

# **College of Engineering Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation**

*Updated, August 2023*

*Approved by Faculty Affairs on August 17, 2023*

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Faculty Tracks and Ranks</i></b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Areas of Faculty Performance</i></b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Teaching	9
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>11</b>
3.2.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Research	11
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>12</b>
3.3.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Service	13
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Administration (if applicable)</b>	<b>13</b>
3.4.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Administration	14
<b>4</b>	<b><i>Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness</i></b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Research</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Service</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Administration</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Administration</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>5</b>	<b><i>Promotion and Tenure Review</i></b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1.1	Assistant Professor	20
5.1.2	Associate Professor	21
5.1.3	Full Professor	22
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty</b>	<b>23</b>
5.2.1	Lecturer Titles	23

5.2.2	Instructional Professor Titles _____	24
5.2.3	Professor of the Practice Titles _____	25
5.2.4	Research Titles _____	26
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Promotion and Tenure Process _____</b>	<b>28</b>
5.3.1	Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration _____	28
5.3.2	Required Documentation _____	28
5.3.3	Solicitation of External Reviewers _____	31
5.3.4	Workflow _____	32
5.3.5	Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH) _____	33
5.3.6	College of Engineering Advisory Committee _____	34
5.3.7	Department Tenure & Promotion Committee (DTPC) _____	35
<b>6</b>	<b><i>Annual Review</i> _____</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Purpose _____</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Focus _____</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Time Period of Review _____</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance _____</b>	<b>40</b>
6.4.1	Performance Ratings for Teaching _____	40
6.4.2	Performance Ratings for Research _____	41
6.4.3	Performance Ratings for Service _____	41
<b>6.5</b>	<b>Required Components _____</b>	<b>42</b>
6.5.1	Faculty Member’s Report of Previous Activities _____	42
6.5.2	Written Evaluation _____	43
6.5.3	Meeting with the Faculty Member _____	44
6.5.4	Performance Assessment _____	44
<b>6.6</b>	<b>Assessment Outcomes that Require Action _____</b>	<b>44</b>
6.6.1	Unsatisfactory Performance _____	44
6.6.2	Needs Improvement Performance _____	45
<b>6.7</b>	<b>Timeline _____</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>6.8</b>	<b>Complaint Procedure if Annual Review Fails to Follow Guidelines _____</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>7</b>	<b><i>Midterm Review</i> _____</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Purpose _____</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Process _____</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Feedback from the midterm review _____</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>8</b>	<b><i>Post-Tenure Review</i> _____</b>	<b>48</b>

8.1	Purpose of Periodic Peer Review	48
8.2	Peer Review Committee	48
8.3	Process	48
8.4	Professional Development Review	50
8.5	Professional Development Plan	52
8.6	Appeal	53
8.7	Voluntary Post-Tenure Review	53
9	<i>Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution (ETID) Addendum</i>	54
9.1	Introduction	54
9.2	Criteria for Advancement	54

## 1 Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Engineering is to serve Texas, the nation, and the global community by providing engineering graduates who are well-founded in engineering fundamentals, instilled with the highest standards of professional and ethical behavior, and prepared to meet the complex technical challenges of society. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the College of Engineering for its tenure-track faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The expectations for its academic professional track faculty are similar but confined to their respective areas of assigned responsibility. The nature of scholarly innovation and the characterization of excellence in research, teaching, and service require both flexibility and freedom; thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the [Mission of the University](#); such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general unit guidelines for faculty, annual review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following university documents:

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>LINK</b>
<b>12.01.01 – Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</b>	<a href="#"><u>12-01-01</u></a>
<b>12.01.99.M1 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion</b>	<a href="#"><u>12.01.99.M1</u></a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 – Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="#"><u>12.06.99.M0.01</u></a>
<b>TAMU Guidelines for Annual Evaluation &amp; Mid-Term Review</b>	<a href="#"><u>Annual Evaluation and Mid-Term Review</u></a>
<b>TAMU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines</b>	<a href="#"><u>Promotion and Tenure portal</u></a>

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University System policies or Texas A&M University rules and procedures, the System and/or University statements take precedence.

## 2 Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

Tenure-track and tenured faculty titles are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Academic Professional Track (APT) titles in the College of Engineering are in five tracks: lecturer track (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer), instructional track (Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor), professor of the practice track (Associate Professor of the Practice, and Professor of the Practice), research track (Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor), and visiting track (Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor). Tenured faculty members who retire and relinquish tenure, and subsequently return to teach, do so at the same rank but with a qualifier “senior” (Senior Associate Professor or Senior Professor).

Tenure-track and tenured faculty must contribute to research, teaching, and service. For APT faculty, when the title involves two areas of significant responsibility, the appointment letter must specify the primary and secondary areas of assigned responsibility and the expected effort level at each area. The areas of activity for APT faculty members are defined as the following:

- Faculty in the lecturer track have teaching as their sole area of significant responsibility.
- Faculty in the instructional track have teaching and service (often in the form of pedagogical innovation) as their areas of significant responsibility.
- Faculty in the professor of the practice track typically have teaching as their primary area of significant responsibility. The secondary area is commonly service, but it may be research in some cases.
- Faculty in the research track have research as their primary area of responsibility. They may have service as a secondary area of

- responsibility. They typically do not have recurring teaching assignments.
- Visiting faculty have their activities specified in their appointment letters.
  - Senior faculty have their areas of responsibility specified in their appointment letters.

### 3 Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in their areas of assigned responsibility such as teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; administration; technology commercialization; and contributions to advance the broad goals of the university.

Every tenured and tenure-track faculty is expected to engage in teaching, research or other creative contributions, and service. Every Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty is expected to perform in the areas of assigned responsibility designated in their appointment letter. Furthermore, contributions in the areas listed above must be awarded due credit in the evaluation process.

Descriptions of faculty expectations in their areas of assigned responsibility are presented below. Alternate at-will work assignments (e.g., an administrative role) may temporarily replace one or more areas of responsibility in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the department head and, if required by System Regulations, by the dean. Faculty with an alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on those assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

#### 3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College of Engineering, and effectiveness in this realm of activity is required of all educators. Every faculty member with an appointment that includes teaching is expected to:

- 1) contribute to instruction and student development;
- 2) continuously strive



to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and strengthen the development of the college's instructional programs. Effective classroom instruction is expected and required. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students outside of the classroom is also expected. Some of the academic professional track faculty have appointment letters that include research activities and, as such, they may also be expected to mentor students outside of the classroom. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluation scores are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) domain-specific evidence of student learning outcomes; 5) evaluation of course syllabi and material; and 6) innovation in pedagogy.

