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1 Purpose and Scope of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Committee (hereafter the committee) is a standing committee of the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering (hereafter the department) whose purpose is to provide guidance, advice, and recommendations to the department head, college, and university in matters relating to faculty promotions and the awarding of tenure in the department. The committee adheres to the tenure and promotion rules, guidelines, and policies established by Texas A&M University and the Dwight Look College of Engineering. Criteria used to make decisions on promotion and tenure must be consistent with University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the College of Engineering document, “College of Engineering Guidelines and Procedures for Annual Review, Intermediate Review, and Promotion and Tenure of Faculty”. A departmental document entitled “Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure” in Industrial and Systems Engineering provides guidelines for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

2 Tenure and Promotion Committee Membership

a. The committee is comprised of seven members: four full professors and three associate professors with the additional stipulation that these individuals must have tenure and be administratively located within the department. Emeritus professors and faculty members who have at least a half-time administrative appointment at the department head level or above are not eligible to serve on the committee.

b. A committee member will recuse himself or herself from participation in tenure and/or promotion cases where a conflict of interest exists. A conflict of interest is presumed to exist when a Ph.D. advisee or a family member is under consideration. In other cases of potential conflict of interest, the faculty member will discuss the conflict with the department head who will decide if recusal is appropriate. A faculty member who is eligible to serve on the committee but wishes to be excused from service should make a request in writing to the department head. The department head may excuse the faculty member after appropriate review.

c. Faculty members who have been recommended for tenure to the Board of Regents or promotion to professor could serve (appointed or elected) as non-voting committee members until the following September 1st, at which time they become regular committee members with voting privileges if the Board of Regents approves granting of tenure.

d. The department head appoints the committee chair for a two-year term. The chair will be selected from the department’s eligible full professors. The remaining committee members will be selected as follows:
1) Two full professors and two associate professors will be elected by the faculty, each for a one-year term.
2) One associate and one full professor will be appointed by the department head, each for a two-year term.
3) Committee members can serve multiple terms.
4) Associate professors will only participate in decisions related to review, promotion and tenure of assistant professors.
   e. Committee members’ election will take place in January so the committee can begin its work during the spring semester.

3 Committee Responsibilities

These are the committee’s responsibilities:

1. Upon request of the department head’s request, review and make recommendations regarding departmental promotion and tenure policies.

2. Review the credentials and qualifications of any individual being recruited for the rank of associate professor or higher and, if the candidate is a new hire, provide a recommendation for tenure upon the candidate’s arrival on campus.

3. Upon request of any faculty member, provide guidance on the format and content of materials required by the committee to conduct reviews (see Section 8).

4. Conduct the third-year review and the review for promotion with tenure. The review will result in a written report to the department head. The third-year review and the review for promotion with tenure report will be accompanied by a recommendation (vote by secret ballot).

5. Upon request by the department head or a request from a tenured associate professor submitted through the department head, stipulated members of the committee will conduct a review of the associate professor for promotion to professor. The review will result in a written assessment in the form of a report and a recommendation (vote by secret ballot) to the department head.

4 Mid-Term Review

Each tenure-track faculty member will undergo a comprehensive review at the midway point of their probationary period. For tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period, the midterm review differs from the first-year, second-year, and fourth-year reviews in that the department head will forward the committee report to the college for further consideration. The department head will ask these faculty members to submit additional documents as specified in Section 8.

The committee report for the mid-term review will evaluate progress towards promotion and tenure, identify both strengths and weaknesses in the faculty member’s record, and recommend areas for improvement. In addition, the review includes a recommendation (vote) from the committee for or against reappointment. The result of the committee’s vote will be included in the committee’s written report.
The department head will prepare a separate and independent report evaluating the faculty member’s performance and will provide his/her own recommendation for or against reappointment.

The department head will transmit the faculty member’s progress report, the department head’s report and recommendation, and the committee’s report and recommendation to the college for further evaluation by the College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (CETPAC). The department head will provide the faculty member a copy of the committee’s report before it is transmitted to the college.

Following the completion of the college-level review, specific recommendations will be transmitted to the department head by the dean regarding the faculty member’s assessment. After this occurs, the department head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the college assessment, including an evaluation of progress based on the committee’s review and his or her own review. At the conclusion of the review process, the faculty member will receive a letter from the department head summarizing the assessment and indicating the outcome in terms of continuation or dismissal of the faculty appointment.

5 Mandatory Promotion and Tenure Review

In the penultimate year of a tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period, the department will conduct a review that will include the committee’s evaluation and recommendation (vote by secret ballot) for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The mandatory evaluation year for each candidate for tenure and promotion will be determined by the university guidelines.

