Criteria for Faculty Tenure and Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Annual Review

This document is informed by the following guidelines and policies.

Annual Faculty Evaluations and Tenure-Track Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines
https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/annual_faculty_evals_and_tenure_and_promotion_process_and_guidelines.pdf

Associated HOP Policies
ADM 06-502 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION
ADM 06-505 FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION
https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf

Format for Faculty Review Electronic Dossier
https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/format_for_faculty_review電子_dossier.pdf

Department of Mechanical Engineering

From its inception, the faculty of the Mechanical Engineering Department has recognized the importance of fostering the unique interests and abilities of its members. This has resulted in the development of an extremely collegial environment and a highly productive department in all three areas of evaluation – scholarship, teaching, and service. Cognizant of the effectiveness of this philosophy we believe that the Annual Reviews should recognize the uniqueness of each faculty member. Thus, we place utmost importance on the faculty’s progress along their uniquely established plan for professional and personal growth in the weighting of the categories and the associated criteria used to evaluate each individual faculty member. This requires that each faculty work with the Department Chair to establish a viable workload effort distribution plan for the following year. This plan is also the basis of determining to what extent the expectations are met during the associated annual, tenure & promotion, or post-tenure review evaluation period. The evaluation process then becomes one of monitoring the faculty members’ progress along their plan and the expected outcomes associated with that plan. If adjustments to the faculty member’s overall tenure and promotion plan are needed, the adjustments are to occur prior to the beginning of the next academic year to be reviewed and are to be reviewed and approved by the Department Assessment Committee during their subsequent annual evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments.

The awarding of promotion to Full Professor is an indication that an individual has not only excelled in their individual pursuit of excellence in the areas of teaching, research, and service, but that they also possess the ability and commitment to provide leadership in those areas within the department, college, and university. This does not require that candidates for promotion or under
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review serve in formal administrative positions such as chair or associate chair. It does however require that they have shown sustained excellence in leading in one or more evaluation areas.

Criteria for Evaluation and Associated Rubrics:

The following criteria are indicative of the types of activities that are valued as impactful but are not intended to be all inclusive. Faculty may receive credit for additional activities which are related to teaching, research/scholarship and service.

1.1. Teaching is an extremely important criterion in the evaluation process. Teaching is not measured solely by performance in the classroom but is also measured in the broader context of how one assists in the preparation of the student for the practice of engineering. Performance in this area may be judged by, although not limited to, the criteria mentioned below.

1.1.1. Evaluation Criteria

I. Teaching Excellence. Evidence of teaching excellence includes:

   a. Student evaluations of performance and documented reflections on the student evaluations in the classroom and in discharge of teaching responsibilities. To meet expectations, a faculty member must obtain an average of at least 80% and provide documented reflections for courses with less than 90%. To exceed expectations, a faculty member must obtain an average of more than 90% and provide documented reflections for courses with less than 90%.

   b. Peer evaluations of performance in the classroom and discharge of teaching duties, and documented reflections on the peer evaluations and related quality improvement efforts (e.g., delivery of required UG courses)

   https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/_files/documents/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-faculty-peer-observation%20of%20teaching.pdf

   To meet expectations, depending on classification (NTT, TT, T) a faculty member must obtain a peer review of teaching (each year, every three years) and provide a documented self-reflection in response to the review. To exceed expectations, a faculty member must provide documented self-reflections, and discuss related quality improvement implementation and result.

   c. Contributions to curriculum, course development, and/or pedagogy. To meet expectations, a faculty member must document one effective practice, contribution to curriculum, course development, or pedagogy per year. To exceed expectations, a faculty member must document one significant effective practice/contribution or multiple effective
practices/contributions to curriculum, course development, and/or pedagogy per year.

d. Activity toward the development of classroom aids/materials and different systems of delivery. To meet expectations, a faculty member must document one development of classroom aids/material or different systems of delivery per year. To exceed expectations, a faculty member must document multiple developments of classroom aids/material or different systems of delivery per year.

II. Other Teaching Related Activities and/or Achievements. Evidence of teaching excellence also includes other teaching related activities and/or achievements including the ones listed below. To meet expectations in these criteria, faculty should provide:

a. Evidence of student success in subsequent courses and/or career (e.g., support statements from former students and/or faculty)

b. Awards and honors received for excellent teaching are considered highly significant and have multipliers given in brackets [ ] depending on the level of award or honor (e.g., local [2], regional [3], and/or national [4] awards and/or distinctions)

c. Evidence which demonstrates comprehensive and current knowledge of course content (e.g., development of graduate offering(s) and/or UG technical electives in area of expertise)

d. Evidence which reveals a positive professional attitude in discharging classroom responsibilities (e.g., delivery of required UG courses and willingness to address the teaching needs in the department)

e. Successful dissemination of new pedagogical tools or approaches to other faculty in the department

f. Providing oversight to multiple-section course curriculum as a course coordinator

g. Other teaching related duties including but not limited to: recitations, exams outside of the scheduled class time, etc.

1.1.2. Evaluation Rubric

The evaluation rubrics in the area of teaching are in general the same for all faculty. However, expectations vary depending on faculty classification (NTT, TT, T) as described in the rubrics below. In addition, the rubrics given below reflect expectations for NTT, TT, and T faculty with 80%, 50%, and 50-60% teaching load efforts, respectively.

- **Exceeds Expectations:** Established teaching agenda as evidenced by
  - Meeting expectations in all four criteria and exceeding expectations in two criteria under category I, OR
  - Meeting expectations in three criteria and exceeding expectations in two criteria under category I AND meeting expectations in three criteria under
category II for tenure-track faculty OR meeting expectations in four criteria under category II for all other (NTT, T) faculty and for Post-Tenure review.

- **Meets Expectations:** Established teaching agenda as evidenced by
  - Meeting expectations in all four criteria or meeting expectations in a & b and exceeding expectations in either c or d under category I, OR
  - Meeting expectations in a & b and either c or d under category I AND meeting expectations in two criteria under category II (for tenure-track faculty) OR meeting expectations in three criteria under category II (for all other (NTT, T) faculty and for Post-Tenure review).

- **Does Not Meet Expectations:** Teaching agenda not clearly defined
  - Does not satisfy requirements in categories I & II necessary to meet expectations.

- **Unsatisfactory:** Documented evidence of a pattern of behavior not conducive to the teaching mission of the department (e.g., no attention to teaching duties and responsibilities).

1.1.3. **Expectations for Tenure and Promotion**

The minimum expectations for the granting of tenure and for the promotion to associate professor, and for promotion to full professor or from one NTT rank to the next or for satisfying Post-tenure review requirements in the area of teaching are as follows

- **Established teaching agenda as evidenced by**
  - Meeting expectations in all four criteria or meeting expectations in a & b and exceeding expectations in either c or d under category I, OR
  - Meeting expectations in a & b and either c or d under category I AND meeting expectations in two criteria under category II (for tenure-track faculty) OR meeting expectations in three criteria under category II (for all other (NTT, T) faculty and for Post-Tenure review).

1.2. **Research/Scholarship** is also an important criterion in the annual evaluation process. Research/Scholarship may include original scholarly works in the area of engineering education research as well as in technical research areas. Performance in this area may be judged by, although not limited to, the criteria mentioned below. Note that all (T/TT) candidates pursuing tenure and/or promotion must undergo an external review of their research/scholarship (http://www.utrgv.edu/_files/documents/provost/faculty-resources/utrgv-guidelines-for-external-reviewers.pdf).

1.2.1. **Evaluation Criteria**

Approved by Department of Mechanical Engineering Faculty on September 2, 2019
Approved by CECS Dean on October 22, 2019
Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs on November 4, 2019
I. Dissemination of Research. Evidence of research dissemination includes activities listed below. To meet expectations, a faculty member with a 30% research workload is typically expected to achieve the equivalent of a peer-reviewed research journal paper and a peer-reviewed conference paper with UTRGV affiliation per year. To determine the exceed expectations ranking, committee members will reflect upon the quality of the publications and the impact of the research.

a. Publications including
   i. Journal, articles
      1. Invited*
      2. Contributed*
   ii. Book chapters
      1. Invited*
      2. Contributed*
   iii. Books (valued up to one journal article per chapter as determined by the departmental T&P committee)*
   iv. Discipline-related critical reviews* (e.g., Published Book Reviews)
   v. Conference proceedings*
   vi. Published abstracts*
   vii. Technical publications required by funding agency
      *Indicate whether peer reviewed, or non-peer reviewed and discussion about what did the faculty contribution consist of.

b. Presentations including
   i. Research papers at professional meetings and conferences
      1. Invited
      2. Contributed
   ii. Seminars (internal & external)
   iii. Presentations of creative works and exhibitions

Note about the role of Proceedings in Scientific Practice of Engineering: In engineering, many conferences are very competitive, of high quality, and similar in prestige to many journals. However, since this cannot be said for all engineering conference proceedings, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide sufficient evidence of journal level merit for conference proceedings on a case-by-case basis.

II. Support and Recognition of Research. Evidence of research support and recognition includes activities and recognitions listed below. To meet expectations, a faculty member with 30% or greater research workload is expected to provide evidence of actively seeking externally funded research grants as PI or co-PI/senior personnel. To determine the exceed expectations ranking, committee members will
reflect upon the quantity and the quality of the research proposals submitted and/or funded.

a. Funding
   i. External grants and contracts*
   ii. Internal Grants
   iii. Other research related activities (e.g., mentoring of student research, not funded proposals)
   *indicate whether PI or Co-PI and if Project Manager for funds
b. External grants submitted but not funded

c. Awards and other professional recognition including
   i. Honors from professional and learned societies
   ii. Membership on professional technical committees
   iii. Membership on journal editorial boards
   iv. Membership on panels, committees and councils which evaluate research projects, creative works, presentations and exhibitions.
   v. Registration as a professional engineer or certification by professional engineering organization.
   vi. Citations of work published in peer reviewed journals

d. Patents awarded (Provisional patent, disclosures)

e. Leadership of multiprincipal grant or center where they provide mentoring or direction to multiple faculty investigators

III. Student Involvement in Research. Evidence of student and other faculty involvement in research includes activities listed below. To meet expectations in this criterion, a faculty member with 30% or greater research workload is typically expected to provide evidence of actively mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in research. To determine the exceed expectations ranking, committee members will reflect upon the number and performance of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as other faculty, mentored in research.

   a. Evidence of joint faculty and student participation in independent studies (e.g., research papers, master’s theses, honor’s theses, presentations, funding for UG student research such as URI, LSAMP, fellowships, and scholarships, and/or UG student research mentor)
   b. Evidence of production of master’s students who go on to pursue a Ph.D.

1.2.2. Evaluation Rubric

The evaluation rubrics for annual evaluation in the area of research/scholarship are in general the same for all T/TT faculty. Deviation from the general rubrics must be based on the established annual workload effort distribution plan with the standards given below relating to a 30% research effort distribution. For NTT faculty, research related activities are not required but if present will be included in the determination
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of their service effort requirements and accounted for in the overall evaluation of their performance.

- **Exceeds Expectations:**
  - Meets expectations in all three (I, II, and III) **AND** exceeds in one of them.

- **Meets Expectations:**
  - Meets expectations in all three (I, II, and III) **OR** the average of all three is meets and none is unsatisfactory.

- **Does Not Meet Expectations:**
  - The average of all three (I, II, and III) is below meets expectations.

- **Unsatisfactory:**
  - Not engaged in research. Does not meet expectations in all three (I, II, and III).

### 1.2.3. Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

The minimum expectations for the granting of tenure and for the promotion to both associate and full professor, and for satisfying Post-Tenure review requirements in the area of research/scholarship are all the same and are as follows.

Meets expectations in all three (I, II, and III).

### 1.3. Service

Service is also an important criterion in the annual evaluation process. Service will be assessed based on time, effort and significance of the activity. Performance in this area may be judged by, although not limited to, the criteria mentioned below.

