

Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering Bylaws

Approved: May 14, 2003

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

These bylaws implement aspects of the Agreement Between Wright State University and the Wright State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, (hereafter known as the Agreement), that address procedures for the participation by appropriate bargaining unit faculty members (hereafter known as BUFMs) in the governance of the Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering (hereafter known as the Department). These bylaws may be modified at any time through agreement of a majority of BUFMS in the department, the dean, and the Faculty Governance Committee.

1.2 Faculty Purpose

The faculty of the Department is a community of scholars whose objective is (1) to create and maintain a climate of free inquiry resulting in the expansion, advancement and preservation of knowledge and it's sharing with others and (2) to promote the professions of mechanical and materials engineering. We seek to promote a common spirit of inquiry between teacher and student in an open framework of trust and mutual respect. Cooperative efforts among those espousing different disciplines are encouraged and nurtured in the hopes of achieving real progress in those areas where progress does not come easily.

2.0 ORGANIZATION

2.1 Selection of Departmental Chair

The Dean shall initiate the selection process for a Department Chair. The Dean shall announce whether the search is to be external or restricted to candidates currently employed by the University. The Dean shall appoint a search committee, which will include faculty of the department, and may include other E&CS faculty and members from outside the College or University at the discretion of the Dean. A majority of the committee will be BUFMS from the department. The committee procedures are not specified except that the committee will follow all University Affirmative Action policies and procedures and will consult with the department faculty such that each full-time faculty member has an opportunity for input into a faculty recommendation of acceptable candidates. The committee will recommend one or more qualified candidates to the Dean according to the charge to the committee.

2.2 Faculty Input to Review of Administrators

When the chair is formally reviewed pursuant to the Agreement, each faculty BUFM will be provided an opportunity to give written input to the review committee.

2.3 Department Committees

Standing committees (excluding the Faculty Development Committee) are appointed by the Department Chair. Appointments will be in effect September 1-August 31 of each year. The new committees will take office in

the fall term. Committee chairs are elected by the respective committees each year. In addition, the Chair or the BUFMs may create from time to time such ad hoc committees as may be required to undertake and discharge specific tasks.

2.3.1 Program Area Committee(s) (3)

These committees shall be involved with planning and recommending curricular matters specific to their program area. These groups shall also recommend teaching assistant candidates for their laboratory areas and other related issues.

These committees are composed of faculty groups from the design, energy and materials areas within the Department. Each BUFM shall be on one area committee.

2.3.2 Curriculum Committee

The Committee has the responsibility for evaluating and making recommendations on faculty requests for:

- All undergraduate and graduate course changes, additions or deletions.
- All changes in the department curricula.

The committee is also responsible for assisting in the ABET curriculum assessment process.

Curriculum Committee shall be composed of at least three BUFMs and the department chair, as an ex-officio non-voting member.

2.3.3 Petitions and Admissions Committee

The Petitions and Admissions Committee is responsible for recommendations on student petitions specifically related to policies and requirements that pertain to the Department and making recommendations on those involving college and university requirements. This committee also makes admission recommendations on M.S. program applicants.

The composition of the Petitions Committee shall be 3 BUFMs and the Department Chair as ex-officio, non-voting member.

2.3.4 Honors and Awards Committee

This committee nominates departmental students for awards and scholarships. This committee also nominates faculty for college and university honors and awards. It also deals with issues involving departmental and university honors programs.

This committee is composed of one BUFM from each of the Department's design, energy and materials areas and the department chair as an ex officio, non-voting member.

2.3.5 Faculty Development Committee

This committee works on behalf of the Department to achieve a diverse faculty of outstanding ability and superior performance in teaching, scholarship, and professional service. The specific responsibilities of the Committee are as follows:

- To recommend hiring standards for new faculty, and when requested, to aid in the recruitment of new faculty.
- To assign faculty mentors to assist new BUFMs in the department.
- To annually evaluate BUFM progress toward Promotion and/or Tenure
- To make recommendations regarding proposals for promotion and tenure of faculty.
- To promote high standards of faculty achievement.

The Faculty Development Committee shall include all tenured BUFMs in the department. The Department Chair will chair all promotion and tenure deliberations, but is a non-voting member of the committee in all matters.