### 3.1.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Teaching

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

- Peer evaluation, including review of instructional materials (syllabi, lecture notes, assignments, and exams) and in-class observation, documented by memo to the department head;
- Student feedback, as documented in student evaluations and in the summary of student input provided within peer evaluation;
- Critical self-evaluation and impact of actions towards the continuous refinement of teaching practices, as documented in the faculty progress report;
- Development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses;
- Authorship of textbooks and/or other pedagogical resources;

- The offering of well-aligned courses with clear learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessments, both formative and summative, as indicated in ABET assessment reports;
- Accessibility and effectiveness in mentoring and advising graduate student, as evidenced by student annual performance reviews, publications with mentees, and student awards;
- Mentoring and training of instruction support staff, e.g., teaching assistants, lab assistants, peer teachers;
- Engagements in teaching development activities as a participant, presenter, or facilitator;
- Engagements in engineering education through the college's Institute for Engineering Education and Innovation;
- Contributions to workforce development, as evidenced by successful course offerings through TAMU/TEES centers or competitive grants from national agencies to advance/expand training;
- Publications in highly selective or highly visible venues in engineering education;
- Awards and runner-up mentions for teaching.

Additional criteria for effectiveness that may be considered in evaluating teaching performance include:

- Impact on large student populations by teaching multiple sections per semester and/or through high enrollment within sections;
- Dissemination of innovations in teaching with colleagues through learning communities, workshops, conference presentations, and publications;
- Support of industry and academic partnerships that promote student learning;
- Participation in curricular improvements and pedagogical innovation;
- Demonstrated evidence that former students succeed in subsequent courses, career, and graduate school;

- Integration of technology and/or advances in computing to enhance learning and to prepare students for an evolving digital landscape;
- Supervision of extra-curricular student projects that enhance student learning (e.g., advising of academically focused student organizations or team competitions).

## 3.2 Research

Research effectiveness is expected of all faculty with appointments that include research. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to: 1) publish scholarly work in recognized high-quality venues; 2) build national and international level recognition in their respective professional areas; 3) pursue and sustain their research through external sponsorship/funding; 4) effectively manage research program personnel, particularly Ph.D. students – including providing financial support and career development guidance. These same expectations apply to APT faculty members with appointments that include research as their primary focus area. APT faculty members with research as a secondary focus area need to demonstrate effectiveness in research activities at the degree that corresponds to the effort level specified in their appointment letter and with recognition of impact through applied research. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, promotion, and tenure.

Evaluation of research does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing research. Measures/sources of information include: 1) research expenditures, including indirect costs generated and students supported; 2) submission of grant proposals, including white papers and review reports; 3) publications, evidence of impact, and external expert review of articles; 4) patents, licenses, and commercial adoption of research; and 5) recognition with awards and nominations.

### 3.2.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Research

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating research performance are:

- Publication portfolio, the quality of academic outlets (e.g., premier, peer-reviewed prestigious conference proceedings);
- Active research grants, research expenditures, proposals submitted, and other evidence of active and strategic engagement in pursuing funding opportunities;
- Supporting graduate students and/or post-doctoral fellows;
- Portfolio of patents, licenses, and other evidence of commercial adoption of research products;
- External expert review of quality and impact of scholarly work;
- Recognition through external awards from professional society, honors, and citation from peers.

### 3.3 Service

Professional service is central to the shared governance model of the College of Engineering, and effectiveness in service within the department and within the broader professional community is expected of all faculty. Tenured faculty are expected to contribute service effectively to the college and/or university. The expectation from the junior tenure-track faculty is that they will devote the majority of their service effort to their profession as opposed to devoting service time internally within the university. This expectation flips later in the career, with senior tenured faculty and tenured associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professorship having to demonstrate strong evidence of service to the department, college, and university at large, while keeping external visibility in their research community. Service expectations also apply to APT faculty, especially when their appointment letters include service as an area of significant responsibility.

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to: 1) serve on departmental committees; 2) take on leadership roles in departmental committees and/or initiatives, as assigned; and 3) represent the department in college-level and/or university-level committees, as assigned; and 4) pursue leadership positions within one or more professional societies. APT

faculty members with appointments that include service are also expected to serve the department, college, university, or their professional community. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing service. Measures/sources of information include: 1) committee assignments; 2) meeting attendance and minutes; 3) professional society positions and related responsibilities; 4) self-evaluation; 5) peer-evaluation; and 6) feedback from professional peers inside and outside of the university.

### 3.3.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Service

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are:

- Meeting organization, attendance, contribution, and follow-up on assigned action items (as appropriate for the committee or taskforce);
- Peer-evaluation, by an anonymous survey (for committee chairs) and chair evaluation (for committee members), written self-evaluation;
- Leadership in scholarship aspects of professional societies, including editorial boards and/or organizing committees of conferences;
- Review of manuscripts submitted to journals and conferences;
- Participation on review panels, boards or study groups for governmental agencies and foundations, and honors and awards committees/panels at national and international levels. Standing appointments and chair roles are highly desirable;
- Election or appointment to officer or equivalent leadership role within professional societies.

### 3.4 Administration (if applicable)

Administrative appointments are necessary to establish responsibility for the operational aspects of departments. These typically involve interfacing with and sometimes supervising departmental staff. Aside from department

heads (who are appointed by the dean), faculty are generally assigned, appointed, or elected to these roles following individual departmental guidelines. Effectiveness in these positions is required of those so appointed. Evaluation of effectiveness in administration mainly affects decisions on renewal of appointments and/or consideration for additional administrative positions. Nevertheless, significant impact and excellence in these roles should be considered towards promotion.

Evaluation of administration does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing administrative performance. Measures/sources of information include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) stakeholder (student, staff, external, and the like) feedback.

