1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

Post-tenure review is intended to promote continued professional development and to enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated Professional Development Plan (see University Rule 12.06.99.M1, listed in Section 5.0 Resources/References) and return to expected productivity. Two review mechanisms, namely, annual review by the Mechanical Engineering (ME) Department Head, and peer review by the ME Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC), are employed for post tenure review.

1.2 Background

In 1996, the University Faculty Senate approved the rule for Post Tenure Review, which was approved by President Bowen and Chancellor Thompson in 1996. In 1997, the College of Engineering established a Post Tenure Review Committee and in July 1997 this committee approved and published a set of guidelines for the College of Engineering. In March 1998 the Department of Mechanical Engineering prepared the Department Faculty Annual Review Criteria and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review, which the present document replaces. In 2008, the Provost notified all Deans that the Post Tenure Review Guidelines and practices, in accordance with State Statute, must include a component of peer review at least once every six years, which the Office of General Counsel (OGC) determined was not met by Department Head annual review. The Mechanical Engineering Post-Tenure Peer Review Procedures presented in this document were developed in accordance with these guidelines and recommendations and basic principles prepared by the Associate Dean of the Dwight Look College of Engineering in January 2013.

Every mechanical engineering faculty member is reviewed every year by the Department Head. In addition, a post tenure peer review process occurs at least every six years for all tenured faculty members.

2.0 ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

2.1 Annual Review Process

The Mechanical Engineering Department Head performs an Annual Review of all faculty members following the College established procedures in COE Guidelines and Procedures for Annual Review, Intermediate Review & Promotion and Tenure of Faculty (September 2011). University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 2.5, explains the purpose, basis, and requirements for the faculty annual review process.

The annual review processes include an assessment of a Faculty Activity Report prepared by the faculty member, a review of student evaluations of instruction (and possibly classroom observation report), an interview with the Department Head, and a written evaluation prepared by the Department Head. The written evaluation contains an analysis of the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses and comments on the faculty member’s plans for the coming year. Recommendations for improvement are included in the evaluation.
2.2 Standards for review

The following scale will be used by the Department Head in assessing each of the three areas of performance (teaching, research and scholarly activity, and professional service) separately:

4. Superior
3. Above expectations
2. Satisfactory: meets expectations
1. Below expectations
0. Unsatisfactory: deficient and unacceptable

Based on the performance of the faculty member in the three areas of teaching, research, and service, an overall performance rating of “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” is given in the annual evaluation.

Any faculty member receiving a “Superior”, “Above/Meets Expectations,” or “Below Expectations" rating also receives a “Satisfactory” for his/her annual review.

A Departments Head’s “Unsatisfactory” annual review evaluation to the COE Dean must be accompanied by a written plan for near-term improvement.

2.3 Indicators of positive performance

Because faculty members possess a broad diversity of backgrounds, interests, strengths, and responsibilities within the multiple missions of the department, a single list of requirements or traits will not be stipulated for each of the categories of performance. Considerable subjective judgment is necessary and desired in performance evaluations. The human element is essential in a comprehensive and fair procedure, and faculty peer input assists greatly in this evaluation task. It is nevertheless reasonable and beneficial to attempt to delineate specific indicators of positive performance in each of the primary areas of activity: teaching, research and scholarly activity, and professional service. University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Appendix I, lists examples of criteria that may be employed in judging the level of performance of a faculty member in each category of performance.

Each faculty member’s performance will be characterized by a combination of such indicators, with the resulting evaluation based on the quality of the overall contribution. Evaluations shall specifically consider the rank and experience of the individual being evaluated with gradations in expectations according to rank.

Three consecutive “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews will trigger a review at the college level by an Ad Hoc Review Committee, appointed by the Dean, following procedures described in TAMU University Rule 12.06.09.M1 (Section 3).

2.4 Conditions Warranting an Evaluation of “Unsatisfactory”

Faculty effectiveness is evaluated in three categories: teaching, research and scholarly activity, and professional service. Faculty members who perform adequately in either teaching or in research and scholarly activities can always be given assignments that provide genuine benefits for the department, the institution and the citizens of the State of Texas. The determination of “unsatisfactory” performance does not rest on a failure to fulfill one aspect of accomplishments but will be the result of a broad pattern of shortcomings. The following list of deficiencies is indicative but is not intended to be exhaustive:
Teaching
- Standard end-of-semester student evaluations of teaching will not be the only instrument used in determining teaching quality and effectiveness.
- Student evaluations of instruction that clearly indicate poor teaching. Low student evaluations of instruction must be indicative of a trend and not be based on one semester’s performance and definitely not the results of one course in one semester.
- Feedback from students receiving B.S. or graduate degrees, which indicate sustained poor teaching performance.
- Complaints about teaching that are clearly of substance. This could be the result of complaints by a number of individual students or several groups of students. The complaints should span a considerable time so as not to be based on temporary conditions.

Research and Scholarly Activity
- Failure to carry on professionally-related, interest-driven research and scholarly activity or design.
- Lack of involvement in the promotion of research and scholarly activity.
- Lack of participation in the preparation of proposals.
- Sustained lack of publications.
- Absence of participation as a reviewer of proposals submitted to funding agencies and manuscripts for technical journals.

Professional Service
- Dormant continued professional development.
- Lack of professional society activity other than membership.
- Unresponsive as a member of department, college, or university committees.

2.5 Logistics and Required Reporting
The Department Head reports annual review findings as required by the Dwight Look College of Engineering procedure (see section 5.0).

3.0 POST TENURE PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES

3.1 Peer Review Process
A post tenure peer review must occur at least once every six years for all tenured faculty members irrespective of satisfactory or unsatisfactory annual reviews. The Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC) performs the peer review. The six-year period resets each time the faculty member goes through a promotion process, appointment, or review for professional development or endowed professorship/chair position.

