossier and statements of action are forwarded to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

B. Review Schedule

March 15 - Candidate notifies the Chairperson of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences of her/his intention to apply for promotion/tenure in writing. The request is forwarded to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee which begins the process of soliciting peer evaluations.

March 30 - Candidate submits names and addresses of persons who are potential reviewers to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

July 1 - Candidate submits full Curriculum Vitae and review materials to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Sept. 1 - Candidate submits completed dossier to the Chairperson of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chairperson.

Sept. 15 - The recommendation of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is forwarded to the candidate.

Oct. 1 - The dossier and the recommendation of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is forwarded to the Chairperson of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences.

Oct. 15 - The Department Chairperson forwards the dossier and recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean with a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate and the Department Committee.

Dec. 1 - The College Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards the dossier and recommendation to the Dean with a copy to the candidate and the Department Committee.

Jan. 2 - The Dean forwards dossier and recommendation to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure with a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate, the Department Committee and the College Committee.

Feb. 15 - The University Promotions and Tenure Committee forwards the dossier and recommendation to the Provost with a copy of its recommendation to the candidate, the Department Committee, the Department Chairperson and the Dean.
Feb. 25  -  The Provost forwards dossier and approved recommendation to the President for approval by the Board of Trustees with a copy of his/her recommendation to the candidate. Should the Provost fail to support an application for promotion/tenure, the reasons for the decision will be given to the candidate, the Department Committee, the Department Chairperson, the College Committee, the Dean and the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure.

Appeals are possible at every level. An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision. Appeals must be handled within two weeks, except under extenuating circumstances. The University Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions and Tenure will hear no appeals beyond March 1, and the Provost’s Office will hear no appeals beyond March 15. Any appeals not heard by these dates must be carried over to the following academic year.

C. Dossier Preparation and Presentation

1. The candidate is strongly encouraged to consult with members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.

2. The candidate should organize the dossier according to the following pattern using appropriate forms available from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson. Use tabs to delineate sections.

   a. Introductory Material

      (1) Contents and Guidelines

         # Recommendation for Promotion Form
         # A table of contents
         # A copy of the college’s and department’s promotion and tenure criteria.

      (2) Application for Promotion

         # Candidate’s letter requesting promotion
         # A curriculum vitae
         # Candidate’s statement (optional)
(3) Internal Recommendations

# The department committee’s recommendation
# The chairperson’s recommendation
# College committee’s recommendation (if any)
# Dean or director’s recommendation or endorsement
# University committee’s recommendation
# Any appeal materials (appeals and rebuttals)

(4) External Recommendations

# Letters of evaluation from peer reviewers together with supporting material. These letters will be numbered sequentially for reference.
# Candidate’s statement (optional)

b. Evidential Materials

(1) Teaching

Teaching is an extremely important factor in promotion decisions. Medical Laboratory Science education has as its primary focus two teaching objectives: (1) to impart the theoretical and practical knowledge that underlies the practice of Medical Laboratory Science; and (2) to teach laboratory technique and develop manual dexterity.

The nature of evidential materials related to teaching is dependent upon the predominant teaching assignment. Teaching activities may include: classroom teaching; laboratory teaching and development of professional competencies; seminars; directed undergraduate studies (e.g., degree with distinction advisement, independent study); directed graduate studies (e.g., thesis and research supervision, thesis committee); academic advisement; and other instructional activities.

Another important component of Medical Laboratory Science teaching involves the continual professional development of faculty in order to upgrade those skills necessary to convey state of the art technology in student laboratories. In Medical Laboratory Science, teaching performance includes not only the ability to communicate a body of knowledge but it also involves the design and implementation of effective laboratory courses and the development of instructional materials.

Evidence related to teaching may include (in no order of priority):

(a) Student performance on national standardized examinations in the candidate's teaching area. This information needs to clearly define the candidate's role in the teaching process.
(b) Peer evaluations (written in the form of a narrative critique) that attest to the candidate's classroom and laboratory competence, knowledge of subject matter, organization and preparation, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity and creativity in the classroom and laboratory setting.

(c) Data from student evaluations (of the instructor and of the course), including class size, number returned, means and standard deviations, should be presented in a tabulated format. The procedures used in administering the evaluations should also be described.

(d) Verbatim copies of student comments from student evaluations (describe method for sample selection).

(e) Solicited evaluations from former students. Procedures for drawing the sample should be clearly described.

(f) Long-term follow-up of students.

(g) Course portfolio evaluation.

(h) Teaching awards.

(i) Teaching grants.

(j) Program/project grants.

(k) Contributions to curriculum/course development.

(l) Requests for/acknowledgment of consultation in teaching, curriculum/program development, etc.

