1. Introduction

This guideline specifies the Department’s Post Tenure Review Guideline, which consists of an Annual Post Tenure Review and a periodic (every six years) Post Tenure Peer Review.

2. Annual Post Tenure Review

Each year, the Department Review Committee shall provide an evaluation of faculty for purposes of annual and post tenure review. In addition to the detailed ranking for annual evaluation purposes, a statement indicating an overall ranking of satisfactory/unsatisfactory, for annual review purposes will be included in the annual evaluation report.

2.1 Levels of Performance

For purposes of Post Tenure Review evaluation, the Department Review Committee shall rank people at one of three primary levels of performance in each of the three categories of work, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. unsatisfactory</td>
<td>unsatisfactory</td>
<td>unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the performance in a category is marginally satisfactory, but not yet unsatisfactory, an evaluation of “needs to improve” may be given. This is an indication that the evaluation will become unsatisfactory in a future year, if performance is not improved.

The three rankings would be combined to give an overall satisfactory/unsatisfactory grade as follows:

*Rule 1*: If teaching is unsatisfactory, then the overall rating is unsatisfactory.
*Rule 2*: If research is unsatisfactory, then either teaching or service must be superior to get an overall satisfactory, otherwise the overall is unsatisfactory.

The attachment lists the indicators of the different levels of performance.

2.2 Department Review Committee

The Department Review Committee shall be composed of the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, the Associate Department Head for Academics, and the Department Head. The Review Committee shall conduct performance evaluations of all faculty members for the purpose of annual evaluation and post-tenure review.

3. Six Year Post Tenure Peer Review
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All tenured faculty members must undergo peer review every six years after receiving tenure or being promoted. The guideline consists of the following components:

- The post tenure peer review is conducted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This constitutes a peer review since all members of the P&T Committee are elected.
- Any member of the committee who is undergoing post tenure peer review will recuse themselves from discussions, report writing, and voting about their case.
- At the beginning of each year, the committee will be given the list of faculty who must undergo review. A faculty member must undergo review if it has been six years since the most recent of tenure, promotion following tenure, or peer review. With the following exceptions, all tenured faculty will undergo review.
  - Per College of Engineering guidelines, 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; the PTR clock will restart when their 100% administrative appointment ends. 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.
  - Endowed chair and professorship reviews performed by the Department Head will replace the post tenure peer review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- The materials used for the review will be:
  - The previous six annual Faculty Progress Reports (FPR) – provided by the Department.
  - An up-to-date Curriculum Vitae – provided by the faculty member.
  - A 2-3 pages statement discussing teaching, research and service activities in the previous six years – provided by the faculty member.
- The committee shall write a consensus peer review report, which includes (1) teaching, research and service categories discussed in separate sections, and (2) a summary evaluation. The performance for each category and the overall performance shall be evaluated as described in Section 2.1 of this document, as interpreted for a six year period. All committee members shall sign the report. This report will be placed in the faculty personnel file, a copy given to the faculty member, and the results communicated to the Dean.

4. Procedure for Guideline Changes

Any changes to the Post Tenure Review Guideline will be made by faculty discussion and vote.
Attachment
Annual Performance Indicators

Teaching

Superior:
- Selection for a University, college or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Outstanding teaching performance evaluations
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
- Chair of doctoral research committees
- Publication in 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:
- Continuing or repeated substantial neglect of teaching responsibilities

Satisfactory:
- In between the above

Research: The department encourages multi-disciplinary research in addition to single disciplinary research.

Superior:
- Publications in leading refereed journals
- Receiving major fellowship or research award
- Frequent citation of publications
- Publication of scholarly book(s)
- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Receiving nationally-approved patents
- Member of a review panel for national research organization
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
- Receiving significant external funding for research
- Evidence of creative professional practice
- 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
- Presentation of papers at national meeting of appropriate discipline
- Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings
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Satisfactory:
- Publications in refereed journals
- Significant self-development activities, such as Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness

Unsatisfactory:
- None of the 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 a national meeting
- Officer in Faculty Senate
- Chair of major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
- Committee chair of national professional organization
- Office in regional or state professional organization
- Program or local arrangements committee chair for regional or state professional organization meeting
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies
- Advisor to student organization
- Administrative roles within the department

Satisfactory:
- Participate adequately on University, college and department committee and task forces
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

Unsatisfactory:
- Continuing or repeated substantial neglect of service responsibilities