

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved February 2023

Next scheduled review August 2024

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	2
3. Areas of Faculty Performance	6
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	7
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	14
6. Engineering Medicine Promotion & Tenure Advisory Committee (EMPTAC).....	17
7. Annual Review	17
8. Mid-Term Review	20
9. Post-Tenure Review	22

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University **School of Engineering Medicine** is to deliver educational and research programs at the convergence of engineering and medicine. To support this mission, appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members are essential. This document is designed to provide a means of evaluating and promoting faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the **School**, while providing them with stability of employment.

The faculty of the **School of Engineering Medicine** are expected to: **i)** develop an innovative, scholarly, and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service, and **ii)** achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. To achieve these goals requires both flexibility and freedom. Thus, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the **School of Engineering Medicine**. These guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general guidelines for evaluating faculty throughout their careers, including: annual performance evaluations, criteria for promotion and tenure, mid-term review, and post-tenure review. These guidelines are consistent with the requirements and guidelines of the University. In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between the present document and Texas A&M University (TAMU) or Texas A&M University System (TAMUS), the policies, rules, and procedures of TAMUS or TAMU take precedence. The foundations of the **School** guidelines and additional details can be found at the Faculty Affairs [website](#) and in the TAMU documents listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Protocols Governing Faculty Evaluations

Title	Link
University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion)	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
University Rule 12.01.99.M1- APPENDIX I (Examples of Criteria to Evaluate Faculty)	12.10.99.M1 APPENDIX I
Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review)	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
University Guidelines for Annual Evaluation and Mid-Term Review	Faculty Affairs Rules & Policies
Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs: Promotion and Tenure Submission Guidelines	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure
TAMUS Regulation 12.01.01 (Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure)	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
TAMUS Policy 12.07 (Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty)	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-07.pdf
Texas A&M University Guidelines To Faculty Titles	Faculty Titles
Interfolio Faculty 180 Quick Guides	Faculty Affairs – Faculty 180 Guides

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

By definition, a position is considered to be a faculty appointment if the primary title includes the word “professor,” “instructor,” or “lecturer”. However, not all faculty appointments are eligible to participate in all shared governance activities. Eligibility of faculty to participate in shared governance activities are defined by the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate and other approved guidelines, including College/School and Department guidelines.

Definitions of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at in University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#) and University Guidelines to [Faculty Titles](#). Faculty are hired or appointed into one of three tracks: **i**) tenure-track (TT), **ii**) academic professional track (APT), or titled track (conscripted faculty title qualifiers). Not all tracks have ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Similarly, not all ranks and tracts are eligible for promotion, or renewal. In some cases, however, faculty can be reclassified and appointed to a different track, which could then give the faculty member opportunities for promotion. The relative contributions to

performance areas (i.e., teaching, research, administration, scholarship, and service) vary for each track and are specified in annual appointment letters. Faculty titles within the **School of Engineering Medicine** are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Faculty Titles

Entry Level	First Promotion	Second Promotion
Tenure Track (TT)		
Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Instructor		
Academic Professional Tracks (APT)		
Instructional Assistant Professor	Instructional Associate Professor	Instructional Professor
Research Assistant Professor	Research Associate Professor	Research Professor
Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
Clinical Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Clinical Professor
Assistant Professor of Practice	Associate Professor of Practice	Professor of Practice
Title Tracks (Conscribed Faculty Title Qualifiers)		
ACES Assistant Professor		
Senior [Faculty Title]		
Clinical Instructor		
Visiting [Faculty Title]		
Adjunct [Faculty Title]		
Assistant Lecturer		

All new faculty members shall be provided with an appointment letter stating the initial terms and conditions of employment. Any subsequent modifications or special understandings in regard to the appointment will be stated in writing and a copy will be given to the faculty member. All faculty members, unless the terms and conditions of their appointment letter state otherwise, are expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. In addition, some faculty members may negotiate or be assigned to make contributions to administrative duties.

2.1 Tenured/Tenure-Faculty Titles.

Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom and is irrevocable except as specified in University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#).

If an appointment is tenure-accruing, the appointment letter will indicate the length of the period of probationary service at TAMU and state the credit agreed upon for appropriate service at other institutions.

The probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed a total of seven years of full-time service. All appointments during the probationary period are for a fixed term of one year or less and are subject to renewal or non-renewal each year of the probationary period. Assistant professors will be evaluated for promotion to associate professor and for tenure concurrently and will not be awarded one without the other. Persons whose initial appointment is at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire ([TRUH](#)).

