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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose
This document presents the plan of the Aerospace Engineering Department for the annual performance evaluation and the implementation of post tenure review. The plan was developed and approved by the faculty in September 1997.

1.2 Background
On October 14, 1996 the University Faculty Senate approved the rule for Post Tenure Review. This was approved by President Bowen on November 1, 1996 and then by Chancellor Thompson on November 21, 1996. In the spring of 1997 the College of Engineering established a Post Tenure Review Committee and in July this committee approved and published a set of guidelines for the College of Engineering. The Aerospace Engineering Plan presented in this document has been developed in accordance with these guidelines. Any recommendation on post tenure review is a product of the annual performance review. Therefore, the annual performance evaluation plan is presented first.

2.0 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN

2.1 Process
Each year every faculty member’s performance is reviewed by the department head. To prepare for the review the department head reviews the faculty progress report and student evaluations, and may obtain input from other faculty. The department head may request additional input from the faculty member. The department head then prepares a draft written evaluation which is then reviewed with the faculty member. This evaluation contains an assessment of the faculty member’s performance, his strengths and weaknesses and his plans for the next several years. After this meeting a final evaluation is prepared and signed by the department head and faculty member. The faculty member’s signature indicates that the review has been held, not that he/she necessarily agrees. If the faculty member disagrees with any portion of the review he/she has the option of preparing a statement which is appended to the review and signed by the faculty member and department head.

2.2 Evaluation Criteria
Each faculty member’s performance is reviewed in three areas, a) teaching, b) research and scholarly activities, and c) service and professional outreach. The percentage of time each faculty member puts into these areas varies according to the individual’s talents, desires and responsibilities. However, it is desirable that all faculty members contribute in each of these areas. To achieve maximum performance from the department it is the department head’s responsibility to utilize the faculty according to their talents and desires.

Although this is an annual evaluation it is not a one year snap shot. Since a faculty member’s input into the three areas can vary from year to year for a variety of reasons the performance over the past several years needs to be considered, not just the past year.
The basis for the indicators used for evaluating the performance in each of these three areas include, but are not necessarily limited to those outlined in the College of Engineering document "Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Faculty. Some of these are:

**Teaching**
- Student evaluations
- Peer review of classroom performance and course syllabi, content and materials
- Courses taught, both undergraduate and graduate
- Graduate students directed and graduated
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Support of student activities, e.g., AIAA
- Student project advisor

**Research and Scholarly Activities**
- Refereed conference papers and journal articles published or accepted.
- Conference papers presented or accepted
- Original contributions to research books, monographs and handbooks
- Published textbooks
- Significant innovative designs in use in industry or elsewhere
- Externally funded research projects and number of graduate students supported
- Joint research projects with industry and other universities
- Joint research projects with other faculty
- Citations in scholarly journals and/or textbooks

**Service and Professional Outreach**
- Service on departmental, COE and university committees
- Department administration
- Meetings with prospective students, on-campus and off-campus
- Advisor to student organizations
- Professional society activities, e.g., officers, technical committees, conference and session chairs
- Journal editors and journal paper reviews
- Government and industry advisory and technical committees
- Service on accreditation teams and boards

**2.3 Performance Ratings**
In each of the three areas there will be four ratings:
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

**2.4 Final Rating/Resolution**
From the ratings in the three areas, and the relative effort the faculty member puts into each of the three areas, an overall rating is developed. If the overall rating by the department head is "Unsatisfactory" the case will be referred to the Department P&T Committee for review and approval/recommendation. Obviously, if the faculty member receiving the "Unsatisfactory" rating is a member of the P&T committee, that individual will not participate in the review. This review will include meeting with the faculty member. If after review the P&T committee and the department head disagree, they will meet to try and reach consensus. If agreement is not possible, the P&T committee's report will become part of the faculty member's record.
If a “Needs Improvement” rating is obtained in any area, a plan for improvement will be developed by the faculty member and department head. As stated earlier, if the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may prepare a statement that is appended to the review. Since the performance evaluation is not a one year snap shot, an “Unsatisfactory” rating would normally be preceded by a “Needs Improvement” rating. However, this is not a requirement. An “Unsatisfactory” rating in any area is sent to the Department Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Committee for review and approval and/or recommendation.

3. POST TENURE REVIEW

3.1 Objectives
The objectives of the post tenure review are:

- To identify those faculty members whose performance chronically and substantially fails to meet the minimum established departmental performance criteria, and
- Provide an opportunity for the faculty member to improve his/her performance and return to being a contributor consistent with the standards of a tenured faculty member of Texas A&M University.

3.2 Ratings
Based on the objectives and the fact that an overall performance rating is given in the annual performance evaluation there will be two recommendations:

- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

3.3 Process
All faculty members who have received an “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations” or “Needs Improvement” rating will receive a “Satisfactory” for post tenure review. Therefore, a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for receiving an “Unsatisfactory” post tenure review rating is that the faculty member must have received an “Unsatisfactory” rating in the annual performance evaluation. If after review by the department head and the faculty member of the faculty member’s performance over the past several years, the department head decides that the recommendation should be “Unsatisfactory”, then the case will be referred to the P&T committee for review and recommendation. The P&T committee and the department head must agree on an “Unsatisfactory” rating for a “Unsatisfactory” rating to be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering. Otherwise the post tenure review rating will be “Satisfactory”. In summary, for a faculty member to receive an “Unsatisfactory” post tenure review rating the department head and P&T committee must agree on the rating.