The Faculty Development committee shall meet as needed to undertake such tasks as it may set for itself in achieving the goals expressed above. Faculty including members of the committee will not participate or be present at committee meetings that affect their own promotion or tenure process or those to a higher rank than their own. The committee shall explain the reasoning for its conclusions in its recommendations.

2.3.6 Peer Evaluation of Teaching Committee

The objective of the committee is to create an environment within the department that emphasizes excellence in the classroom. The Committee undertakes peer evaluation of faculty teaching. The Teaching Committee will be composed of 3 tenured BUFMs (one from each department group) and the department chair as an ex officio, non-voting member.

The Peer Evaluation Teaching Committee will select two individual evaluators for each probationary BUFM who will conduct peer evaluations of teaching. Each evaluator will review syllabi and other class materials, and attend one lecture class on separate days, and submit a report to the reviewed faculty member, the Department Chair, and the FDC.

2.4 Recommendation of the Faculty

In all areas not specifically mentioned above, the faculty advice or recommendation will result from a meeting of the faculty scheduled by the chair or at the request of 25% of the BUFMs in the department. Except in emergencies, an agenda must be distributed one week prior to the meeting. Recommendations must be approved by a majority of the BUFMS present at the meeting.

3.0 Annual Evaluation

3.1 General Criteria

All faculty members shall be evaluated annually by the department chair. This is done primarily based on the annual report filled out by the faculty member, on student evaluations of teaching, and on the peer teaching evaluation, if any.

The faculty members shall be evaluated separately in teaching, scholarship and professional service. After evaluation of each of the three areas, the department chair shall assign a numerical rating between 0 and 4 as foreseen in the Agreement: 0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = adequate, 2=meritorious, 3=outstanding and 4=extraordinary. The criteria used to arrive at these ratings are to be uniform for all evaluations and are listed below. The composite average rating is then calculated based on an optimization of the three relative weighting factors to provide a maximum composite rating for the individual faculty member. The relative weighting factors must be constrained within the following ranges: 20%-70% for teaching, 20%-70% for scholarship and

10%-50% for service, unless changed for one of the reasons below. The department chair shall convey the evaluation including the assigned scores and weights to the faculty member in writing.

Under the following circumstances, the department chair may assign weights without using the optimizing algorithm or being constrained by the usual range of relative weights:

1. unique work assignments that differ from those of other BUFMs;
2. disciplinary action against the faculty member, pursuant to the Agreement;
3. substandard performance extending over more than one year.

3.2 Specific Criteria

If multiple measures are required to achieve a certain level of performance, these measures may be from the same category. For example, if two additional measures are necessary from the list: i) publication of one journal article, ii) external grant of \$100,000 and iii) three quarters of graduate student support, publication of two journal articles would fulfill the requirement.

Scholarship and service criteria calling for three-year averages shall first apply during the third year these bylaws are in effect. For the first annual evaluation performed under these bylaws, accomplishments from the previous year only will be considered; for the second annual evaluation, averages over the past two years will be used. Similarly, new bargaining unit faculty members who have been employed at Wright State University for less than two full years will be evaluated for their accomplishments in the past year only. After two full years at Wright State University, they will be evaluated using averages of those first two years.

3.3 Teaching

Factors used in rating teaching performance include effectiveness of in-class teaching; teaching of workshops and continuing education courses; student advising; serving as major advisor for Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses; serving on thesis and dissertation committees; supervising senior design, honors and independent study projects; supervising postdoctoral fellows; developing new courses and laboratories, integrating new technologies in courses and attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching.

3.3.1 Unsatisfactory

The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of in-class teaching performance. Unsatisfactory performance often leads to a significant number of student complaints. Examples of in-class teaching problems include:

- the faculty member does not seem prepared for classroom activities;
- the faculty member does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well or is not available to students;
- on a regular basis, the faculty member shows up late for class, dismisses class early or does not show up for class at all;
- on a regular basis, the faculty member is not available during office hours.

