



TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER™

School of Medicine

Operating Policy and Procedure

SOM OP: 20.22, **Mid-Cycle Review**

PURPOSE: The purpose of this School of Medicine (SOM) Policy and Procedure is to provide faculty with a clear idea of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

REVIEW: This SOM Policy and Procedure shall be reviewed within each even-numbered fiscal year by the Office of Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development. Revisions will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean for approval and publication.

POLICY/PROCEDURE:

General. Faculty facing promotion and/or tenure in TTUHSC School of Medicine departments should have a prior assessment of their progress toward their goals. To that end, each department may perform a mid-cycle review 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 and 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 deficient. The aim of the review is to provide information that will assist the non-tenured faculty member seeking promotion and provide the tenure-track faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure while there is time for changes in orientation and activity, if needed. The mid-cycle review process is not mandatory, but highly recommended by the School of Medicine Tenure and Promotion Committee.

This mid-cycle review is not intended to replace the responsibility of the department chairs on each campus to include an examination of progress toward tenure and/or promotion as part of the annual review of all faculty. This mid-cycle review is non-binding and is intended to give faculty some indication of their progress. Mid-cycle review runs concurrently with the tenure and promotion cycle and therefore faculty may not go through the tenure and promotion cycle during the same year of their mid-cycle review.

PROCEDURE

1. The Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development will determine a timetable for each newly hired faculty member with regards to the approximate year of the tenure/promotion decision and the midpoint of that term. For example, the maximum probationary period for awarding tenure is seven (7) years. Therefore, the midpoint should be no later than three (3) years. However, faculty can request a mid-cycle review at any time, including follow-up reviews.
2. During January of the review year, the campus department chair and the faculty member will be notified electronically by the Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development that a mid-cycle review is appropriate. Included with the notification will be a link to the Mid-Cycle Review Policy ([SOM OP 20.22](#)) and a link to [Faculty Success](#). Faculties who do not wish to participate should indicate declination of the process by clicking the appropriate link within the notification.
3. The faculty member who plans to participate should closely review the policies and, through discussion with their chair, identify their area of “excellence” and “meaningful participation”. The participating faculty member will complete their application through [Faculty Success](#). The deadline for completion of the application is March of the evaluation year, and an electronic copy of the completed application is submitted electronically to the Office of Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development via [Workflow Manager](#).
4. The Office of Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development will contact the Department Faculty Review Committee, and provide them the link to Workflow Manager to access the faculty member’s application, the appropriate table from the [SOM OP 20.21, Faculty Tenure and Promotion](#), and the [peer evaluation guidelines](#). The membership of each faculty review committee will consist of all members of the department faculty on all campuses who have reached the level of advancement

under consideration. That is, all Professors consider those cases involving all ranks; Professors and Associate Professors consider those cases involving promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and all tenured faculty consider tenure decisions. The Department Faculty Review Committee will be asked to evaluate the mid-cycle review with the same rigor as they examine regular tenure/promotion portfolios.

In the case of small departments where it is not possible to form a review committee of at least three departmental faculty, the Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development will choose a committee of at least three faculty of appropriate rank from other departments.

5. The members of the departmental Mid-Cycle Review Committee will complete the evaluation and submit their vote on the faculty member's credentials. 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 faculty member.

Three outcomes of the vote are possible:

- a. The faculty member is "on track" for tenure/promotion
- b. The faculty member is "off track" but deficient in only one or two areas.
- c. The faculty member is "off track" and deficient in several areas.

In the case of a vote for "off track," the specific areas in which the faculty member was found deficient should be identified and recommendations made to strengthen the area(s).

6. The completed evaluation must be submitted electronically no later than April 30 of the evaluation year. The Office of Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development collects the evaluations and the Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development provides the evaluation results to the faculty member under review as well as the campus department chair. It is important to emphasize that these evaluations are not binding for final tenure/promotion decisions.
7. The mid-cycle review will provide a reasonable assessment for the faculty member that will aid in designing individual development programs. The outcome of the mid-cycle review will generate different degrees of intervention:
 - a. A vote of "on track" would require only ongoing reinforcement of a faculty member's existing strengths.
 - b. A vote of "off track" with one or two deficiencies might require minimal remediation if the faculty member has potential of addressing these points in due time.
 - c. A vote of "off track and deficient in several areas" is more serious. In this circumstance, the Campus Department Chair and Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development should consult with the faculty member to design a program to ameliorate the identified deficiencies.

The Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development will arrange a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the results of the mid-cycle review and design a program for development where deficiencies are identified. If necessary, the Associate Dean for Faculty Recruitment, Affairs and Development will arrange a meeting with the department chair to discuss the faculty member's results and the development program. The campus department chair will follow-up with the faculty member regularly to discuss their progress.

LINKS

[Faculty Success](#)
[SOM OP 20.21, Faculty Tenure and Promotion](#)
[Mid-Cycle Review Process Webpage](#)
[Peer Evaluation Guideline](#)