



MID-POINT REVIEW (PRE-TENURE/PRE-PROMOTION) PROCEDURE

PURPOSE

To provide faculty members with peers' objective feedback of their progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

INTRODUCTION

Faculty facing promotion and/or tenure in TTUHSC El Paso Paul L. Foster School of Medicine departments should have a prior assessment of their progress toward these goals. To that end, each department may perform a mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) of faculty. All reviews shall address cumulative accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, clinical service, and academically related public service. The review is intended to be informative, encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward tenure and/or promotion, instructional to faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance, and cautionary to faculty where progress is significantly lacking. The aim of the review is to provide information that will assist faculty members seeking future tenure and/or promotion while there is time for changes in orientation and activity, if needed, of the individual involved.

This mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) is not intended to replace the responsibility of the department chairs to include an examination of progress toward tenure and/or promotion as part of the annual evaluation of all faculty members. This mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) is non-binding and is intended to give faculty some indication of their progress.

POLICY

This peer review process is mandatory for faculty on the tenure track and strongly encouraged for faculty on the non-tenure track.

PROCEDURE

1. The mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) is typically performed at the time the faculty member has been at their current rank for about three years. For example, the maximum probationary period for awarding tenure to an assistant professor is seven years. Therefore, the midpoint will be no later than three years. Assistant professors with probationary credit of one year and two years will be reviewed in the second and third years, respectively. However, faculty can request a mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) at any career stage, including follow-up reviews. A mid-point review is not necessary for faculty on the tenure track hired with three or more years' credit. In these



cases, such a review of accomplishments in previous positions should be part of the hiring decision.

2. During spring of the review year, the department chair and eligible candidates will be notified by the associate dean for faculty affairs that a mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) is required for tenure-track faculty members and strongly encouraged for non-tenure track faculty members. The following documents will be included with the notification: Paul L. Foster School of Medicine Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Tenure and Promotion and Pre-Tenure and/or Pre-Promotion Application. Chairs are encouraged to discuss pre-tenure and/or pre-promotion with faculty during annual faculty evaluations.
3. Faculty who wish to participate, including those on the tenure track who are due for their review, must submit a Mid-Point Review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) Confirmation of Participation Form. Applicants are to submit this form to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the deadline specified on the timeline. Faculty who have submitted the Confirmation of Participation Form who then decide they do not want to participate must notify the Office of Faculty Affairs in writing.
4. The deadline for submission of the mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) application form is **March 30, 2018**. The completed application form and all accompanying documents will be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the faculty candidate. The application and accompanying documents should not exceed 200 pages.
5. The department chair will assemble a Mid-Point Review (Pre-Tenure/Pre-Promotion) Committee and appoint a committee chair. The membership of each faculty review committee will consist of all members of the department faculty who hold academic ranks that are higher than that of the faculty applicant. That is, all professors consider pre-promotion reviews involving all ranks; professors and associate professors consider pre-promotion reviews involving promotion to the rank of associate professor; and all tenured faculty members consider pre-tenure reviews.

In the cases of small departments where it is not possible to form a review committee of at least three department faculty members, the chair, in consultation with the associate dean for faculty affairs, will choose a committee of at least three faculty of appropriate rank from other departments.

6. In addition to review by the mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) department committee, each application will be reviewed by two members of the Committee on Faculty Appointments, Tenure and Promotion, and Comprehensive Performance Evaluation (CFAPTA).
7. Mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) applicants may withdraw their application and participation in this review by submitting a written request to the associate dean for



faculty affairs. All requests for withdrawal must be submitted to the associate dean for faculty affairs prior to the review by the Department Mid-Point Review (Pre-Tenure/Pre-Promotion) Committee.

8. The department review committee and CFAPTA members will be given access to the candidate's mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) application via a secured SharePoint site. Committee members will be asked to evaluate the application with the same rigor as they examine regular tenure/promotion portfolios according to the PLFSOM Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Tenure and Promotion. Each committee member will be required to submit a mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) Confidentiality Form prior to being granted access to the SharePoint system. Committee members are strongly encouraged to attend a committee workshop.
9. The department review committee and CFAPTA members are asked to complete a peer evaluation form. To ensure an accurate outcome, it is important that the committee vote on the portfolio as it is presented, rather than on projected productivity of the candidate.

Two outcomes of the vote are possible:

- i. Progressing as expected to prepare for future tenure and/or promotion
- ii. Not progressing as expected for future tenure and/or promotion

In the case of a vote of "not progressing as expected," the specific areas in which the candidate was found lacking should be identified on the evaluation forms.

10. The department review committee chair collects the evaluation forms from the department review committee members and submits them to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Likewise, the CFAPTA members will submit their evaluation forms to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The evaluation forms must be returned to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the date specified on the timeline.
11. The associate dean for faculty affairs will prepare a summary of the peer-evaluation forms and provide the report to the department chair. A copy of this summary will be made available to the department review committee chair, as well as the Committee on Faculty Appointment, Tenure/Promotion, Comprehensive Performance Evaluation (CFAPTA) members at the time of review for tenure/promotion. It is important to emphasize that these evaluations are not binding for final tenure/promotion decisions.

The mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) will provide a reasonable assessment of candidates to aid in designing individual development programs.



The outcome of the mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) will generate different degrees of remediation:

- (i) A vote of “progressing as expected” would require only ongoing reinforcement of a candidate's existing strengths.
 - (ii) A vote of “not progressing as expected” will require more attention. In this circumstance, the chair and associate dean for faculty affairs should discuss with the candidate a program to ameliorate the identified shortcomings.
11. **“Not Progressing as Expected” Results:** It is the responsibility of the department chair, in collaboration with the associate dean for faculty affairs, to design a development program for each faculty member whose review results in a designation of “not progressing as expected.” The associate dean for faculty affairs will arrange a meeting with the department chair to discuss the results of the mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) and develop a remediation program. The department chair will meet with the faculty member under review to discuss the outcome of the mid-point review (pre-tenure/pre-promotion) and describe the recommended remediation program.

“Progressing as Expected” Results: For faculty members whose review results in a designation of “progressing as expected,” the department chair may meet with the faculty member to review the summary report. The Office of Faculty Affairs will send a copy of the summary report to the faculty member.