### 1.3.1. Evaluation Criteria

I. **Internal Service to the Department and its Students.** Evidence to internal service to the department and its students includes activities in the list below. To meet expectations a faculty member with 20% service workload (approximately 8 hours per week on average) is typically expected to provide evidence for at least three items in criteria a and at least two or three activities listed in b for tenure track, and tenured and non-tenure track faculty, respectively.

   a. Service to students
      i. Student curricular advising
      ii. Advising of Senior Design project groups (at least one team per year)
      iii. Sponsorship (faculty advisor) for student organizations
      iv. Sponsorship (faculty advisor) student design competition teams
      v. Other support or advising of students
      vi. Review sessions for professional examinations and seminars offered to graduate students
b. Service to the department
   i. Administrative duties (Department Chair, Associate Chair, Graduate Program Director, UG program director, ABET Coordinator)
   ii. Departmental committees [curriculum, faculty search, outreach, etc.]
   iii. Contributions to accreditation requirements. To meet expectations, a faculty member must actively participate in accreditation activities [e.g., Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) student learning outcome assessment]
   iv. Secretary for Department Meetings
   v. Mentoring of new faculty, junior faculty, and one-year lecturers in development of their own teaching skills
   vi. Mentoring of junior faculty who become successful researchers in their own right

II. External Service. Evidence Includes:
   a. Service to the University (Chair of committee more significant)
      i. University committees or councils
      ii. College committees or councils
      iii. Faculty senate
      iv. Special duties not covered in 1-3 (e.g., University search committees)
   b. Service to the Community outside the University / Community Engagement
      i. Active participation in professionally related community organizations
      ii. Participation in local boards and committees in the area of professional expertise
      iii. Work activities related to public schools and educational organizations
      iv. Presentation of workshops, conferences or seminars to the community
      v. Community engagement activities
   c. Service to Professional Organizations
      i. Technical Conference Chair / Committee Chair
      ii. Journal Editor / Associate Editor
      iii. Journal Reviewer and Conference Reviewer
      iv. Active membership in professional and educational associations
      v. Participation at professional meetings
      vi. Participation on boards and committees of professional organizations
      vii. Assistance to professional organizations in organizing seminars, workshops, etc.
   d. Professional Consulting which relates to the University’s mission may be considered but will not be taken as a substitute for service in categories a-c

1.3.2. Evaluation Rubric

The evaluation rubrics for annual evaluation in the area of professional service are in general the same for all faculty, except that the numbers for full professors are given in brackets [ ]. The standards given below relate to 20% service workload. A greater
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or lesser service workload distribution will result in a respective increase or decrease in these requirements

- **Exceeds Expectations:**
  - Meets expectations in a **AND** b of category I and any four [six] activities listed of category II.

- **Meets Expectations:**
  - Meets expectations in a **AND** b of category I and any two [four] activities listed of category II.

- **Does Not Meet Expectations:**
  - Does not meet expectations in a **OR** b of category I **OR** any two [four] activities listed of category II.

- **Unsatisfactory:**
  - No evidence of service to the department or its students or no delivery of Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) or Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) course assessment documents.

1.3.3. **Special note for non-tenure track faculty with one year appointments (OYA) and an 80% teaching load (4-4 equivalent) and a 20% service load.** The most likely activities include, but are not limited to, items Ia.ii and vi, Ib.ii and iii, and IIb.iii and v. To meet expectations in service an OYA must show evidence of at least three of the activities in categories I & II with an average of 8 hours per week of effort.

1.3.4. **Expectations for Tenure and Promotion**

The minimum expectations for the granting of tenure and for the promotion to associate and full professor in the area of professional service are all the same except for the number of activities in category II. The numbers for promotion to full professor are in brackets [ ].

- The average of the annual evaluations in the period of review is Meets Expectations.

1.4 **Overall ME Annual Evaluation Rubric**
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Mechanical Engineering faculty members should follow the guidelines and process delineated in HOP Policy ADM 06-502 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION. The final overall ME annual evaluation results in a single rating as determined below for both tenured and tenure track faculty, and for non-Tenure Track faculty. Special consideration will be given for non-tenure track faculty engaged in research.

- **Exceeds Expectations:**
  - Tenured/Tenure Track
    - Meets expectations in all three categories (Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service) and exceeds in one of them.
  - Non-Tenure Track
    - Meets expectations in the two categories (Teaching and Service) and exceeds in one of them.

- **Meets Expectations:**
  - Tenured/Tenure Track
    - Meet expectations in Research/Scholarship and the average of three categories is meets expectations with no unsatisfactory rating in any category (i.e. exceeds expectations in either teaching or service, meets expectation in research/scholarship, and does not meet expectations in either teaching or service).
  - Non-Tenure Track
    - Meets expectations in both categories (Teaching and Service).

- **Does Not Meet Expectations:**
  - Tenured/Tenure Track
    - Does not meet expectations in Research/Scholarship or the average of three categories is below meets expectations.
  - Non-Tenure Track
    - Meets expectations in Service but does not meet expectations in Teaching.

- **Unsatisfactory:**
  - Tenured/Tenure Track
    - Unsatisfactory in any of the three categories (e.g., teaching, research, or service) or does not meet expectations research/scholarship and either teaching or service.
  - Non-Tenure Track
    - Does not meet expectations in either teaching or service.

2. **Minimum Performance Requirements for Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review**
Mechanical Engineering faculty members should follow guidelines and process delineated in HOP Policy ADM 06-505 FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION.

2.1. **Minimum Basic Performance Requirements for Promotion to Associate Professor**

To be eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, an individual should have a terminal degree (Ph.D.) and should have completed five years of successful experience at the rank of assistant professor or equivalent.

2.2. **Minimum Basic Performance Requirements for Promotion to Professor**

To be eligible for promotion from associate professor to professor, an individual should have a terminal degree (Ph.D.) and should have completed five years of successful experience at the rank of associate professor.

2.3. **Minimum Basic Performance Requirements for Tenure**

To be eligible for tenure, a candidate should have successfully completed a probationary period of five years at UTRGV. Credit for previous teaching experience may be granted but this must be negotiated at the time of hire.

2.4. **Additional Requirements for Tenure and/or Promotion**

Meeting the minimum basic performance requirements for tenure and/or promotion stated above does not guarantee tenure and/or promotion. The contributions of the candidate to the department mission are also of great importance. And, in the case of tenure, the candidate's likely future contributions are considered. Candidates are also expected to perform their duties in a collegial and professional manner with regard to students, staff, faculty colleagues, and the general public.

2.5. **Early Tenure and/or Promotion**

Exceptional candidates may apply for early tenure and/or promotion. Such candidates must have outstanding teaching, research and service records far exceeding expectations.

3. **Performance Requirements for Post-tenure review**

3.1. **Requirements for Satisfactory PTR**

Post-tenure review will follow the same procedure applied to promotion to full professor. Faculty will be evaluated based upon their agreed upon workload effort distribution plan.

Approved by Department of Mechanical Engineering Faculty on September 2, 2019
Approved by CECS Dean on October 22, 2019
Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs on November 4, 2019
in the three categories of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service with the expectation level requirements as previously defined. It should be noted that tenured faculty research effort should never fall below 10% unless they are serving as a Dean.

3.2. Outcomes of Post-Tenure Review

Outcomes of the post-tenure review described here are based on the UTRGV Post-Tenure Review Policy (ADM 06-504) guidelines. If the final result of the comprehensive performance review is “Exceeds expectations,” or “Meets expectations,” the faculty member will not undergo another comprehensive performance review for six years unless a comprehensive review is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews.

If a faculty member receives a rating of “Does not meet expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” in any of the three evaluation areas, the faculty member must develop an action plan to be reviewed and approved by the chair and dean, to address any weaknesses or concerns and enhance or strengthen the faculty member’s portfolio in the designated area(s). The faculty member’s progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions, as outlined below.

If a faculty member receives a rating of “Does not meet expectations” on the comprehensive performance, it may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, mentoring in research issues or service expectations, or adjustment of assigned duties. Such arrangements should be built into the action plan.

If the comprehensive performance review is “Unsatisfactory” in any of the areas, the dean in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member’s workload or recommend additional actions to the appropriate EVP.

If the overall result of a comprehensive performance review is an “Unsatisfactory” rating, this may result in an additional review by the appropriate EVP or designee to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents’ Rules 31008 and 31102.

The comprehensive performance review outcome is not subject to resolution outside of this process. The outcome may be appealed through each of the review levels up to the appropriate EVP as outlined in the “Pathways for Review Deadlines.” The decision of the EVP is final.