- 2.1.a Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of tenured/tenure-track faculty members. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will be primarily teaching. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research, teaching, and service. Granting tenure is a recognition of excellence in all three areas and entitles the faculty member to continue in their academic position unless dismissed for good cause, and promotion is based on continuing accomplishment and national/international recognition for scholarship.
- 2.1.b Instructor is an appointment that is used for a person who is recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. This title would normally be used for less than one year after hire. Failure to complete the required degree by a specified date can result in the termination of the appointment. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be changed to Assistant Professor and the tenure probationary period will begin. Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research, teaching, and service.

2.2 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Titles.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty titles are non-tenure accruing appointment titles with renewable appointments, typically with a three year appointment at the entry level and not to exceed five years. Faculty members in these appointments provide a professional skill to the academic institution. All are expected to make significant contributions in at least one area of scholarly research, teaching, and service. In addition, APT faculty may be assigned administrative duties, which will be evaluated periodically and taken into consideration during deliberations for promotion. These expectations can include work in applied or clinical settings. APT faculty members can be reclassified across equivalent ranks to reflect work assignments. All APT faculty members must meet one of the following criteria: **a)** have a terminal degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will teach, **b)** have a Master level degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will teach and significant teaching experience at the college/school level in the field or in a related field, or **c)** have an extraordinary record of accomplishment in an applied setting.

- 2.2.a Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor are expected to make significant contributions to teaching activity, and this can include education in applied or clinical settings. Instructional faculty will also make significant contributions in either research, service activity, or administrative duties. Typically these activities will be central to carrying the curriculum forward and professional development in the discipline or industry in which they teach. Instructional faculty members will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity, and research/service activity in the context of instruction and programmatic/curricular development.
- 2.2.b Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor are expected to make significant contributions to research activity, and their appointment is often associated with substantial research funding or work on a particular project. Research faculty can also be assigned to teaching, service activity or administrative duties. Typically these activities will be central to research activity and involvement of students in research. If instruction is more than 50% of assigned duties, it is likely that a reclassification to an instructional track is needed. Research faculty members will primarily be evaluated on research activity, and teaching/service activity in the context of their research expertise.

- 2.2.c. Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer are expected to make significant contributions to teaching activity. Lecturer faculty can contribute to research or service activity but not be assigned. If they are being assigned research or service, they should be in another track. Lecturer faculty members will primarily be evaluated on teaching activity.
- 2.2.d. Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor are expected to make significant contributions to education in a clinical practice discipline or applied setting. If their work assignment requires a license or certification, clinical faculty members are expected to maintain the educational and practice requirements for active licensure/certification. Clinical faculty can also be assigned to research, service activity or administrative duties. Typically these activities will be incidental to clinical education and clinical practice. Clinical faculty members will primarily be evaluated on education, and research or service activity in the context of their professional expertise.
- 2.2.e. Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice are expected to make significant contributions to education in an area where they have substantial professional credentials or experience. At the Assistant level, professors of practice must have an advanced degree appropriate for the field in which the faculty member will teach, teaching experience, and will typically have practiced in their industry for a minimum of three years. In addition, they must have attained a record of significant accomplishments during their time in industry, or maintain a license or certification that qualifies them as a professional in their field. Specific adjectives can be added before this title for recruitment purposes to reflect expertise in an area.
- 2.3 Title Track (Conscribed Faculty Title Qualifiers). Conscribed faculty title qualifiers indicate a non-tenure accruing appointment title intended for use in a specified situation and/or appointment type and are not eligible for evaluation for promotion, but in some cases, can be reclassified. Faculty who are at less than 66% effort should be hired under a conscribed faculty title qualifier. These appointments, however, can be 100% effort if faculty are hired for specific situations. Any faculty member engaged in teaching activity must be eligible to be credentialed. Faculty in most of these titles are typically not eligible for voting rights in campus and department activities.
- 2.3.a. Clinical [Faculty Title] indicates a short-term, non-tenure accruing appointment that involves a specific set of expectations and duties associated with clinical instruction agreed upon between the faculty member and the **School**. This title can also be used for laboratory settings. These appointments are limited to a maximum of a one year appointment, but can be renewed. Ranks include Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor.
- 2.3.b. Visiting [Faculty Title] indicates a short-term appointment associated with a salary. The appointment can be for one semester or one year, but is expected to be no more than three years. The appointment should involve a specific set of expectations and duties agreed upon between the faculty member and the **School** as part of the hiring offer letter. Ranks include Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor.
- 2.3.c. Adjunct [Faculty Title] indicates a non-paid, non-tenure accruing appointment that involves a specific set of expectations and duties agreed upon between the faculty member and the **School**. These appointments are limited to a maximum of a one year appointment, but can be renewed through the same process. Ranks include Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor.
- 2.3.d. [Faculty Title] Lecturer is a non-tenure track appointment used for less than five years for candidates for a TAMU doctoral degree. These appointments are focused on teaching assignments, and they do not normally confer eligibility for faculty voting rights in shared governance processes on campus. Ranks include Principal, Senior, Assistant.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (i.e., teaching, research, scholarly activity, service, and administration). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the supervisor and the Dean of the **School of Engineering Medicine**. Faculty with an alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties. For additional details, see University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#) and the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs: [Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#).