3.3.2 Adequate

The faculty member in this category performs satisfactorily based on student evaluations and review of the relevant teaching materials. Adequate performance in teaching is represented by only few negative comments by students and, if available, an overall positive assessment by peers. Performance at an adequate level of teaching is typically demonstrated through:

- meeting with the class at scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances;
- being available during posted office hours unless there is an unavoidable conflict;
- being prepared for the classroom;
- keeping course content current.

3.3.3 Meritorious

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, at least two measures such as those listed below can be used as evidence of meritorious teaching:

- preparing a course that the faculty member is teaching for the first time;
- making major modifications to a course;
- serving on master's thesis and dissertation committees of students graduating during that year;
- effectively supervising independent study projects and honors thesis students;
- effectively integrating new technologies into classroom instruction.

3.3.4 Outstanding

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, at least two measures such as those listed below can be used as evidence for outstanding teaching:

- co-authoring at least one journal article with students;
- attracting funds for laboratory equipment to support teaching;
- serving as a major advisor for a completed master's thesis or doctoral dissertation.

3.3.5 Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate teaching activities that exceed expectations for outstanding and make major contributions to department and college which are recognized outside the university.

3.4 Scholarship

Factors used in rating the scholarship performance include submission of journal articles to peer-reviewed archival journals; acceptance of submitted articles; submission and acceptance of abstracts, proceedings, book chapters, reports, etc.; submission and award of patents; invitation to give lectures, conference presentations, seminars; submission of research proposals; funding of research proposals; support of students in the faculty member's research program. One awarded patent equals one peer-reviewed archival journal article.

3.4.1 Unsatisfactory

The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of performance in scholarship as outlined below.

3.4.2 Adequate

Research progress may be indicated by documenting an average of at least one of the following measures per year over the past three years:

- publication of a technical paper in a technical conference or a book chapter;
- submission of a journal paper for a peer-reviewed journal;

- submission of a research proposal to an external agency.

If the faculty member has had no external research support during the year, there must be documentation about submission of a research proposal to an external agency. This proposal must be for a major grant from a national source with the faculty member as the principal or co-principal investigator.

3.4.3 Meritorious

Research performance in the meritorious category can be demonstrated by an average of at least two measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below:

- publication of a technical paper in a peer-reviewed journal;
- initial funding of a research grant;
- three quarters of graduate student support.

3.4.4 Outstanding

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious scholarship, an average of at least two additional measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below can be used as evidence of outstanding performance:

- publication of at least one additional journal article;
- external research grants and contracts exceeding \$100,000 in total costs per year;
- an additional three quarters of graduate student support.

3.4.5 Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate research activities that exceed expectations for outstanding.

3.5 Service

Factors used in rating the service performance include membership in department, college, program and university committees; chairmanship in committees; participation in student recruitment efforts; active participation in professional societies and their committees; organization of professional conference sessions, chairmanship of conference sessions; review of professional articles and grant proposals; editorship of professional journals; lectures to community groups.

3.5.1 Unsatisfactory

There is little or no service activity demonstrated by the faculty member in the annual activity report. The faculty member does not meet the requirements of an adequate level of performance.

3.5.2 Adequate

The faculty member demonstrates all of the following in the area of service:

- regular and timely attendance at the department faculty meetings;
- fulfilling individual responsibilities to the department, including effective service on department committees;

- participation in student advising, open houses and other representative functions vital for the department.

3.5.3 Meritorious

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for adequate performance, an average of at least three measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below can be used as evidence for meritorious performance:

- effectively serving on college or university committees;
- effectively chairing an active department committee;
- effectively serving as an advisor for a student club;
- serving as a session chair in a national conference;
- holding an office in a local or professional organization;
- reviewing for a journal;
- serving as a guest speaker for area business, government or community organization.

3.5.4 Outstanding

Assuming the faculty member has met the requirements for meritorious performance, an average of at least two measures per year over the past three years such as those listed below can be used as evidence for outstanding performance:

- effectively serving as an editorial board member or associate editor for a professional journal; · effectively serving as a track chair in a national conference;
- organizing a conference workshop or panel for a national conference;
- holding positions of leadership in community or professional organizations.

3.5.5 Extraordinary

The faculty member must demonstrate service activities that exceed expectations for outstanding performance. Extraordinary performance requires demonstration of leadership roles in several service activities and appropriate outcome of these activities.