For a faculty member whose appointment as assistant professor began in the fall semester on a seven-year tenure-track, the review process will normally be initiated during the spring semester of the fifth year. A faculty member desiring consideration for promotion to associate professor with tenure prior to the mandatory year of the probationary period, may request that the department head initiate the review process ahead of the normal schedule. However, cases for early promotion require clear evidence that the candidate meets or exceeds the department’s expectations for performance in research, teaching and service.

5.1 Schedule

The department head will provide a memorandum to all faculty members on a yearly basis detailing the deadlines and relevant materials to be submitted for the evaluation. To candidates being reviewed for promotion to associate professor with tenure, the department head will send out a letter outlining deadlines and materials required, at least six months before those materials are due. Once the candidate’s package of materials has been submitted to the department head, the package may be augmented and updated if important and relevant events occur (such as paper acceptance and research grants awarded).

5.2 Selection of External Reviewers

By March 15 immediately preceding the evaluation year, faculty members to be considered for promotion and tenure should provide the department head with a list of four to five individuals the department may contact to request external letters of evaluation and a list of individuals the candidate designates as “not to be contacted” for letters of evaluation. The
committee will provide the department head with a list of four to five external reviewers. This list should comprise primarily nationally recognized scholars and/or researchers at peer institutions or better who work in the candidate’s field of expertise and can evaluate the candidate’s contributions to the field. External letters may reflect more than just scholarship; for instance, letters may also address a candidate’s teaching and service activities. Letters from individuals who may have conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., the candidate’s dissertation advisor(s) and his/her own students) will be discounted by the committee and will be avoided. The department head will choose from among the external reviewers suggested by the candidate and those suggested by the committee to ensure that at least six letters are received. In accordance with university guidelines, the final list must contain at least one name not on the candidate’s list and no one from the candidate’s not-to-be-contacted list. The department head will also ensure that the final list has at least one name not on the committee’s list. If individuals invited to submit outside letters decline to do so, substitute names may be added to the list by the department head consistent with the selection rules. In some situations, additional letters may be requested by the college after the package leaves the department. All responses submitted by external reviewers must be included in the documentation transmitted to the college.

5.3 Tenure and Promotion Committee Report

The committee’s written evaluation will include summary reports that evaluate the candidate’s teaching, research, service, and other activities (if appropriate). The contributions expected for promotion to associate professor with tenure are described in the document entitled “Expectations for Promotion in Industrial and Systems Engineering”. The research report will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly contributions to his or her field of research. The teaching report will include, among other things, an evaluation of classroom instruction, a review of course materials, and supervision of graduate students to determine the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate’s teaching contributions. The service report may include service to the institution (department, college and university) as well as the profession as a whole. The committee’s written assessment will also address external evaluations. In particular, both positive and negative comments will be addressed, reinforcing them or pointing out why the committee believes that they may not be well founded.

5.4 Departmental Report

With the committee’s report as input, the department head will develop his/her own independent evaluation and recommendation. The department head’s evaluation, together with the committee’s evaluation, is the departmental recommendation. The departmental recommendation and supporting materials will go forward to the college independent of the outcome of the vote-- unless withdrawn by the candidate. In the case of a mandatory review, withdrawal of the tenure and promotion package by the candidate must be accompanied but the candidate’s resignation.

The package that is sent forward from the department consists of the following items. As noted in section 5.1 the candidate can continue to update his/her vitae information as relevant changes occur.
• Candidate’s statement on teaching, research, and service
• Candidate’s curriculum vitae
• Candidate’s faculty progress report in college-report format
• Candidate’s list and verification of what was submitted to the department for review
• Departmental evaluation of quality of teaching
• Departmental evaluation of quality of research
• Departmental evaluation of quality of service
• Departmental evaluation of quality of other relevant activities
• External review letters with bio sketch of each reviewer
• Departmental committee summary report and recommendation
• Department Head’s recommendation

5.5 Communication with the Candidate

The department head will personally inform the candidate concerning the recommendations made at each level of the process as it continues through the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, dean, provost, president, and Board of Regents in accordance with university and college guidelines.

6 Review for Promotion to Professor

A tenured associate professor who wishes to be considered for promotion should request that the department head initiate the review process for promotion. The process described in the preceding section will be applied to evaluate the candidate for promotion to professor. Specifically, the deadlines for preparation of the promotion package are the same as described in the preceding section. The contributions expected for promotion to professor are significantly greater than those expected for promotion to associate professor with tenure and are described in the document entitled “Expectations for Promotion in Industrial and Systems Engineering”.