3.1 **Teaching** is central to the mission of the **School of Engineering Medicine**, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: **i)** contribute to instruction and student development; **ii)** continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and **iii)** promote and diversify the development of the **School's** instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Several supporting documents are required, including: **i)** sample course syllabi, **ii)** sample assignments, **iii)** sample examinations, and **iv)** samples of instructor feedback in student assignments, and **v)** samples of student evaluations. Although required, these items not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Some examples of other measures/sources of information include: **1)** self-evaluation; **2)** peer-evaluation; **3)** records of all courses taught and service as course director; **4)** evidence of continuous course and teaching improvement (e.g., contributing to educational workshops); **5)** evidence of course and curriculum development; **6)** awards for distinguished teaching; **7)** evidence of development of educational improvements; **8)** publication of educational research and/or textbooks; and **9)** appropriate blending of engineering and medical concepts and principles in the curriculum.

3.2 **Scholarly activities**. For faculty members with designated research activity, it is expected that they will publish scholar works in high quality journals and/or proceedings appropriate for their discipline, build national and international recognition, pursue and sustain external sponsorship/funding, and effectively manage research personnel - particularly students. Given the mission of the **School of Engineering Medicine**, faculty are encouraged to pursue research that highlights innovative educational and translational pedagogies as well as research related to conventional medical and engineering sciences.

3.3 **Service**. Faculty service can be within the **School of Engineering Medicine** and/or within the School of Medicine, College of Engineering and/or at the University level. Hence, faculty are encouraged to serve and lead committees that have direct effects on the **School**. Service at the University level is expected at the associate and professor levels. Service in professional societies, as reviewers, conference organizers, and leaders is expected of all faculty.

3.4 **Administration**. Administrative appointments are necessary for **School** operations, and effectiveness is considered when maintaining or renewing such appointments. Effectiveness in these positions is required of those so appointed. Evaluation of effectiveness in administration mainly affects decisions on renewal of appointments and/or consideration for additional administrative positions. However, significant impact and excellence in these roles should be considered towards promotion and/or tenure. Evaluation of administration does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing administrative performance. *Measures/sources of information include:* 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) stakeholder (student, staff, external, and the like) feedback.

4. Indicators of and Criteria for Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness.

The **School of Engineering Medicine** recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. Below are representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area. For additional details, see University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#) and the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs: [Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#).

4.1 Indicators of and Criteria for Excellence and Effectiveness in Teaching

4.1.a Performance Rating for Teaching.

<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	Absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in teaching.
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	Minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, blending medical and engineering concepts into course materials, or student-centered, laboratory, and/or clinical teaching.
<u>Satisfactory</u>	Appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Supporting evidence may include: documentation of courses taught, activity as course co-director, examples of blending medical and engineering concepts into course materials, course evaluations, and peer and student evaluations.
<u>Exemplary</u>	Strong evidence of effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators. Supporting evidence should include the elements describe above and additional evidence of curricular development and innovation, internal and external awards, organization of or participation in workshops, activities in professional societies, or invited presentations. Many also will have contributed to novel educational methodologies and curricular development and have publications in peer reviewed journals and/or of textbooks.
<u>Most Meritorious</u>	Those receiving the Most Meritorious rating should have the attributes of an Exemplary Rating and additional evidence of nationally/internationally recognition as an educator, securing funding for instructional scholarly activities and/or funding for implementing innovative and advanced instructional methods, recipient of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. To evaluate fairly the member, a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence may be necessary, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence.