3.2 Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)
The Mechanical Engineering DPRC consists of five tenured full professors, of which at least four shall have six or more years of experience in the ME department at TAMU.

Three members shall be elected by the voting faculty and two shall be appointed by the Department Head.

All members shall serve staggered two-year terms. All members shall not serve more than two consecutive terms.
A committee member scheduled for peer review during his/her term should recuse him/herself of the review process.

The DPRC shall include representation from each major area or discipline within the department.

A faculty being given three “unsatisfactory” performance evaluations by the Department Head may choose an ombudsperson among the TAMU faculty to serve as an observer member during committee proceedings.

### 3.3 Required Documentation

Each faculty member undergoing the six-year post tenure review is required to submit a current CV. A brief summary of the last six-years on Teaching and Educational Activity, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Professional Service Activity (T/R/S) may be prepared at the request of the committee.

### 3.3 Evaluation Criteria and Indicators of Performance

The post tenure review criteria follow the current COE Guidelines and Procedures for Annual Review, Intermediate Review & Promotion and Tenure of Faculty (September 2011). University Rule 12.06.99.M1 on Post-Tenure Review, Section 2.1, states the rationale for the review and details a peer-coordinated Professional Development Plan for improvement of faculty performance.

A faculty member's performance is reviewed in three areas, a) teaching and student advising, b) research and scholarly activity, and c) professional service and outreach. University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Appendix I lists examples of criteria employed in evaluation of faculty performance and measures of the criteria.

### 3.4 Standards for review

The DPRC evaluates each faculty member’s performance in each category, and assigns a rating of “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” with an overall rating based on the same rubric.

The percentage of time each faculty member puts into these areas varies according to the individual's talents, desires, and responsibilities. Since a faculty member's input into the three areas can vary from year to year, the DPRC must consider the six-year period.

- “Unsatisfactory” indicates a record of performance below expectations and may initiate remedial action.
- “Satisfactory” indicates the faculty member is performing duties as required.

Section 2.4 presents examples of conditions that may lead to an “Unsatisfactory” rating in the evaluation categories.

Finally, the committee will assign an overall rating of “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” assessing the whole performance of the individual. The overall rating will weigh each of the individual ratings as per the effort allocation of the faculty member in a particular category during the evaluation period (six years).

If the faculty member receives an “Unsatisfactory” rating in all three areas, an overall performance rating of “Unsatisfactory” will be assigned.
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3.5 Logistics
Each faculty member will receive timely notification of when his or her upcoming post tenure review documentation is due. The Department Head will activate the Post Tenure Peer Review process.

3.6 Required Reporting
The DPRC submits a brief written report, covering the categories of review, to the Dean through the Department Head. The Department Head makes post tenure review recommendations to the Dean.

4.0 PROCEDURE CHANGES
Any changes to the above processes will require approval by two-thirds of the Mechanical Engineering Faculty.

5.0 REFERENCES/RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty-Relevant Rules/SAPs &amp; Guidelines</th>
<th><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/node/558">http://dof.tamu.edu/node/558</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12/03.99 M1</strong> Faculty Teaching Workload Reporting (July 31, 2006)</td>
<td><a href="http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.03.99.M1.pdf">http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.03.99.M1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLES OF CRITERIA THAT MAY BE EMPLOYED IN EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the multiple missions of Texas A&M University, in the context of the particular roles and responsibilities of the individual faculty member.

TEACHING

(includes classroom instruction, academic advising (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision, and mentoring).

**Indicators of Outstanding Merit**
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Chair of doctoral research committees
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program)
- Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)

**Indicators of Merit**
- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
· Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
· Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
· Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students

**Possible Measures/Sources of Information**

**Self-evaluation**
Reflective response to student ratings and comments and to peer review
Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of course materials and delivery
Analysis of student achievement of course objectives
Statement of goals for improvement
Participation in teaching workshops or other improvement activities

**Peer-evaluation**
Peer critique of course materials
Peer critique of classroom teaching

**Student satisfaction**
End-of-semester student ratings of instruction
Mid-semester questionnaires
Exit interviews

**Student outcomes**
Evidence of student growth over the semester
Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses
Placement of graduate students in academic or professional positions
Publication of graduate student thesis
Employer reports of student performance

**RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY**
(includes research, creative activities, and all other forms of scholarship -- creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and is communicated).

**Indicators of Outstanding Merit**
· Publications in leading refereed journals
· Receiving major fellowship or research award
· Frequent citation of publications
· Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s)
· Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
· Awards for, or publication of, peer reviewed creative activities
· Juried works in creative activities
· Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization
· Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
· Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
· Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research)
· Publications with teaching focus in leading refereed journals
· Evidence of creative professional practice

**Indicators of Merit**
· Publication of scholarly book(s)
· Publications in refereed journals
· Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research
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organizations
· Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
· Editing a scholarly book
· Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines
· Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
· Continued public activity in plastic, performing or diverse arts
· Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness
· Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
· Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**
(include extension, outreach, clinical service, service to the department or unit, service to the University, advising (may also be included as a teaching activity where appropriate) and professional service) NOTE: Evidence of outstanding merit or merit may be found in the selection process itself or in documentation of performance.

**Indicators of Outstanding Merit**
· Being an officer in a national or international professional organization
· Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
· Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
· Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
· Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
· Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
· Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service

**Indicators of Merit**
· Being a committee chair in national or international professional organization
· Being an officer in regional or state professional organization
· Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
· Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
· Serving on University, college, and department committees and task forces
· Serving as consultant
· Being an advisor to student organizations
· Serving in administrative roles within the department
· Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
· Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness