Post Tenure Review Policy
Department of Biomedical Engineering

Introduction
This policy specifies three things:

1. The levels of performance to be used for the purpose of post tenure review.
2. The criteria to be used in determining performance level.
3. The responsibility of the Departmental Peer Review Committee (DPRC) is to conduct a peer review for tenured faculty who are due for their six-year post tenure peer review.

Review
Each year, the department head shall provide an evaluation of each faculty member’s annual performance.

For individuals (deans, associate deans, department heads) with a 100% administrative appointment, the peer PTR process can be put on hold until after they return to their normal faculty duties. For any Department Head or Associate Dean that has less than 100% administrative appointment and is presumably still doing teaching and scholarship, then they remain subject to the PTR peer review process.

In accordance with University policy, at least once every six years each tenured faculty member will receive a peer review to be conducted by the Departmental Peer Review Committee. Note that the six-year period is reset each time the faculty member goes through the promotion.

For purposes of post tenure and peer review evaluation, the DPRC shall rank faculty in each of three categories of work, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING</th>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three rankings will be combined to give an overall satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating, with the following guidelines:

Rule: If either teaching or research is unsatisfactory, then either, teaching, research, or service must be superior to get an overall satisfactory; otherwise the overall rating is unsatisfactory.

The attachment lists the examples of activities that could lead to different levels of performance. The DPRC shall review each candidate based on the research, teaching, and service metrics as shown in the attached performance indicators for the previous six years through the submission of their CV along with a summary of their annual teaching reviews for the same time period. The faculty being reviewed will also be allowed to submit supplemental information along with their CV that they deem appropriate for the purposes of the review.
Departmental Peer Review Committee
The Departmental Peer Review Committee shall be composed of all tenured full professors within the department and the elected portion of the tenure and promotion committee (tenured associate professors can be included), with persons being recused during their own review. The review committee shall be convened to perform the mandatory six-year peer review process.

The DPRC shall meet in early spring of each year to review those faculty scheduled for their six year review. The department head shall provide the list of faculty needing to be reviewed each year to the DPRC.

The DPRC six year reviews should be concluded and submitted to the department head by May 1st of each year. The department head also independently does their review. The results for all faculty reviewed that year shall then be reported to the Dean of the College of Engineering.

This document shall be reviewed periodically, but no less than every five years, by the department head and faculty within the department and modified as needed by majority vote of the faculty.

This document was agreed up by majority faculty vote on January 18, 2013.
Attachment
Performance Indicators

The following are examples of activities that could lead to different levels of performance.

Teaching

Superior:
- Selection for a University, college or professional society teaching award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Chair of doctoral research committees
- Publication of refereed education journals
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction and accomplishments
- Coordination of multisection courses
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

Unsatisfactory:
- Continued or repeated substantial neglect of teaching responsibilities

Satisfactory:
- In between the above

Research

Superior:
- Publications in refereed journals
- Receiving major fellowships or research award
- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Receiving issued patents
- Member of a review panel for national research organizations
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
- Receiving significant external funding for research
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings

Satisfactory:
• Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
• Significant self-development activities that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness (i.e. Faculty Development Leave)

**Unsatisfactory:**
• Failure to accomplish significant activities as listed above

**Service**

**Superior:**
• Officer in a national professional organization
• Service on a major governmental commission, task force or board
• Administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
• Program chair or similar chair at national meeting
• Officer in Faculty Senate
• Chair of major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
• Committee chair of national professional organization
• Officer in regional or state professional organization
• Service as consultant to business of government agencies
• Advisor to student organization

**Satisfactory:**
• Participate adequately on University, college and department committees
• Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

**Unsatisfactory:**
• Continued or repeated neglect of service responsibilities