4.1.b Criteria for Excellence in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes.
- Demonstrated evidence of teaching excellence by selection for peer reviewed University, School, or professional Society outstanding teacher/instruction awards.
- Participation in development of questions for specialty board examinations.
- Contribution to new instructional program development.
- Development of new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses.

- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals.
- Publication of the results of education research endeavors.
- Publication of scholarly review articles, textbooks, original clinical investigations, descriptions of clinical experience, or case reports/results that emphasize education endeavors.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).
- Development of innovative or acclaimed instructional materials including syllabi or software.
- Presentation at professional meetings or other institutions of higher education that serve the teaching mission of the **School**.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Evidence of successful career paths of former graduate students and post-doctoral students.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s).
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects or education research.
- Leading a major curriculum development, assessment, or redesign effort for the introduction of innovative technology or novel teaching methodologies in the instructional setting.
- High-quality of teaching to multiple College instructional programs.
- Leadership role in educational activities of national/international professional societies.
- Chair of Master's/Doctoral student committees.
- Placement of Master's/Doctoral students or postdoctoral students into significant academic, scholarly, and/or professional positions.
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to doctoral student development.

4.1.c Criteria for Effectiveness in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Good teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes.
- Evidence of contributing to or coordinating courses or both.
- Coordination of team-taught or integrated courses.
- Rigorous, accurate and equitable grading.
- Development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes.
- Service as a member of thesis/dissertation committees of graduate students.
- Mentoring and training medical students or post-graduate residents in experimental experiences and postgraduate residencies.
- Favorable evaluation by faculty mentored by the candidate.
- Direction of independent student research.
- Mentoring of junior colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality.
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness.
- Introduction of current and emerging instructional methodologies and technologies in the curriculum.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the **School**.

- Development of pedagogical approaches to enhance student engagement and to optimize student learning.
- Introduction of practices to evaluate the engagement of students in a critical analysis of course material, or which evaluate their involvement in research or scholarly activity.
- Contribution to a **School**-wide culture of evidence-based approaches to evaluation and improvement of academic programs.
- Development of valuable evidence-based metrics for teaching effectiveness.
- Preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs.
- Selection for student or departmental awards for outstanding teaching.
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Evidence of active teaching of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows.
- Consistent membership on Master's/Doctoral student committees.

4.2 Indicators of Excellence and Effectiveness in Research and Scholarship of Instruction.

4.2.a Performance Ratings for Excellence in Research and Instructional Scholarly.

<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	Absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	Minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, and book chapters.
<u>Satisfactory</u>	Adequate evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
<u>Exemplary</u>	Strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. The School can also include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.
<u>Most Meritorious</u>	Faculty receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an Exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

4.2.b Criteria for Excellence in Research and Instructional Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:

- Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings.
- Substantial record of peer-reviewed primary and/or corresponding senior authored publications that demonstrate evidence of originality as an investigator.
- Publications of original research in the leading peer-reviewed, discipline-related journals.
- Favorable citation index listing of research/educational publications within their respective discipline.
- Consistent, sustainable, and competitive external funding for research.

- Key participation in forming productive collaborative research arrangements with industry, community agencies, foundations, and other academic institutions.
- Significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements.
- Coordination of interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects.
- Publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s).
- Leadership of national meetings or workshops
- Authorship of a textbook, textbook chapter, review articles, contributions of published symposia.
- Editorship or associate editorship of scholarly, refereed journals, or of special issues of a journal.
- Recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars.
- Evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface with other academic disciplines.
- Originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspective on, and uses of information.
- Peer-reviewed publication of instructional materials, e.g., case studies, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials.
- Extramural recognition for contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant, service on editorial boards of prestigious journals in the chosen area of teaching scholarship, and invitations to present keynote or plenary national or international meetings concerning education.
- Significant extramural funding for research on issues of importance in teaching.
- Publication of critically acclaimed chapters, books, or comparable electronic materials about education.
- Election to membership in major national research societies.
- Dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College.
- Editorship or associate editorship of a major journal in the chosen area of teaching scholarship.
- Serving on national grant organization study sections, review panels, or site visit teams.
- Serving on national professional society program committees.
- Election to major national professional societies.
- A senior leadership role demonstrating superior competence and outstanding productivity on research projects.
- Consistent and sustainable extramural support for an established research program.
- Service on National Advisory Councils or Boards, Editorship of journals, leadership of national/international study sections, consensus panels, or other similar activities.
- Frequent citation of publications.