(m) Other

(2) Scholarship

In the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences, scholarship is an important factor in promotion decisions. Scholarship includes creative endeavors and activities that contribute to the generation and/or advancement of knowledge for the profession and in the basic and clinical scientific areas. This should be characterized by the individual demonstrating independence and/or leadership with respect to his/her scholarly contributions.
Refereed scientific and professional publications will be considered important indicators of scholarly achievement of the candidate’s research program. Less importance will be given to non-refereed publications, unless external reviews clearly establish the significance of these publications. If a person jointly authors a publication, grant application, etc., the individual contributions of each collaborator must be documented.

Evidence related to scholarship may include (in no order of priority):

(a) Publication of refereed research articles, educational articles, review articles, books, book chapters, technical reports, clinical papers, abstracts, computer software, and computer assisted instruction materials.

(b) Manuscripts accepted or submitted for publication.

(c) Research grants funded/non-funded/or submitted for review.

(d) Presentations (refereed or invited) given at scientific meetings.

(e) Awards (national, regional, local, or University) received in recognition of scholarship.

(f) Professional consultation in scholarly or clinical projects. Examples of professional consultation may include but are not limited to: review of manuscripts, review of grant proposals, book reviews, practice innovations, etc.

(g) Non-refereed publications.

(h) Colloquia, seminars, conferences, lectures, etc. that contribute to the advancement of knowledge.

(i) Elected membership in professional honor societies.

3) Service

Service includes a number of activities that benefit the department, the college, the university, the community, and the profession. Within the university and in the community, health care providers and health care consumers request and require faculty to meet health care and health education needs. In evaluating service, the quantity and quality of the faculty member's activities and contributions are considered.

Possible evidence includes (in no order of priority):

(a) University Service
Policies, Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

i) Departmental Committees, recruiting activities, and special assignments

ii) Nonacademic advisement of students (career, professional, or personal)

iii) Participation in affairs related to student activities

iv) College Committees and special assignments

v) University Senate, University committees, and special assignments/elected activities

vi) Administrative and quasi-administrative appointments

vii) Other

(b) Professional Service

i) Chairing sessions at colloquia, seminars, and/or conferences

ii) Serving as an officer or committee member of a professional organization

iii) Editorial duties

iv) Review of abstracts or manuscripts

v) Presentation of continuing education offerings

vi) Other

(c) Community Service

i) Community service (local, state, regional, national, international), such as election or appointment to boards, commissions, committees, and other positions of leadership

ii) Invited lectures to community groups

iii) Other

(d) Awards or recognition for service

(e) Requests for/acknowledgment of professional consultation in service activities.
III. **Dossier Evaluation Guide**

The Department Promotion Tenure Committee will use the following definitions in making recommendations upon reviewing a candidate’s promotion/tenure dossier.

**Excellent:** Evidence of achievement at a level clearly recognized as exceptional performance, exceeding expectations for the current rank with demonstration of potential for continued achievement.

**Good:** Evidence of achievement at a level above the expectations for the current rank with demonstration of potential for continued achievement.

**Satisfactory:** Evidence of achievement at a level that meets expectations for the current rank.

**Unsatisfactory:** Evidence of achievement at a level that falls below expectations for the current rank.

IV. **Standards for Promotion/Tenure**

**Preamble**

In accordance with University policy, the mission of the Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences encompasses teaching, scholarship, and service. Therefore, faculty members must strive for excellence in all three areas.

For promotion to Assistant Professor

1. Apart from earning the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree, the primary requirement is the demonstrated ability and desire to achieve excellence in scholarship and teaching and to make positive contributions in all three areas. Therefore, the candidate must receive a rating of GOOD in teaching and SATISFACTORY in scholarship and service. At this rank, past achievements are not as important as evidence of potential for growth.

For promotion to Associate Professor

2. The candidate must have an earned doctoral degree. For promotion, a satisfactory or adequate record as an assistant professor is not sufficient. For both promotion and tenure applications, there must be very clear indications, based on firm evidence and outside peer evaluations, that the candidate has in fact attained high levels of accomplishment. In the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, the candidate must receive a rating of EXCELLENT in his/her major area of assigned responsibility, (i.e.)
teaching or scholarship, and GOOD in the remaining two areas. There must be unmistakable evidence that the individual has progressed and that this activity will be sustained. Some contributions are expected to be at the state/national levels.

A candidate initially appointed as an Associate Professor shall be recommended for tenure based upon evidence that he/she has met the above requirements.

For promotion to Professor

3. This rank is reserved for individuals who have established an outstanding reputation in their disciplines and whose contributions to the University's mission are outstanding. There should be unmistakable evidence of significant and sustained achievement since the last promotion. The candidate's claim to have met these requirements must be thoroughly and completely documented by outside peer evaluations that attest to the importance of the candidate's contribution to the field. In the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, the candidate must receive a rating of EXCELLENT in his/her major area of assigned responsibility, (i.e.) teaching or scholarship, and GOOD in the remaining two areas. Some contributions are expected to be at the national/international levels.
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