#### 3.4.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Administration

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating administrative performance are:

- Written self-evaluation, including accomplishments towards the goals of the administrative position;
- Peer-evaluation, by an anonymous survey of departmental faculty;
- Staff and/or student evaluation, by an anonymous survey, as appropriate to the position;
- Implementation of approaches that enhance productivity, efficiency, and quality; demonstrated capacity for creative solutions.

#### 4 Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The college recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, excellence and effectiveness in performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based

on input from the College of Engineering faculty and in accordance with the examples of criteria in Section 4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

#### 4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

The indicators of *Excellence in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:

- Internal and external awards for excellence in teaching;
- Student evaluations significantly above departmental norms;
- Superlative peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by the department and/or the college;
- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students to complete theses or dissertations within appropriate timelines for the discipline;
- Successful career mentoring of graduate students, including job placement;
- Internal and external awards to students under mentorship;
- Grants that support innovation in engineering education;
- Development of textbooks, course materials, educational software, etc., that are adopted at other institutions;
- Outstanding contributions to the advancement of non-traditional course delivery (e.g., study abroad, online courses);
- Successful supervision of student projects of high visibility (e.g., project-based in national competitions, deliverables in sponsored research);
- Publications in highly selective or highly visible venues in engineering or computer science education;
- External invited presentations at highly visible venues or prestigious institutions;
- Outstanding contributions to the improvement of teaching practices, procedures, or tools. For example, the creation/piloting of new initiatives to provide out-of-class student support, improve feedback to students, improve the effectiveness of TA support;



- Outstanding contributions to industry, academic, or government partnerships that impact student learning;
- Leadership or outstanding contributions to the college's engineering education efforts with external visibility;
- Outstanding contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement;
- Outstanding contributions to undergraduate students' experiences or career guidance.

#### 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:

- Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by the department;
- Student evaluations within or above departmental norms;
- Positive feedback from students, e.g., during exit interviews;
- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students to complete theses, dissertations, and/or design projects;
- Supervision and mentoring of undergraduate students to complete their research/design projects or theses;
- Publications with students as primary co-authors;
- Nomination of mentored students by the department and/or college committees for awards;
- Contributions to the advancement of non-traditional course delivery (e.g., study abroad, online courses);
- Supervision of extra-curricular student projects that enhance student learning (e.g., in the context of student organizations);
- Publications in venues in engineering or computer science education;
- External invited presentations that advance our educational mission;
- Contributions to improving teaching practices, procedures, or tools;



- Contributions to maintaining industry, academic, or government partnerships that impact student learning;
- Engagement in professional development activities to improve practices in teaching and mentoring of students;
- Involvement in the college's engineering education efforts;
- Contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement;
- Contributions to undergraduate students' experiences or career guidance;
- Contributions to practices related to serving the state and its broad population.

### 4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research

The indicators of *Excellence in Research* include, but are not limited to:

- Publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings pre-identified by departmental faculty as highly selective forums;
- Evidence of substantial impact in the field, as demonstrated by citations, patent licenses, technology commercialization, licensing technologies, and start-ups;
- Participation in major professional society conferences as a keynote speaker and other significant invited presentations;
- Delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at prominent institutions;
- Continuous, substantial external funding that supports a large research program including support of faculty salary, graduate students, undergraduate students, and post-doctoral fellows;
- Leadership role in pursuing/obtaining large multi-PI grant funding that involves local collaborators as well as external partners;
- Election to the rank of Fellow in a technical society;
- Leadership positions in committees within award-granting organizations that influence research directions and funding decisions;
- Leadership positions in scholarly or industry publications.

#### 4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Research* include, but are not limited to:

- Publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings in which the faculty member is a key contributor;
- Participation in conferences through contributed presentations by the faculty or their students;
- Delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at peer institutions;
- Research funding that sustains a vibrant research program and financially supports graduate students;
- Contributions to improving methods, processes, devices, or technologies which advance the state-of-the-art for industry, government, or military applications.

#### 4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service

The indicators of *Excellence in Service* include, but are not limited to:

- Election to officer or equivalent leadership positions in professional society pre-identified by faculty as highly selective organizations;
- Position as Editor-in-Chief (or equivalent) of prime archival journal(s);
- Position as conference chair, technical program chair, and/or track chair for well-regarded conference(s);
- Position as chair or appointment to a significant role in standing grant proposal review panel/study section or government boards/study groups/task forces;
- Outstanding leadership demonstrated in departmental, college or university committees;
- Leadership and commitment to excellence demonstrated by identifying needs at the departmental or higher level and developing a plan to address them, including setting up new initiatives, building sustainable programs, establishing new practices;

- Leadership of mentorship and outreach efforts.

#### 4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* include, but are not limited to:

- Election or appointment to officer or equivalent leadership role within professional societies;
- Position as editor, associate editor, or similar role for premier, peer-reviewed journals in one's field;
- Participation on organizing committees or technical program committees for prestigious conferences and/or workshops;
- Positive contribution through participation in faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees or initiatives;
- Significant portfolio of peer-reviewing activities for funding agencies, conferences, and journals;
- Significant portfolio of mentorship and outreach efforts;
- Commitment to excellence by identifying needs at the departmental or higher level and developing plans to address them.

#### 4.7 Indicators of Excellence in Administration

The indicators of *Excellence in Administration* include, but are not limited to:

- Securing significant endowed gifts through development activities;
- Creation of pertinent initiatives, sustainable programs, and new practices to meet unit needs;
- Outstanding leadership in departmental, college and/or university committees.

#### 4.8 Indicators of Effectiveness in Administration

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Administration* include, but are not limited to:

- Documentation and refinement of policies and operating procedures;

- Operational efficiency and effectiveness with resources that advances the department or unit;
- Providing opportunities for members of the department or unit to develop leadership skills;
- Assistance to upper administration with planning and policies;
- Transparency, open and clear communication of unit expectations, strategies, and plans.

## 5 Promotion and Tenure Review

### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated on accomplishments in each of their areas of assigned responsibilities (teaching, research, and/or service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

In facilitating the evaluation process for tenure and tenure-track faculty, the main loyalty of evaluators must be to the university and its constituent (i.e., students, faculty, department, college, and stakeholders), Texas, the nation, and the global community. The criteria for the College of Engineering are as follows.