4.0 General Evaluation Criteria for P&T

The Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering establishes the following general criteria for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure. More specific quantitative requirements for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor are discussed below, but are qualitatively defined by these general measures. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of excellence in scholarship, teaching and service to the institution and to the academic and professional communities. Letters of reference may be used as evidence of strength. The criteria are grouped into three categories: *Scholarship*, *Teaching*, and *Service*.

4.1 Scholarship

The most important components of a candidate's scholarship performance are the publication record, the record of external funding, and the evaluation letters received from external referees. For favorable consideration for promotion at either level and for the award of tenure, candidates must provide clear and compelling evidence that they are productive scholars who have developed an active and independent research program. General expectations with respect to publications and funding are summarized below.

4.1.1 Publications

4.1.1.1 Archival Journal Papers

A publication record consists of several components, however peer reviewed archival journal papers serve as the foundation on which the remainder of the record should be built and evaluated. While it is expected that faculty members engage in research primarily related to their engineering disciplines, a candidate's scholarship record may also include peer-reviewed journal publications in the area of engineering education.

4.1.1.2 Quality of Published Works

It is expected that faculty publish in various quality journals according to the nature and scope of the contribution, the intended audience, and the technical level of the discussion. Nevertheless, it is required that a significant portion of the scholarship appears in respected journals in the faculty member's research area, as confirmed by the external reviewers.

4.1.1.3 Other Forms

A complete publication record may include more than archival, refereed journal papers. For example, books, book chapters, refereed conference papers, substantial software packages, and patents are all worthy products of faculty scholarship. While these individual works are generally considered to be of lesser scholarly value than the archival journal paper they may, in aggregate, represent some scholarship equivalence of journal papers. This depends largely upon the quality and visibility of the individual works.

4.1.1.4 Authorship Considerations

At least half of the required publications, especially the archival publications, should have the faculty member or his or her students as the primary author. Collaborative efforts are encouraged where appropriate to the research topic and when resources can be obtained through teamwork that would not be available to the single investigator. Nevertheless, a publication record in which a disproportionate share of the papers are primarily authored by collaborators is not appropriate in that it fails to document the establishment of an independent research program.

4.1.1.5 Consistency in the Scholarly Record

The faculty member should be able to show that the scholarly record has been built and sustained over his or her time at Wright State University. It is natural that a transient period may occur as faculty acquire and develop graduate student researchers, build laboratory facilities, focus on a new area of research or assume additional duties. However, once a reasonable period of adjustment is past, the research program of the faculty member should begin to grow in a fairly steady manner. To receive a favorable evaluation, evidence of consistency must be present in the faculty member's record.

4.1.2 External Funding

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the departmental research mission not only through scholarly publication, but also by obtaining resources to support research activities. The primary objective of obtaining external funding is to aid in the production of high quality scholarship and to allow a faculty member to build the infrastructure to sustain such activities.

A cornerstone of an active academic research program and a priority in the departmental research mission is the sustained support of graduate students. In addition to graduate student support, funding from external

awards is commonly used to support research activities, facilities and equipment, and other personnel. While these expenditures are all instrumental in establishing and maintaining a research program, the sustained support of graduate students is considered a particularly important measure of the scholarship value of external funding awards.

4.1.2.1 Competitive Awards

Along with refereed journal publications, competitively reviewed proposals by funding agencies or members of industry provide an additional external measure of the quality and contribution of faculty research. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate success in obtaining competitive funding awards as principal or co-principal investigators.

4.1.2.2 Internal Funding

Opportunities for “internal” funding frequently exist within Wright State University that limit the competition for the awards. The objectives of these programs are to enhance the recipient’s ability to competitively obtain additional external funding from other agencies. Success of these programs should be directly reflected in the publications generated and external funding obtained as a result of the internal support. Consequently, except for funds to support graduate students, internal funding has no bearing in an evaluation for promotion or tenure.