The departmental recommendation and support materials will go forward to the college and university (as described in the previous section) independent of the outcome of the vote, unless withdrawn by the candidate. Since the review for promotion to professor is not mandatory, the candidate has the option of withdrawing at any point in the process by submitting a written request to the department head. If the candidate withdraws her/his application for promotion, she/he will be counseled by the department head as to the perceived weaknesses of the case and how these weaknesses may be overcome. Withdrawal of the application for promotion is done without prejudice; that is, withdrawal of an application for promotion does not affect subsequent application for promotion, except that only one application may be made per year.

7 Administrative Procedures of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The committee chair will appoint a committee member (or him/herself) to draft a summary document to guide evaluation of the candidate by the committee as a whole. This document will be based
on review of the applicable documents identified in Section 8 and will be distributed to all committee members. The summary document includes a list of all relevant accomplishments and has no evaluative statements.

With the distribution of the summary document, each committee member will be asked to prepare written comments for discussion of the candidate. These written comments are for committee discussion only and should include any of the candidate’s perceived strengths and weaknesses in each of the areas under review (teaching, research, services, and other activities). The committee chair will distribute the unattributed comments to all committee members to help guide the discussion.

When the document describing the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses is prepared, the chair will schedule a meeting of the committee to discuss the candidate. The discussion will focus on the perceived strengths and weaknesses, and based on the discussion, committee members may modify their initial positions or may provide additional evidence to justify their positions. It is the duty of each committee member to fairly and actively contribute to the discussion of each candidate unless they are recused from consideration of the case.

In cases where a vote is required, when the discussion has matured and all viewpoints have been heard and fairly considered, the committee chair will request committee members vote by secret ballot. The vote will be for or against one of the following propositions: “The Tenure and Promotion Committee recommends that {candidate’s name} be reappointed”, or “The Tenure and Promotion Committee recommends that {candidate’s name} be promoted to the rank of {Associate Professor with tenure or Professor}.” All committee members are expected to be present at the vote, and absentee ballots shall not be used unless a written waiver is received from the department head or his/her designee. A committee member shall not abstain from voting. In circumstances involving conflict of interest, the committee member must recuse him/herself from the discussion of the candidate as well as the voting.

After the committee vote has been tallied and verified by at least two committee members other than the chair, the chair will assign a committee member to draft the evaluation. In the cases of the mandatory review for promotion and tenure and the review for promotion to professor, the chair may ask different individuals to draft the separate reports on research, teaching, service, and other activities (if appropriate). The committee will then meet to review the draft reports and ensure that the discussion and committee vote are adequately represented. The report will convey the meaning of the committee’s recommendation and will provide adequate explanation for any disagreements among the committee members in assessing the candidate’s performance vis-à-vis tenure and/or promotion.

, the committee will submit a recommendation, which includes separate reports on research, teaching, service, other activities, and the summary evaluation that includes vote counts for and against according to the secret ballot. If a subset of the committee wishes to submit a minority report, the minority must include the names of those submitting it.

Once a formal assessment of the candidate is complete, the reports (see above) and result of the vote recommending promotion or reappointment will be transmitted to the department head by the committee chair.

8 Documentation required for each review
The candidate will prepare a package of documents for review. The committee will be responsible for conducting a faculty evaluation of teaching. The candidate may submit additional materials that he/she feels are relevant to an adequate review. Committee members, through the chair, may request additional information and/or clarification from the candidate.

Required information for Mid-Term review:

- **Candidate Provided Information**
  - The candidate’s current curriculum vitae, including:
    - A list of all projects funded since the candidate was appointed to his/her current rank, including, for each project, the sponsor, amount, participative role (PI, co-PI or investigator), duration, number of students supported, and the amount of funds under the candidate’s control;
    - A list of papers with their full citation that have been published and those accepted with no further revision required; list categorized by refereed journals, refereed proceedings, and other publications.
  - The candidate’s most recent annual Faculty Progress Report
  - Copies of selected papers
  - Teaching portfolio
  - Summary of the advising of graduate and undergraduate students.

- **Department Provided Information**
  - A summary of teaching evaluations for each course taught by the candidate
  - The distribution of grades assigned in each course taught by the candidate
  - Benchmarked average teaching evaluations for all departmental faculty at each level of course work (i.e., 200, 300, 400, 600); and numbers of faculty and M. Eng., M.S. and Ph.D. students in the department

Review for promotion to professor or associate professor with tenure includes, in addition to items above, the following:

- **Candidate Provided Information**
  - List of external reviewers and those not to be contacted (supplied to department head)
  - Candidate’s statements of Philosophies of Research, Teaching, and Service

- **Department Provided Information**
  - Peer review evaluation of classroom performance
  - External letters of evaluation