#### 5.1.1 Assistant Professor

- **Teaching:** Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are classroom instruction, with student evaluations near or above departmental norms; primarily positive feedback from students, satisfactory peer evaluation, development of new courses and/or significant revisions of existing courses, and effective supervision and mentoring of MS and PhD students to complete theses and dissertations in a timely manner.

- Research: Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in research through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.4. Indicators of particular importance are publications in high quality, peer-reviewed venues in which the faculty member is a key contributor, participation in conferences through contributed presentations, and evidence of externally sponsored research to build and sustain one's research program, including the support of graduate students.
- Service: Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in service through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.6. Indicators of particular importance are participation in activities of a professional society, reviewer for technical journals or highly selective conferences, serving on evaluation panels, and participation with positive contributions to faculty meetings and departmental committees. The focus is on visibility and external service.

### 5.1.2 Associate Professor

Associate professors are expected to continue to demonstrate effectiveness with the same quality and impact criteria for assistant professors noted above in Section 5.1.1. Tenured faculty are also expected to contribute greater service to the college and university. To be competitive for promotion to full professor, excellence and impact should be demonstrated as indicated in one or more of the following areas:

- Teaching: Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.1. Indicators of particular importance are awards for excellence in teaching, student evaluations significantly above departmental norms, superlative peer evaluation from observation and analysis, supervision and mentoring of graduate students that gain employment in academe, publications with students as primary co-authors, and internal and external awards to students under mentorship.
- Research: Excellence in research is demonstrated by indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.3. Indicators of particular importance are

publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings pre-identified by departmental faculty as select forums; participation in major professional society conferences through keynote/plenary and other significant invited presentations; delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at prominent institutions; continuous, substantial funding that supports a large research program including support of faculty salary, post-docs, graduate students, and undergraduate students; leadership role in pursuing/obtaining large multi-PI grant funding that involves local collaborators as well as external partners; election to the rank of Fellow in a technical society.

- Service: Excellence in service is demonstrated by indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.5. Indicators of particular importance are assignment to significant leadership positions within a professional society pre-identified by faculty as a select organization; position(s) as associate editor or editor-in-chief (or equivalent), or a member of the editorial board of archival journal(s); leadership demonstrated in departmental, college or university committees; and leadership and commitment to excellence demonstrated by identifying needs at the departmental or higher level and developing a plan to address them, including setting up new initiatives, building sustainable programs, establishing new practices, and the like. The focus is on both internal and external service with national visibility.

### 5.1.3 Full Professor

Full professors are expected to continue to meet the same quality and impact criteria for associate professors noted above. Professors are also expected to contribute greater service, leadership, and mentoring. Excellence should be maintained in one or more of the areas, as indicated in Section 5.1.2 above. The focus is on both internal and external service with national and international visibility.

## 5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (APT), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of significant responsibility. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with an emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. Faculty with Lecturer in their title will be evaluated with an emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. Other APT faculty with Professor in their title will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their two areas of significant responsibility, with the emphasis on each area determined by the level of effort as specified in their appointment letters. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT faculty. Furthermore, faculty are expected to meet the requirements of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and, in particular, service contributions should be no less than 10% of the total effort of any faculty member. It may be pertinent to note that, at 10% of the total effort, an area of responsibility is not deemed significant. However, at or above 20% of the total effort, an area of assigned responsibility is significant.

### 5.2.1 Lecturer Titles

#### 5.2.1.1 Lecturer

- Teaching: Lecturers are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2, except for mentoring and supervision of graduate students. Indicators of particular importance are student evaluations near or above departmental norms, primarily positive feedback from students, and satisfactory peer evaluations.

To be competitive for promotion to the Senior Lecturer title, Lecturer faculty must demonstrate indicators of excellence in teaching (Section 4.1).

#### 5.2.1.2 Senior Lecturer

Senior Lecturers are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in teaching with the same quality and impact criteria for Lecturers noted above.



Senior Lecturers are also expected to play a key role in the process of curriculum continuous improvement.

### *5.2.1.3 Principal Lecturer*

Principal Lecturers are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Faculty at this rank have often received university-level internal awards and external recognitions for excellence in teaching. They routinely get student evaluations that are significantly above departmental norms. Teaching evaluation from their peers are very strong, and they are invited to give presentations about learning and teaching at highly visible venues.

## 5.2.2 Instructional Professor Titles

### *5.2.2.1 Instructional Assistant Professor*

- Teaching: Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrated effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are student evaluations near or above departmental norms, primarily positive feedback from students, and satisfactory peer evaluations. Faculty with the Instructional Assistant Professor title also need to demonstrate effective engagement in activities that advance engineering education and the overall educational mission of the department. Examples are listed in Section 4.2 (e.g., publications in engineering education venues, grants that support innovation in engineering education, improvements to curriculum, improvement of non-traditional course offerings, innovation of impactful off-campus student learning, advances in engineering education).
- Secondary Area of Assigned Responsibility: Besides demonstrating effectiveness in teaching as described above, Instructional Assistant Professors need to demonstrate effectiveness in their secondary area of assigned responsibility. Appointment letters need to identify the second area and specify the effort level associated with the primary and secondary areas. The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level of the secondary area. The indicators for



service are listed in Section 4.6 and the indicators for research appear in Section 4.4.

To be competitive for promotion to the Instructional Associate Professor title, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in teaching (Section 4.1) and effectiveness in their secondary area of assigned responsibility.

#### *5.2.2.2 Instructional Associate Professor*

Instructional Associate Professors are expected to continue to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching with the same quality and impact criteria for Instructional Assistant Professors noted above. Instructional Associate Professors are also expected to have a higher level of contribution in their second area of assigned responsibility.

To be competitive for promotion to Instructional Professor, excellence should be demonstrated in both the primary and secondary areas of assigned responsibility.

#### *5.2.2.3 Instructional Professor*

Instructional Professors are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in their activities, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

### *5.2.3 Professor of the Practice Titles*

#### *5.2.3.1 Associate Professor of the Practice*

- **Teaching:** Associate Professors of the Practice with teaching as one of their areas are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are student evaluations near or above departmental norms, primarily positive feedback from students, and satisfactory peer evaluations. As part of their teaching activities, faculty with the Associate Professor of the Practice title also need to demonstrate effective engagement in activities that leverage their professional experience to advance engineering education and the

overall educational mission of the department (e.g., contributions to industry partnerships that impact student learning, contributions to undergraduate students' experiences or career guidance, publications in engineering education venues, contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement, and other activities listed in Section 4.2).