4.2 Teaching

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in the classroom, as a graduate advisor, and as a mentor. Evidence of excellence can be inferred from such measures as student and peer evaluations of classroom performance, number of graduate students successfully advised to completion, successful advisement of senior design and independent study projects, papers coauthored with students, involvement with student chapters of professional societies, publications addressing engineering education or courseware, published textbooks or courseware, effective course enhancement or teaching innovations, curriculum development, lab development, and teaching awards. Each faculty member is expected to teach a variety of material at both undergraduate and graduate levels subject to department scheduling requirements.

Faculty members are expected to effectively use the resources available and administer their classes in a manner that is punctual, prepared, professional, and personable. In addition, faculty members should be available, outside of class, for a reasonable period of time each week to meet with students from class, from student organizations, or who are seeking advice on other academic matters.

4.3 Service

In order to be considered for promotion, faculty members must demonstrate that they have performed service responsibilities for the Department, the College, and the University community, by participating actively in Department, College, and University committees. In particular, faculty members should consistently attend assigned committee and other Departmental meetings and complete the work necessary for the committees to fulfill their responsibilities. In addition, faculty members are expected to contribute to their academic community and its professional activities in a manner which increases with rank, as outlined below.

4.3.1 Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Assistant Professors are expected to focus primarily on scholarship and teaching, and to a lesser extent on service. However, for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, candidates are expected to participate in College and Department committees and to show some evidence of professional service involvement at the

national level. Typical examples of such involvement include membership in professional societies, participation in national conferences and symposia, and reviewing of journal papers.

4.3.2 Expectations for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, the candidate is expected to have assumed a leadership role in Departmental, College, or University committees, and to have demonstrated significant professional service involvement at the national level. Examples of such involvement include holding editorships of journals, serving on conference organization committees, organizing and chairing sessions at conferences, holding offices in professional societies, continued paper and proposal reviewing, and participating in review panels for funding agencies.

5.0 QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR P&T

In the sections that follow, representative levels of performance in specific areas of scholarship and teaching are quantified and described in terms of "marginally acceptable", "acceptable" and "strong". Measures of performance substantially below these representative values would be considered "weak", while those substantially above would be considered "very strong". When taken in conjunction with the general criteria previously outlined for scholarship, teaching and service, a candidate's *cumulative* performance record must be rated at least an average of "acceptable" in order to receive a favorable recommendation for promotion.

5.1 For Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

In this section specific quantitative requirements for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and for awarding tenure to an untenured Associate Professor are outlined. It is normally expected that an Assistant Professor will be considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure during his or her sixth year at Wright State University, and that an untenured Associate Professor will be considered for tenure during his or her third year at Wright State University. However, for those candidates having substantial relevant prior experience or demonstrating exceptional performance, provisions for early consideration for promotion with tenure are also provided.

The quantitative criteria below refer to the candidate's total performance record, which may include time prior to the candidate's joining the faculty at Wright State University. However, a candidate's performance record within the previous five years, and particularly since appointment at Wright State University, is given strongest consideration.

5.1.1 Scholarship

In this section, representative levels of performance are given for several quantifiable measures of scholarship, including total number of refereed journal publications, total dollars in external research funding, and total quarters of full-time graduate student support.

In regard to the number of refereed journal publications, a total of 8 is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of 10 is considered "acceptable", and a total of 12 is considered "strong". While papers submitted for publication are certainly indicative of ongoing scholarship activity, the above representative numbers refer only to papers officially accepted for publication and those already in print. Further, it is expected that at least half of the above representative numbers of papers would have been published following the candidate's appointment at Wright State University, and that a consistent scholarly record has been maintained throughout the candidate's probationary period.

In regard to total dollars of external research funding, a total of \$200,000 is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of \$250,000 is considered "acceptable", and a total of \$300,000 is considered "strong". Here, only external research funding officially awarded to Wright State University and allocated to a research account under the direction of the candidate is considered.

In regard to total quarters of full-time graduate student support, a total of 12 is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of 15 is considered "acceptable", and a total of 18 is considered "strong". Here, "full-time" support refers to no less than the minimum level of graduate student salary required by the School of Graduate Studies to garner a full-time tuition waiver for the student supported. For the purpose of quantifying graduate student support, the source of funding may be either internal or external, as long as the support is payable from a WSU account under the direction of the candidate.