4.2.c Criteria for Effectiveness in Research and Instructional Scholarly Activities include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of articles in professional journals appropriate to the field of endeavor. Greater significance will be attributed to primary and corresponding authored papers in peer reviewed journals, but all co-primary and co-corresponding publications will be evaluated.
- Publication of books, monographs, or manuals on paper or in electronic media that are widely disseminated, evaluated by peers, and advance the field of endeavor.
- Award of extramural support commensurate with the current primary field of research.
- Demonstration of a sustained leadership role in an independent research program (e.g., research program leader or laboratory/clinic director).
- Evidence for a principal role in management and/or support of a collaborative research program (e.g., letters from program leader or members of the research program).
- Development/award of patents for discoveries in the candidate's field.
- Leadership and/or organization of peer-reviewed clinical trials as documented by program reviews or letters.
- Participation in interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects.
- Invited presentations of original scientific data at regional/state/national meetings, or at major institutions or research organizations.
- Service on editorial boards of journals.
- National and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of reference.
- Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines.
- Publication in non-refereed journals that are widely recognized.
- Publication of a respected professional book.
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
- Presentation of papers at regional/state/national conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s).
- Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings.
- Documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.
- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals.
- Publication of technical reports, case reports, or monographs in peer-reviewed journals.
- Presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings.
- Contribution in area of expertise to the scholarship of others.
- Authorship of review articles.
- Serving as a research mentor for graduate, post-graduate, medical students or residents.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies adopted by other faculty members within the College.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Service.

4.3.a Performance Ratings for Excellence in Service.

<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	Absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in service.
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	Minimal evidence of effectiveness in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the School and an absence of extra School -related service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
<u>Satisfactory</u>	Adequate evidence of effectiveness in service. Those in this category will have involvement in School service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
<u>Exemplary</u>	Strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, undertaking significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations also would be typical.
<u>Most Meritorious</u>	Those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

4.3.b Criteria of Excellence in Service include, but are not limited to:

- Officer, committee chair, or board/committee member in a national/international professional organization in one's discipline or national/international task force.
- Program chair or similar position for a national/international meeting.
- Administrative leadership role within the **School** or University.
- Officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Chair of a major University committee or task force.
- Demonstration of a significant time commitment to or role in committee work.
- Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, **School**, University, or system administrative or service roles.
- Service on study sections (or scientific peer review groups), consensus panels, and other similar activities.
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, committee, or board.
- Awarded significant external support for career development.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal. This activity per se is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of an editorial board can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Service as a frequent ad hoc member or permanent member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies, or foundations such as the NIH, NSF or USDA.
- Organization of regional, national, international symposia and colloquia.

- Significant and effective mentorship of junior faculty members as evidenced by selection for **School**, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards.
- Awards that recognize clinical expertise.
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national or international organizations.
- Consultation as requested by other faculty members.
- Service as a consultant on patient care (e.g., third-party payment groups, courts, health organizations).
- Holding leadership roles in hospital or healthcare organizations.

4.3.c Criteria for Effectiveness in Service include, but are not limited to:

- Committee chair of regional/state/national professional organization.
- Officer in regional or state professional organization.
- Program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organization meetings.
- Active member of the Faculty Senate.
- Service on University, **School**, department committees and task forces.
- Serving in administrative roles within the department.
- Contribution to external development efforts.
- Advisor to student organizations.
- Administrative roles within the department.
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups.
- Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. This activity per se is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Participation in Departmental, **School**, or University strategic planning, search committees, **School** seminar programs, faculty development programs, assessment programs, symposia and colloquia, and student recruitment activities.
- Presentation of continuing education programs.
- Invited presentations at academic and professional groups.
- Development and participation in healthcare service to community programs.
- Certification by specialty board.
- Referral of patients from practitioners both within and outside the University.
- Expression of confidence and respect from patients and clinical staff.
- Application of current methods in patient care.
- Membership on a specialty examining board.
- Diligent efforts to make clinical and private patient care efficient and effective.

- Occasional service as an ad hoc member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies, or foundations such as the NIH, NSF, or USDA.

4.4 Indicators of Excellence in Administration.

4.4.a Performance Ratings for Excellence in Administration.

<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	Absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in administration.
<u>Needs Improvement</u>	Minimal evidence of effectiveness in administration. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the School and an absence of substantial contributions toward advancing the goals and vision of the School .
<u>Satisfactory</u>	Adequate evidence of effectiveness in administration. Those in this category will have involvement in local administration appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of having contributed substantially toward achieving the goals and vision of the School .
<u>Exemplary</u>	Strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in administration. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local administrative activities such as chairing committees, developing initiatives that exemplify the goals and vision of the School. Frequent and impactful interactions with other leadership within the School , other Schools, and TAMU leadership would be typical.
<u>Most Meritorious</u>	Those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary administrator. These faculty would also be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

4.4.b Criteria of Excellence and Effectiveness in Administration include, but are not limited to:

- Written self-evaluation, including accomplishments towards the administrative position's goals.
- Peer-evaluation, by an anonymous survey of faculty.
- Staff and/or student evaluation, by an anonymous survey, as appropriate to the position.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure.

5.1 Tenure Policy. Details regarding eligibility for tenure, tenure policies, tenure system components, and periodic reviews can be found in University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#). Briefly, to be eligible to receive tenure, a faculty member generally should be an employee of TAMU who holds academic rank as associate professor, or professor. Faculty with administrative appointments, such as department heads or deans, and who hold academic rank retain their tenured status as faculty members. However, administrative titles and appointments per se are not eligible for tenure.

Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Except when otherwise specified, a tenured faculty member is guaranteed nine (9) months of full-time employment or the equivalent.

The '*tenure clock*' should not start until an individual is in a tenure-track role (e.g., assistant or associate professor), and once in a tenure-track role, the probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed seven (7) years of full-time service, beginning with appointment to the rank of instructor or a higher tenure-eligible rank. Under extenuating circumstances, the probationary period may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the department head, dean, and the VP of Faculty Affairs. If a faculty member has served a term of probationary service at one or more institutions, the probationary period at TAMU may be for fewer than seven (7) years. In such cases, however, the

person's total probationary period in the academic profession may be extended beyond seven (7) years.

Assistant professors will be evaluated for promotion to associate professor and for tenure concurrently and will not be awarded one without the other. Persons whose initial appointment to the TAMU faculty is at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for tenure upon appointment (Tenure Review Upon Hire, [TRUH](#)).

The sequence of Periodic Reviews for faculty members is described below.

- 5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty. Faculty members will be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the **School** are as follows:
- 5.2.a Assistant Professor. An assistant professor should demonstrate effectiveness, with the potential for excellence, in the areas of teaching, research, and service (see sections 3 and 4).
 - 5.2.b Associate Professor. For promotion to associate professor, a faculty member must meet the evaluation criteria for assistant professor and have attained excellence or reasonable potential for excellence in teaching or research (see sections 3 and 4). Increased effort in service is expected at the School and university levels with leadership roles on committees, within the **University**, and in professional societies.
 - 5.2.c Professor. For promotion to full professor, a faculty member must meet the evaluation criteria for associate professor and provide clear evidence of excellence in teaching (as per section 4.1) or research (as per section 4.3) with the potential to become, at least, a national leader. Increased effort in service is expected by being a director of a program, dean, or committee chair at the university level. Professors are also expected to be leaders in their professional societies.
 - 5.2.d Instructor. This appointment is not eligible for promotion.
- 5.3 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (APT). For promotion, APT faculty members will be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. For example, faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly activities. Similarly, faculty with Instructional, Clinical, or Practice in their title will be evaluated with primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT Faculty.
- 5.4 Process for Promotion and Tenure.
- 5.4.a Identifying candidates for promotion and tenure. The promotion and tenure process begins with the calendar year and is initiated by supervisors or by faculty members requesting promotion and/or tenure in writing to the Dean of the **School of Engineering Medicine** and/or the chair of the Engineering Medicine Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (EMPTAC). For candidates with a mandatory review or required mid-term review (e.g., assistant professors and tenure track faculty with a designated tenure clock, see the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion & Tenure [Guidelines](#)), the chair of EMPTAC may initiate the process via email to the supervisor and faculty member. Supervisors will update candidates in writing on the progression of their review, the vote of EMPTAC, and the decision of the dean.
 - 5.4.b Required documentation. Supervisors should meet with faculty members to discuss the process and should solicit in writing the candidate documents that are to be delivered to EMPTAC prior to

May 1st, so that external letters may be requested and received prior to August 1st. (Additional details of the timeline are available in Office of the [Vice President for Faculty Affairs Promotion & Tenure](#).) The candidate documents are:

- A concise statement (maximum of three (3) pages, single spaces) on teaching, research, and service with the candidate's personal views on their impact, goals, strategy, and/or emphasis. For academic professional track faculty, this statement only needs to address the areas of activity specified in appointment letters. Faculty may include items that they view as pertinent to promotion and/or tenure, provided the statement does not exceed the maximum length.
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) concluding with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature (please note that this signed statement is different than the verification of contents statement that becomes dossier item 3).
 - ❖ Beginning in AY 22-23, the University will implement Interfolio [Faculty180](#) (F180) for annual review evaluations. Faculty members should use the template in the "Profile" section of Faculty180 to prepare their CV.
- A list of six (6) to eight (8) suggested reviewers with short biographies who meet university guidelines, from peer or better institutions and at arm's length. Supervisors should provide guidelines consistent with appointment. For APT faculty, reviewers may be fewer and/or internal, depending on the description of appointment, e.g., APT with research appointments will need at least five (5) letters with multiple external letters addressing research proficiency/impact. Non-research active APT faculty will need at least three (3) letters (internal, external, or a mix of internal and external). Candidates may submit a list of individuals that should not be asked to be a reviewer.
- If applicable, a list of up to three (3) potential, internal reviewers who can address activities such as interdisciplinary or internationalization.
- A cumulative version of the **School's** faculty progress report.
- Selected refereed publications (up to three (3)) that represent the most significant work conducted while at TAMU, to be forwarded to reviewers.

5.5.c Solicitation of external reviewers. University guidelines on the selection of reviewers will be followed, with about an equal number from candidate list, and not from the candidate list, with no reviewers from the candidate's exclusion list. At no time should the candidate contact potential reviewers or inquire about who was selected to be a reviewer. The chair of EMPTAC will review the potential list of reviewers to ensure that they are congruent with university requirements, e.g., from peer or better programs and arms-length. The Dean of the **School of Engineering Medicine** will contact potential reviewers using the University Standard External Review Template. For tenure track faculty, eight (8) letters from reviewers (4 from candidate list) will be sought initially. If necessary, additional reviewers will be contacted with the goal of obtaining at least two (2) reviewers from the candidate list and four (4) that are not on the candidate list.

Updates to the candidate documents can be made at any stage in the process. Updates must be signed and dated by candidate and submitted to supervisor and EMPTAC chair. Each update will be included as an addendum to the candidate documents.

6. Engineering Medicine Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (EMPTAC)

In compliance with University Rule [12.01.99.M1](#), the Dean of the **School of Engineering Medicine** shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a **School-wide** promotion and tenure committee. Hence, the **School** shall

have an Engineering Medicine Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (EMPTAC). The tasks of the EMPATC are to: **1)** review candidate documents, reviewer letters, supervisor recommendations, faculty progress reports, teaching evaluations, and letters of support; **2)** a report that is focused on the performance of the candidate in teaching, research, and service, with particular focus on those areas as per appointment letters for APT faculty; **3)** prepare an “other activities” report as appropriate; **4)** vote anonymously on the candidate’s suitability for promotion and/or tenure; and **5)** compose a written recommendation for the Dean.

6.1 Composition of the EMPTAC. The EMPTAC shall include a minimum of five (5) faculty members. The Dean shall appoint a non-voting Chair who will manage the operations of the EMPTAC. The general faculty of the **School** shall elect the remaining four (4) members: one (1) standing member from the School’s tenured faculty; one (1) alternate member from the School’s tenured faculty who shall serve and vote in the absence of the standing tenured member; one (1) standing member from the School’s APT faculty; and one (1) alternate member from the School’s APT faculty who shall serve and vote in the absence of the stand APT member. It is important to note that the overarching goal is that the members of EMPTAC should represent the diversity of expertise that is embodied in the **School’s** faculty, e.g., instruction, research, medical and engineering sciences, clinical practice, and entrepreneurship.

In addition, the EMPTAC and/or the Dean may appoint additional faculty members to ensure appropriate diversity on the committee and ensure the necessary number of tenure-track (TT) and academic professional track (APT) faculty members.

To the extent possible, the EMPTAC members should have a primary appointment in the **School of Engineering Medicine**. If this constraint is not feasible, then faculty from the Schools of Medicine and/or Engineering may be invited to serve. Committee membership will be limited to full-time or part-time faculty at the rank of professor or associate professor (unmodified or modified). EMPTAC members shall serve staggered three-year terms with one permitted successive term. The Chair shall be appointed for a one-year term and may serve continuously for three consecutive terms. Terms shall begin August 1, except under unusual circumstances.