- Secondary Area of Assigned Responsibility: Associate Professors of the practice need to demonstrate effectiveness in their secondary area of significant responsibility. Appointment letters need to identify the second area (research or service) and specify the effort level associated with the primary and secondary areas. The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level of the secondary area. The indicators for service are listed in Section 4.6 and the indicators for research appear in Section 4.4.

To be competitive for promotion to the Professor of the Practice title, the faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching (Section 4.1), with emphasis on excellence indicators that reflect impactful initiatives that advance engineering education and/or reflect prominence outside the institution. Furthermore, it is necessary to demonstrate effectiveness in their secondary area of assigned responsibility, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

#### *5.2.3.2 Professor of the Practice*

Professors of the Practice are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in their activities, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

#### *5.2.4 Research Titles*

Faculty with the title of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor are primarily engaged in research, typically funded with extramural funds. A secondary area of activities is not required. Service is a possible secondary area of significant responsibility. If a secondary area exists, its effort level needs to be specified in the appointment letter.

#### *5.2.4.1 Research Assistant Professor*

- Research: Research Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in research through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.4.
- Secondary Area of Assigned Responsibility (if applicable): Besides demonstrating effectiveness in research as described above, Research Assistant Professors with a secondary area of assigned responsibility specified in their appointment letters need to demonstrate effectiveness in that area. The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level of the secondary area. The indicators for service are listed in Section 4.6.

To be competitive for promotion to the Research Associate Professor title, the faculty must demonstrate effectiveness in research (Section 4.3) and effectiveness in their secondary area of assigned responsibility (if any).

#### *5.2.4.2 Research Associate Professor*

Research Associate Professors are expected to continue to demonstrate effectiveness in research. If a secondary area exists, they also need to continue to demonstrate effectiveness in that area. The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level specified in the appointment letter.

To be competitive for promotion to Research Professor, the faculty must demonstrate excellence in research (Section 4.3) and effectiveness in their secondary area of assigned responsibility (if any).

#### *5.2.4.3 Research Professor*

Research Professors are expected to demonstrate excellence in both their primary and secondary (if any) areas of assigned responsibility, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

## 5.3 Promotion and Tenure Process

### 5.3.1 Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration

The department head or the departmental Promotion & Tenure committee (DPTC) should identify candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the early part of each calendar year. The process starts at the beginning of the calendar year with a memo sent to faculty members as follows:

- All non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members who are up for their mandatory review are informed of the timeline. These faculty members are asked if they intend to submit the documentation for either (1) promotion and tenure, in the case of Assistant Professors or (2) tenure, in the case of Associate Professors and Professors.
- All tenure-track Associate Professors (tenured or non-tenured) are asked if they would like to be considered for promotion.
- All eligible APT faculty members, with one of the following titles, are asked if they would like to be considered for promotion: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Practice, Research Assistant Professor, and Research Associate Professor.

A reasonable deadline for responses should be established so that the department can complete the candidate identification in the early part of the calendar year. Department heads should meet individually with candidates to discuss the process. Every candidate should be instructed (in writing) to prepare their dossier.

### 5.3.2 Required Documentation

The university promotion and tenure guidelines specify required materials for individual cases. The dossier is assembled through Interfolio. The following items are required for the review of tenured and tenure-track candidates and candidates with research assistant professor or research associate professor titles:

- Impact Statement: This is a concise statement, written by the candidate, that conveys the quality and impact of their contributions within each of their areas of responsibility.
- Annotated Curriculum Vitae: The curriculum vitae reflects experiences and development in the candidate's career and provides an overview of academic accomplishments. Candidates must use the vita template created by Faculty Affairs and they will be asked as part of submission to verify that the contents of their dossier are current and correct.
- Identifying External Reviewers: A candidate must generate a list of between six and eight names of potential external reviewers, together with a short biography of each. The reviewers should be (1) from peer institutions/programs or better and (2) at arm's length, as specified in the university guidelines. Candidates should NOT contact potential external reviewers themselves to inquire about their willingness to write a letter. If desired, a candidate can also provide a "do not contact" list. With the list of possible reviewers, the candidate must also provide a signed checklist attesting to the qualification of the external reviewers as "arm's length", appropriate rank and track, and from appropriate institutions.
- A list of up to three potential reviewers from within Texas A&M University who can address inter/multidisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable. (optional)
- Other Materials and Documentation: There are two areas where a candidate can upload additional documents that are deemed pertinent to the case. Departments may require certain documents to be included (e.g., a teaching portfolio) as indicated in their approved guidelines, and these should be included in the "Unit/Department Specific Required Documents" section. A candidates may choose to include supplemental documents, and these can be uploaded in the "Candidates Supplemental Documents" section.

The following items are required for the review of APT candidates with Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Associate Professor of the Practice titles:

- Impact Statement: This is a concise statement, written by the candidate, that conveys the quality and impact of their contributions within each of their areas of significant responsibility.
- Annotated Curriculum Vitae: The curriculum vitae reflects experiences and development in the candidate's career and provides an overview of academic accomplishments. Candidates must use the vita template created by Faculty Affairs and they will be asked as part of submission to verify that the contents of their dossier are current and correct.
- Identifying Reviewers: A candidate must generate a list of between four and eight names of potential reviewers, together with a short biography of each. If a candidate has research as one of their areas of responsibility, then at least half of them should be external; the external reviewers should be (1) from peer institutions/programs or better and (2) at arm's length, as specified in the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines from Faculty Affairs. Candidates should NOT contact potential reviewers themselves to inquire about their willingness to write a letter. If desired, a candidate can also provide a "do not contact" list.
- A list of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address inter/multidisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable (optional).
- Portfolio highlights (items that represent significant contributions while at Texas A&M University) to be forwarded to the reviewers. (optional)
- Other Materials and Documentation: There are two areas where a candidate can upload additional documents that are deemed pertinent to the case. Departments may require certain documents to be included (e.g., a teaching portfolio) as indicated in their approved guidelines, and these should be included in the "Unit/Department

Specific Required Documents” section. A candidates may choose to include supplemental documents, and these can be uploaded in the “Candidates Supplemental Documents” section.

The department head should make it clear to the candidate that these materials may be updated at any stage of the process, and that updates should be signed and dated by the candidate (as an addendum to the dossier). Updates are to be given to the department head or their designee. Any updates made after the documentation leaves the department must still be submitted to the department head or their designee, who will then submit to the dean’s office.

### 5.3.3 Solicitation of External Reviewers

The university promotion and tenure guidelines on the method of selection of reviewers must be followed. As mentioned above, the candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers. The unit (e.g., department promotion and tenure committee) also provides a list of between six and eight names of possible reviewers. For funded joint appointments, both units should collaborate on the selection of reviewers. The unit will verify that the external reviewers meet requirements using the External Reviewer Chart.

From the two lists, a group of at least seven (7) should be selected and contacted by the department head or delegate. It is recommended that about equal number of letters be solicited from the candidate and department lists. A minimum of three (3) letters included in the dossier must be from the unit-suggested list. External letters cannot be requested from the “do not contact” list submitted by the candidate. The number of requests declined and/or not responded to should be closely monitored to ensure that the minimum number of letters from qualified reviewers is obtained before review. If needed, the unit will ask the candidate for additional reviewers to ensure a balanced distribution of letters from each list. If an external letter writer discloses a potential conflict of interest, the unit must solicit an additional letter to ensure the minimum of five (5) letters is met. The original letter would remain in the file and listed under the “non-arm's length” section of the External Reviewer Chart.



Letters are solicited through Interfolio using the standard template. Units can send a preliminary message to the potential reviewers to notify them of the upcoming request through Interfolio but should not provide the candidate's dossier information as part of this message. Units will be asked to provide a short biography for each reviewer, highlighting specific qualifications and credentials, as part of the External Reviewer Chart.

#### 5.3.4 Workflow

Information for all reviewers contacted must be submitted as an excel file in the External Reviewer Chart. In this chart, the unit indicates which reviewers were suggested by the candidate and which by the unit, the reason for declination if known, a justification for the reviewer's qualifications if relevant, and a biography for the reviewer. The department head and dean should review this information during their evaluation and request that the department committee recruit additional letters if 1) the minimum number of five has not been reached, 2) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are not at peer institutions or programs, 3) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are not arm's length from the candidate, or 4) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are associate professors on dossiers undergoing review for promotion to full. Files that reach Faculty Affairs that do not meet these requirements for external reviewer letters will be returned to the department to request additional letters.

Once the necessary number of review letters has been received, they, along with the other items submitted by the candidate, should be made available to the departmental promotion and tenure committee for review. The candidate's items may be given to the DPTC prior to receipt of the review letters at the discretion of the department head. In either case, the confidentiality of hard-copy and electronic files should be maintained throughout the process. Signed and dated updates by the candidate should be distributed immediately to the committee members and department head, and they should be incorporated into the candidate's dossier.

As described in Sections 5.3.7.2 and 5.3.7.3, the department head receives a report from the departmental promotion and tenure committee. The



department head prepares a separate recommendation evaluating the candidate's areas of performance. This document must:

- Provide a general basis for the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
- Provide an explanation of the candidate's impact on academic endeavors.
- Provide the context of this case within the department.
- Explain special considerations (e.g., lab space, provision delay).
- Explain any mixed or negative votes if not adequately addressed in the department committee's report.
- Explain the department head's vote, especially if contrary to the departmental committee's recommendation.

The department head is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every level, including the DPTC's vote, the department head's vote, the dean's vote, the university's decision, and ultimately (when necessary) the Board of Regents decision. The dean will notify the department heads of decisions at the college, university, and system-level so that they can relay that information to the candidate.

### 5.3.5 Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH)

Candidates for faculty positions whose initial appointment at Texas A&M University is at the rank of associate professor or professor may be eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). Note that tenure is obtained only by the affirmative action of the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University President. The review and submission process for TRUH can be submitted out-of-cycle for candidates who hold tenure at a peer or aspirant peer institution. Universities that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and that rank as Research 1–Tier 1 in the Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education qualify as peer or aspirant peer institutions.

## 5.3.6 College of Engineering Advisory Committee

### 5.3.6.1 Selection and Structure

[University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.6.3, states: “In conducting promotion or tenure reviews, the dean shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a college-wide promotion and tenure committee.” The college-level review of promotion cases will be completed by two separate College of Engineering advisory subcommittees: the College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (CETPAC) will review promotion and/or tenure cases for tenure-track faculty; the College of Engineering APT Promotion Advisory Committee (CEAPAC) will review promotion cases for academic professional track (APT) faculty.

- CETPAC: The CETPAC comprises one member from each academic department. The college’s executive associate dean serves as ex officio, non-voting chair of this committee. Every department head nominates two members of their departmental promotion and tenure committee, and the dean makes the final selection regarding appointments to the CETPAC.
- CEAPAC: Committee members for the CEAPAC are chosen by the dean; five members are selected among the elected APT members of the departmental promotion committees or through nomination by department heads, and four additional members are selected from the College of Engineering faculty at large.

Care will be taken to ensure that the resulting committees and their voting members meet university rules for eligibility, as described in the university promotion and tenure guidelines. The college’s executive associate dean serves as ex officio, non-voting chair of these committees. Furthermore, the dean may invite the College of Engineering faculty ombudsperson and an associate dean with responsibility comprising faculty development matters to serve on the CETPAC and/or CEAPAC as non-voting members.

Voting members on the CETPAC and CEAPAC serve a two-year term, with approximately half of the representatives from each committee being held over for the next year’s committee and half rotating off the committee.

Members are not allowed to vote on cases from their home departments. Committee deliberations and final votes are presented to the dean.

#### *5.3.6.2 College Committee's Report and Recommendation*

The college committee's recommendation report focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's overall performance, reflecting the ultimate vote of the committee and the primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other. Feedback may also be provided in this report.