5.1.2 Teaching

Due to the qualitative nature of student and peer evaluations, a candidate's classroom performance is primarily judged according to the qualitative guidelines outlined in section 4.2. In addition to strong classroom performance, a candidate is expected to demonstrate success as a graduate student advisor. This is most easily quantified in terms of number of students graduated.

In regard to the total number of graduate students advised to completion (with the candidate as major professor), a total of 2 masters students graduated is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of 3 is considered "acceptable", and a total of 4 is considered "strong". If the candidate has graduated both M.S. and Ph.D. students during the probationary period, each Ph.D. student is considered equivalent to 2.5 M.S. students.

5.1.3 Early Consideration

A candidate may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure prior to the end of the probationary period when a candidate has experience as a tenure track faculty member at other institutions or when a candidate's overall performance is rated "strong". In this case, it is necessary that the candidate's level of performance has been of sufficient duration at Wright State University to confirm that criteria have been met.

5.2 For Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, the career accomplishments of the candidate should show clear evidence of a nationally or internationally recognized contributor to the discipline. Moreover, evidence of continuing and consistent scholarship is required to ensure that the candidate's contributions represent the current state of the discipline.

In order to provide sufficient time to establish a continuous record of scholarship at the level expected for promotion to Professor, a candidate normally will have completed at least five years at the rank of Associate Professor. In exceptional cases, a candidate may be considered for promotion to Professor prior to the completion of five years at the rank of Associate Professor. A case may be considered exceptional when a candidate's performance is uniformly rated "strong" according to the criteria outlined below, and when this level of performance has been of sufficient duration to confirm that the criteria have been met.

The quantitative criteria outlined below refer to the cumulative performance record throughout the candidate's career, although specific consideration is also given to the candidate's performance record during the preceding five years.

5.2.1 Scholarship

In this section, representative levels of performance required for promotion to Professor are given for several quantifiable measures of scholarship, including total number of refereed journal publications, total dollars in external research funding, and total quarters of full-time graduate student support.

In regard to the number of archival journal publications, a total of 20 is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of 24 is considered "acceptable", and a total of 28 is considered "strong". As previously stipulated, the above representative numbers refer only to papers officially accepted for publication and those already in print. Further, it is normally expected that at least half of the above representative numbers of papers would have been published within the previous five years.

In regard to total dollars of external research funding, a total of \$600,000 is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of \$750,000 is considered "acceptable", and a total of \$900,000 is considered "strong". Here, only external research funding officially awarded to Wright State University and allocated to a research account under the direction of the candidate is considered. Further, it is normally expected that at least half of the above total research dollars would have been awarded within the previous five years.

In regard to total quarters of full-time graduate student support, a total of 45 is considered "marginally acceptable", a total of 60 is considered "acceptable", and a total of 75 is considered "strong". Here "full-time" support refers to no less than the minimum level of graduate student salary required by the School of Graduate Studies to garner a full-time tuition waiver for the student supported. For the purpose of quantifying graduate student support, the source of funding may be either internal or external, as long as the support is payable from a WSU account under the direction of the candidate.

5.2.2 Teaching

For promotion to Professor, it is expected that the candidate has maintained a high level of classroom performance, as determined from the qualitative measures outlined in section 4.2. In addition, the candidate is expected to have been actively involved in curriculum or laboratory development consistent with the needs of the Department and his or her specialty area.

In addition to consistent performance in the classroom, a candidate for Professor is expected to have advised to completion a significant number of graduate students, including at least one Ph.D. student. With each Ph.D. student graduated being equivalent to 2.5 M.S. students, the equivalent of 8 M.S. students graduated is considered "marginally acceptable", the equivalent of 10 is considered "acceptable", and the equivalent of 12 is considered "strong".

Criteria for Appointment with Tenure

Occasionally an award of tenure is made with an initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. When this is considered, it is normally expected that the candidate currently has tenure at an academic institution whose stature and expectations are at least comparable with those of Wright State University. The career accomplishments of the candidate should establish him or her as a nationally recognized contributor to the discipline. To ensure that the candidate's contributions represent the current state of the discipline, the specific criteria previously discussed for promotion to the rank being considered must be satisfied.