6.2 Criteria for voting eligibility. Only Committee members at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying can vote. Committee members may not vote on candidates who are immediate family members or who were their trainees (doctoral students or post-doctoral mentees).

6.3 Review of the Dean. Upon receipt of the EMPTAC reports and recommendation, the dean shall perform an independent review of each case and write a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure.

6.4 Submission of Dossier to Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The dossier for each case shall have appropriate variation from the guidelines of the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Specifically, there are no departments in the **School of Engineering Medicine**, and hence, dossier items 9 and 10 (Department Promotion and Tenure Committee review and Department Head recommendation) shall be blank. The supervisor letter shall be included in dossier item 13, other materials and documentation.

7. Annual Evaluation

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written evaluation, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible. Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1.

- In terms of annual evaluations for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews.
- In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors

collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

- For faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual evaluation will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

7.1 Purpose.

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See University Rule 12.01.99.M1. For assistant professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual evaluation should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated, and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual evaluation shall serve as the primary documentation for reviewing job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

7.2 Focus. The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For APT faculty, the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion (see University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

7.3 Time Period of Review. In general, annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded time window if determined to be appropriate.

7.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance. During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance will be rated on at least five categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," "Exemplary" and "Most Meritorious" (see Section 4). Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

7.5 Required Components. In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, an annual evaluation must contain the below components.

7.5.a Faculty member's report of previous activities. The form of the faculty member's report of previous activities must include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.

- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

The School of Engineering Medicine shall provide a report template.

- 7.5.b A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations. The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs ([System Regulation 33.05.02](#) Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

- 7.5.c Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member. The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

- 7.5.d Performance Assessment. In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity, patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Program, College, and University.

- 7.5.e Assessment outcomes that require action. As per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

- Unsatisfactory Performance. An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the **School's** established criteria (see above). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean. The report to the Dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head,

program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a Periodic Peer Review. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

- **Needs Improvement Performance.** If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review, they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

7.6 **Timeline.** The annual review process must conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases.

7.7 **Complaint procedure if annual evaluation fails to follow published guidelines.** A faculty member who believes that his or her annual evaluation process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the Dean of the **School** with a copy to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The Dean of the **School** will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the Dean of the **School** may be appealed to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (see University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review (see University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

8. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

8.1 **Purpose.** A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.

- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- The mid-term review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however, internal letters of recommendation may be solicited rather than external letters of recommendation. The mid-term review will include dossier items contributed by the candidate using the latest **School of Engineering Medicine** guidelines for faculty evaluation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the EMPTAC, department head/ director/supervisor, and **School's** Dean.

- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- The mid-term review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. However, it is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a mid-term (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

8.2 Process. The mid-term review should be conducted during the academic year and should occur between March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022

8.3 Feedback from midterm review. Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

9. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- Annual performance reviews conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- Periodic review by a committee of peers (see below).

9.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.2 Peer Review Committee. The EMPTAC will serve as the Peer Review Committee.

9.3 Process. Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Faculty progress reports that cover the review period of up to five or six years.
- Teaching evaluations.
- Other materials as appropriate to assess assigned activities such as interdisciplinary or internationality.

9.3.a The EMPTAC will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria described above and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

9.3.b If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to

periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by **School** guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

- 9.3.c A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the **School’s** guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 9.3.d A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 9.3.e A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 9.3.f For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. (It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.) If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 9.3.g By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the Dean of the **School of Engineering Medicine** and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.
- 9.4 **Professional Development Review.** A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review or upon request of the faculty member. The supervisor will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the Dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” acceptable to the Dean of the **School**.
- 9.4.a The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: **i)** identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; **ii)** develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and **iii)** monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
- 9.4.b The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an *ad hoc* review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member *ad hoc* faculty review committee will be appointed by the Dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, schools, or universities.

- 9.4.c The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the *ad hoc* review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.
- 9.4.d The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one (1) month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research or scholarship.
- 9.4.e The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 9.4.f The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three (3) months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:
- No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.
 - Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4.
 - Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” acceptable to the Dean of the **School**.
- 9.5 The Professional Development Plan. The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the Dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the **School**. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. (For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, Post-Tenure Review.)
- 9.6 Appeal. If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01.

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the Dean, the decision of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final.

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the Dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final.

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the Dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

- 9.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review. A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head, director, or supervisor.