### 5.3.7 Department Tenure & Promotion Committee (DTPC)

#### *5.3.7.1 Selection and Structure*

The departmental promotion and tenure committee is charged with reviewing candidates who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, and whose members are voting on those candidates; this is the vote that is forwarded as the faculty vote. There cannot be different promotion and tenure committees for different candidates in the same track seeking the same rank within the same department. Departments can have different subcommittees for tenure track and academic professional track reviews. The department guidelines must explain how the composition of the departmental promotion and tenure committees is determined. These guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.

Departmental promotion and tenure committees must be composed of a minimum of five (5) eligible-to-vote members for all types of cases for promotion and/or tenure. Every departmental promotion and tenure committee tasked with evaluating tenure-track cases shall consist of at least five (5) tenured full professors, and two (2) tenured associate professors who participate in the committee's evaluation of tenure-track assistant professors for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Likewise, a committee tasked with evaluating APT cases shall include a minimum of two (2) APT members. For every case, at least half or a majority of the committee shall consist of members elected by the departmental faculty. If

there are not enough eligible faculty members administratively located in the department, the unit must develop guidelines on how faculty from other units with related expertise will be selected and added to the committee.

The members of the committee should be appointed or elected to staggered terms to ensure that not more than one-half of the committee rotates off on an annual basis. Two-year staggered terms are recommended. The department head shall appoint the chair of the committee.

#### *5.3.7.2 Operation of the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee*

The departmental promotion and tenure committee shall review every tenure-track faculty member for their intermediate and mandatory tenure reviews. Additional reviews may be done at the request of either the candidate or the department head. Tenured associate professors and eligible APT faculty members in the lecturer, instructional, professor of the practice, and research tracks shall be reviewed by the committee for promotion upon request by either the candidate or the department head. Prospective faculty members being considered for tenure review upon hire (TRUH) must also be reviewed by this committee. If, because of an annual performance review, a tenure-track faculty member is recommended by the department head for non-reappointment prior to their mandatory tenure review, they must be reviewed by the committee and the results of this review must be submitted through the department head to the dean with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

Different members or subsets of members of the promotion and tenure committee can be assigned with the task of leading the evaluation and discussion of different candidates and/or evaluation areas (teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities). The organization and assignment of evaluation responsibilities, and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates, must be systematic and uniform across candidates.

A **secret ballot** should be used to record the committee's vote that will be reported by the committee chair to the department head, who will forward it to the dean. At least two committee members should count and certify the

votes and the results should be announced to the committee immediately. All committee members must be present and absentee ballots should not be used unless an explicit waiver is received from the department head or their designee. A written proxy may be allowed in emergency situations. Committee members should not abstain from voting, except in unusual circumstances such as conflict of interest. In these cases, the committee member should recuse themselves from the discussion of the candidate as well as the voting.

#### *5.3.7.3 Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee (DTPC) Report*

A comprehensive evaluation should be carried out for the candidate. The departmental promotion and tenure committee prepares a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the candidate's areas of activity. For APT faculty, the report should focus on their areas of assigned responsibility; if a candidate has contributed beyond those areas, this can be noted in the summary of the discussion. The report also includes a section to summarize the discussion of the committee about the candidate's overall dossier. Each section of this report must be written by a member of the P&T committee who is eligible to vote. Authorship of each report should be made clear by listing the names of the individuals.

The report should reflect the views of the committee members and conforms to the university promotion and tenure guidelines. Wherever applicable, performance in teaching, research and service, and overall performance must be characterized using one of the options: the committee evaluated that the candidate has [**not met, met, exceeded**] expectations. The report should conclude with a typed statement asserting that "The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee."

## **6 Annual Review**

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section 2.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments or faculty with participation in multidisciplinary centers, the unit leaders (department heads, directors, or supervisors) will need to collaborate to develop accurate. Heads of the primary appointment shall request input from other heads and/or center directors, as appropriate, and reference this input with the annual review letter for the faculty member. Preferably, this input is in the form of a memo to the primary head, providing an individual review of the faculty member's performance in the secondary appointment/center activities.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of activity is primarily administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor may solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

## 6.1 Purpose

The annual review should be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the university is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary



documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

The purpose of the annual review process is:

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be improved and/or enhanced.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant. See Section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.
- Provide appraisal of progress being made towards achieving tenure and/or promotion for tenure track faculty.
- Provide appraisal of progress being made towards achieving promotion for the academic professional track faculty.
- Provide appraisal of continuation of tenured appointment in light of the post tenure review process.

## 6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review, as applicable and as stated in Section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as an assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion.

### 6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year but may also include an expanded window, for example, three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

### 6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3) will be rated as “Does Not Meet Expectations”, “Needs Improvement”, “Meets Expectations”, or “Exceeds Expectations” (optional) based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. The overall performance will also be described using these terms.

#### 6.4.1 Performance Ratings for Teaching

The performance ratings to be used for the annual evaluation of **Teaching** are:

- Does Not Meet Expectations – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in the criteria listed in Section 4.2.
- Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching (see Section 4.2).
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators, as evidenced by the indicators listed in Section 4.1. In addition, these faculty members may be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **meets expectations performance**.



### 6.4.2 Performance Ratings for Research

The performance ratings to be used for the annual evaluation of **Research** are below. For APT faculty, the evaluation also takes into consideration the level of research activity specified in the appointment letter (e.g., as the second area of focus at 25% effort or primary area of focus at 75% effort).

- Does Not Meet Expectations – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research activity.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research, as supported by the indicators listed in Section 4.4.
- Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in research. Effectiveness must be demonstrated through the indicators listed in Section 4.4.
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally (internationally for full professors) recognized for their research activities. Indicators of excellence in research are listed in Section 4.3.

### 6.4.3 Performance Ratings for Service

The evaluation takes into consideration the rank of the faculty member. For APT faculty, it also takes into consideration the level of service activity specified in the appointment letter (e.g., as the second area of focus at 25% effort).

Indicators of excellence in service are listed in Section 4.4. Indicators of effectiveness in service are listed in Section 4.5.

The performance ratings to be used for the annual evaluation of **Service** are:

- Does Not Meet Expectations – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service.

- Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful service, demonstrating leadership and/or partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

## 6.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

### 6.5.1 Faculty Member’s Report of Previous Activities

**For the College of Engineering, the Annual Faculty Progress Report (FPR) document in Interfolio Faculty 180 will be completed to satisfy this requirement.**

The exact form of the faculty member’s report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals.

