

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of South Florida

Last Revised: October 30, 2020

Last Approved: October 30, 2020

Preamble

Introduction..... 1
1. General Criteria and Procedures..... 2
2.

- 1.6.** An extensive mid-tenure review will be conducted, typically during the third tenure-earning year, for tenure-track faculty. The mid-tenure review is similar to tenure review except that external letters are not utilized. For individuals credited with tenure-earning service at the time of initial appointment, the review will be conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period. The mid-tenure review will be conducted by the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee, the Department Chair, the College Faculty Governance Committee, and the College Dean.

All mid-tenure reviews shall address the candidate's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years. All reviews will utilize the department and college criteria for tenure and promotion and will assess overall performance in light of mid-point expectations.

The materials required for this review will consist of the same types of materials used for tenure review including, but not limited to, a current vita; annual evaluations; products of research/scholarship/creative activity; student/peer evaluation of teaching; selected examples of teaching-related activity; service commitments and accomplishments; and a brief self-evaluation by the faculty member.

The mid-tenure review is intended to be informative: to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure, and instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance. Where progress is significantly lacking and appears unlikely to improve going forward, nonrenewal may result.

- f. Presentations at national and international conferences
 - g. Invited seminars and talks
 - h. Patents or other technology transfer for research-related inventions
 - i. Scientific software, codes, and/or databases
 - j. Scientific instruments
 - k. Being awarded a teaching-related, peer-reviewed grant(s)
 - l. Scholarly papers published on teaching and engineering education
- 2.1.3. Research productivity of a candidate should be

- 2.1.9. Active dissemination of research results through regular presentations at national and international professional meetings is expected.
- 2.1.10. Invited talks at peer institutions and departments, invited presentations and talks at major conferences, and prizes from professional societies and other organizations recognizing the scholarly work of a candidate bring prestige to the candidate, the department, and to the university and will be viewed as an additional demonstration of research productivity and impact.

2.2. Teaching Criteria for Tenure

- 2.2.1. The goal of teaching in the department is to promote students' learning,

- c. Membership on review panels for grant proposals to external funding agencies.
- d. Service to national and international professional societies in fields relevant to mechanical engineering (e.g., American Society of Mechanical Engineers). Types of service appropriate at this level are expected to go beyond mid-level leadership roles (e.g., such as participation as Technical Committee Chairs within Divisions of ASME) to include roles such as major officer and board positions (e.g., ASME Division Officer, ASME Executive Board Member, etc.) and other similar high-level leadership positions within major professional societies in fields related to mechanical engineering.
- e. Membership on journal editorial boards and/or holding the position of Chief Editor or the equivalent of 792 reW9d(4r4p0 12 T7 (e)71 108 T5 611.03e)7g.

external reviewers who are highly distinguished in the candidate's field(s) of research and who can comment on the importance and impact of the candidate's scholarly work are a critical element to supporting and justifying the award of promotion for a candidate.

- 3.1.4. A record of excellence in teaching can be demonstrated through a variety of means including student teaching ratings of the candidate on par with the average ratings within the Department and/or College of Engineering, peer evaluations of teaching, data demonstrating that students are achieving learning outcomes of the courses which the candidate has taught, receipt of awards by the candidate for their teaching and/or pedagogical work and innovations, receipt of research awards by undergraduate and graduate students whom the candidate serves as a mentor/advisor for their research, and creation of new courses and/or course products such as textbooks.
- 3.1.5. The candidate should show a substantive level of initiative to serve their pro

the appropriate period of service, Instructors may apply to the department to be considered for a promotion on the basis of meritorious performance.

- 3.3.2. In evaluating a candidate for promotion from Instructor I to Instructor II, the departmental Promotion Committee for the candidate will consider and rate all portions of the candidate's assigned duties during the evaluation period. In addition to the review of annual evaluations in making decisions about the overall rating assigned to an assigned duty area, a comprehensive review of evidence provided by the candidate that demonstrates their performance in the assigned duty areas will be considered to assess the individual's holistic contributions to the department.
- 3.3.3. Excellence in the principal assigned duty for the Instructor applying for promotion is required. Such excellence can be demonstrated by various information supplied by the candidate, but this evaluation should be in concert with (though not solely determined by) the last five years of annual evaluations (or the total number of yearly evaluations available if being considered early). If the applicant has multiple areas of assignment, substantive contributions are also required in proportion to the assignment(s). If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments over the time period being considered, one must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly.

3.4. Standards for Promotion to Instructor III

- 3.4.3. Excellence in the principal assigned duty for the Instructor applying for promotion is required. Such excellence can be demonstrated by various information supplied by the candidate, but this evaluation should be in concert with (though not solely determined by) the last five years of annual evaluations (or the total number of yearly evaluations available if being considered early). If the applicant has multiple areas of assignment, substantive contributions are also required in proportion to the assignment(s). If an individual has equal primary FTE assignments over the time period being considered, one must be designated as the primary area and ratings assigned accordingly.

4. Amendments

Any faculty member may propose amendments to these departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. A proposed amendment must be submitted in writing (or via email) to the Department Chair, who will place it on the agenda within the next three scheduled departmental faculty meetings. The ME faculty may refer the amendment for review by a departmental committee. Upon completion of the review of the amendment within a reasonable time, the proposed change will be placed on the agenda of the next faculty meeting, where after a discussion, a vote will be taken. Upon request by any faculty, the vote must be by secret ballot. A 2/3 vote of all voting faculty members in residence plus those on leave, but present, is necessary to pass such amendments.