For examples, see Section 2.4.3.3 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

## 6.5.2 Written Evaluation

The department heads are responsible for annual reviews. They may include other faculty members in the process if they so choose. Departments that operate with an Annual Review Committee must specify the committee composition rules in their departmental *Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation* document.

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The document will also state the expectations for the next year. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and providing written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusal to sign the acknowledgment of the document should be noted in their file. This memorandum and/or the annual review and any related documents will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review document shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgment by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures. The document should be signed by the department head, director, or supervisor.

No faculty member may receive an overall meets expectations rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs ([System Regulation 33.05.02](#) Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following sentence must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

### 6.5.3 Meeting with the Faculty Member

The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

### 6.5.4 Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

## 6.6 Assessment Outcomes that Require Action

As per University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review (Section 8) ratings require further action.

### 6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall does not meet expectations rating is defined as a "Does Not Meet Expectations" in any single area of faculty performance (Section 3) or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall does not meet expectations rating shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Sections 3 and 4). Each does not meet expectations review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Does Not Meet Expectations" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to a does not meet expectations annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 8.3) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Does Not Meet

Expectations” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives a “Does Not Meet Expectations” periodic peer review (see Section 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

### 6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see Section 8), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Does Not Meet Expectations”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Meets Expectations” when pre-determined milestones are met.

## 6.7 Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The TAMU *Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews* states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

## 6.8 Complaint Procedure if Annual Review Fails to Follow Guidelines

A faculty member who believes that their annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to

the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. See Section 2.4.3.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See Section 2.4.3.6 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

## 7 Midterm Review

In accordance with Section 4.3.5.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive midterm review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period be conducted (normally by December of the third year; see example in Section 7.2) to determine the progress towards tenure.

### 7.1 Purpose

- A midterm review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period and advise the candidate on ways to improve or enhance the progress in meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the midterm review will include reviews by the unit's P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee (CETPAC), and dean.

- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review, but it is recommended as a best practice that an annual review is done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.

## 7.2 Process

The midterm review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the midterm review is due during the 2022-2023 academic year, the midterm review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2021.

Hired	Probationary Period	Midterm Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2021	7 years	Mar – Dec 2024 <i>(Due before December 2024 of AY 2024-2025)</i>

## 7.3 Feedback from the midterm review

Faculty members going through midterm review must receive feedback. Midterm feedback to candidates is given by the Department Heads. Department Heads formulate their feedback based on the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee recommendation, their assessment, the College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee recommendation, and the Dean (or Dean’s designee) assessment.



## 8 Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2).

### 8.1 Purpose of Periodic Peer Review

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty in enhancing professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

### 8.2 Peer Review Committee

The process for selection of the Peer Review Committee composition for post-tenure review varies by department. Departments must describe their process in the departmental *Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation* document.

Peer Review Committees must have at least three members. A committee member can only review faculty members at the same or lower ranks.

### 8.3 Process

In the College of Engineering, the periodic review happens every six years. For faculty members holding endowed chairs or professorships, the review

will happen every five years, in accordance with University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#).

- 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee:
- 3-page statement on teaching, research, and service,
  - Most recent Faculty Progress Report,
  - Student evaluations of teaching and peer teaching evaluation report.
- 8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in this document (in Sections 3 and 4), therefore being consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories meet expectations, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in **six** years (five for faculty members holding endowed chairs or professorships) or following three consecutive "does not meet expectations" annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4 A finding of "Does Not Meet Expectations" performance in any category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in this document. A Does Not Meet Expectations Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (Section 8.4).
- 8.3.5 A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in this document. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (Section 8.4).
- 8.3.6 A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan

developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, the Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (administratively located) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<sup>1</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

#### 8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Does Not Meet Expectations" annual reviews (see Section 7) or an "Does Not Meet Expectations" Peer Review (see Section 8.2) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7) The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review, see University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is

---

<sup>1</sup> It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 8.5.) acceptable to the dean.

8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member *ad hoc* faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be done in a timely fashion (normally within three months after the submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 6.6.2.

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 8.5) acceptable to the dean.

## 8.5 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the

Professional Development Plan, consult Section 5 of University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

## 8.6 Appeal

If, at any point during the procedure, the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University [SAP 12.99.99.M0.01](#) (Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final (Section 6, University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (Section 6, University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (Section 6, University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

## 8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the department head, director, or supervisor (Section 6, University [SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

In the College of Engineering holders of endowed professorships and chairs undergo a peer review for the renewal of their professorships or chairs once



in every five years. Such a peer review could include and address post tenure review. The peer review committee must explicitly address “post tenure review” for the peer review process for the professorship/chair renewal to be considered towards “post tenure review”.

## 9 Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution (ETID) Addendum

### 9.1 Introduction

This section supplements the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines from Faculty Affairs and the College of Engineering. All Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution programs are applied in nature and oriented towards industry. Normally, candidates for appointment will have industry experience or collaborations with industry. Faculty will maintain current in industrial practice in their fields of study by continuously interacting with industry or by participating in various professional activities. Consulting, summer or temporary employment, faculty development leave with industry, or sponsored research on industrial projects qualify for the purpose of industry interactions and industrial experience.

### 9.2 Criteria for Advancement

Evaluation for advancement includes the areas of teaching, research or other scholarly, creative activities, and service. Candidates are expected to present evidence of originality and impact of their work (e.g., citations; textbooks adopted by other schools; original devices; patents; products or techniques used in industry; documented increases in productivity or profitability, and the like). Participation in externally funded research, design, and development is required. Recognition of a candidate’s work by industry is of value and will be recognized in addition to academic external evaluations.

It is explicitly recognized that archival refereed journal publications are a strong, but not the sole indicator of professional accomplishment and excellence in the Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution. Additional indicators include:



- Publications in refereed academic proceedings
- Textbooks and/or chapters in textbooks
- Case studies published in refereed academic proceedings or journals
- Documented new processes, devices, or techniques developed in response to industry needs
- Innovative teaching techniques documented in archival form and adopted by other institutions
- Extramurally supported curriculum and laboratory development and innovation

---

## Contact Office

---

Office of the Executive Associate Dean of Engineering

E-mail and phone number are available at the [College of Engineering Leadership Team webpage](#)