

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| PTR Criteria by Department of Ocean and Mechanical Engineering | 2 |
| PTR Criteria by Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science | 6 |
| PTR Criteria by Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatics Engineering | 10 |
| Appendix: COLLEGE PTR PROCEDURE | 14 |
| (Ratified by the College Faculty Assembly on April 15, 2024) | 14 |

PTR Criteria by Department of Ocean and Mechanical Engineering

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) CRITERIA

Department of Ocean and Mechanical Engineering

College of Engineering and Computer Science

Florida Atlantic University

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the guidelines for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) for the Department of Ocean and Mechanical Engineering in the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Florida Atlantic University. The guidelines presented herein are consistent with the principles of inviolability of academic freedom to pursue academic endeavors commensurate with an individual's expertise, interests and abilities exercised in meeting the requirements of the Department, College, and the University. Portfolios prepared in pursuit of PTR should reflect a comprehensive record of the individual in supporting the academic and professional targets and criteria outlined in this document.

DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

The general procedure for PTR is described in the Board of Governor (BoG)'s relevant regulations, Provost's PTR Guidelines memorandum and the College's guidelines. It is expected that all faculty, particularly all candidates for Post-Tenure Review, review and become familiar with the details of the following documents:

1. This document.
2. College of Engineering and Computer Science PTR Procedure.
3. The most recent documents, posted on the Provost's website:
 - ◆ [BOG Regulation 10.003](#)
 - ◆ [FAU Regulation 5.002](#)
 - ◆ [Post-Tenure Review Policy](#)
 - ◆ [PTR Coversheet for Departments](#)

All the University documents related to PTR are available on the Provost's web page:

<https://www.fau.edu/provost/for-faculty/post-tenure/>

Faculty workload assignments are in the following three categories: (i) teaching/instructional efforts, (ii) research and related scholarly or creative accomplishments and (iii) service. Candidates seeking

PTR shall be evaluated in the categories of their annual workload assignment averaged over the PTR review period.

In general, PTR is based on the consideration of the extent and impact of the candidate's contributions to the University, as well as their stature in their professional community. Such consideration relies on evidence provided by the quality of the candidate's scholarly publications and funded research, their teaching performance, and their service to their professional community and the University, as applicable. Assessment of a candidate's accomplishments is performed according to the categories of their annual workload assignment for the period of PTR review. It may be based on evidence of performance regarding student perception of teaching (SPOT), supervision of Post-Doctoral fellows, Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses, new course development, proposal development and acquired research funding, refereed journal publications, refereed conference presentations and publications in conference proceedings, granted patents, authorship of scholarly books, development of new laboratory facilities and experiments, introduction of innovative methods of classroom and online instruction, student mentoring and supervision, and recognition by national/international professional bodies, etc.

The candidate should provide evidence of accomplishments and be evaluated in the categories of their annual workload assignment averaged over the PTR review period. Based on the candidate's dossier, the department committee, consisting of all eligible faculty members, votes on **the PTR candidate by choosing one of the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.**

The Department Chair shall review the candidate's dossier, along with the committee's report and recommendation. The Chair shall also review any additional records, if applicable, related to the candidate's professional conduct, academic concerns, and performance issues. Subsequently, the Chair will recommend to the Dean a performance rating of the PTR candidate from the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

Listed below are the PTR criteria.

PTR CRITERIA

The PTR Advisory Committee shall rate the PTR candidate by considering the following criteria:

A. Teaching and student mentoring, as evidenced by

- ◆ Quantitative data on teaching, including SPOT and peer teaching evaluations.
- ◆ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students.
- ◆ Publications in peer-reviewed engineering education journals and conferences.
- ◆ Development of new courses or laboratories in the candidate's field of expertise.
- ◆ Publication of textbooks, lab manuals or other instructional material.
- ◆ Teaching recognition.

B. Scholarship and research impact, as evidenced by

- ◆ A record of peer-reviewed publications in the journals and the international conferences in the candidate's field.
- ◆ Submission or approval of patents.
- ◆ Served as PI or co-PI of peer reviewed research grants, subawards or subcontracts from federal or state agencies. Grants from non-profit research organizations/foundations or industry will also be considered.
- ◆ Financial support of graduate students and postdocs through research grants.
- ◆ Submission of competitive research proposals to federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry.
- ◆ Ph.D. dissertations supervised by the candidate as an advisor.
- ◆ Supervision of master's theses to completion.
- ◆ Financial support and supervision of post-doctoral fellows.

c. Service, as evidenced by

- ◆ Participation on review panels at national funding agencies, e.g., NSF, NIH, etc.
- ◆ Serving on journal editorial boards, technical committees of national professional organizations.
- ◆ Reviewing for journals and/or conference proceedings.
- ◆ Serving on conference program committees and/or chairing conference technical sessions.
- ◆ Participation in Department, College, or University committees.
- ◆ Participation in community engagement.
- ◆ Participation in the local communities of the candidate's profession.
- ◆ Outreach efforts, for example in the form of workshops and presentations for K-12 and higher-education students.

The PTR Advisory Committee shall vote on the PTR candidate using one of the following rating scales:

- ◆ **Exceeds Expectations:** Demonstrates a clear and significant level of accomplishment in the categories of their annual workload assignment based on the above criteria, consistently surpassing the average performance of faculty across the department over the PTR review period.
- ◆ **Meets Expectations:** Achieves an expected level of accomplishment in the categories of their annual workload assignment based on the above criteria, compared to faculty in the

department.

- ◆ **Fails to Meet Expectations:** Performance falls below the average performance of the faculty in the department in the categories of their annual workload assignment but shows potential for improvement.
- ◆ **Unsatisfactory:** Performance fails consistently to meet the expectation based on the above criteria in the categories of their annual workload assignment. This reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

Note that a candidate who receives a rating of three or above for each annual evaluation during the review period may not receive a PTR rating below “Meets Expectation.”

PTR Criteria by Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

(Draft)

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) CRITERIA Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science College of Engineering and Computer Science Florida Atlantic University

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the guidelines for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) for the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Florida Atlantic University. The guidelines presented herein are consistent with the principles of inviolability of academic freedom to pursue academic endeavors commensurate with an individual's expertise, interests and abilities exercised in meeting the requirements of the Department, College, and the University. Portfolios prepared in pursuit of PTR should reflect a comprehensive record of the individual in supporting the academic and professional targets and criteria outlined in this document.

DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

The general procedure for PTR is described in the Board of Governor (BoG)'s relevant regulations, Provost's PTR Guidelines memorandum and the College's guidelines. It is expected that all faculty, particularly all candidates for Post-Tenure Review, review and become familiar with the details of the following documents:

4. This document.
5. College of Engineering and Computer Science PTR Procedure.
6. The most recent documents, posted on the Provost's website:

- ◆ [BOG Regulation 10.003](#)
- ◆ [FAU Regulation 5.002](#)
- ◆ [Post-Tenure Review Policy](#)
- ◆ [PTR Coversheet for Departments](#)

All the University documents related to PTR are available on the Provost's web page:

<https://www.fau.edu/provost/for-faculty/post-tenure/>

Faculty workload assignments are in the following three categories: (i) teaching/instructional efforts, (ii) research and related scholarly or creative accomplishments and (iii) service. Candidates seeking PTR shall be evaluated in the categories of their annual workload assignment averaged over the PTR

review period.

In general, PTR is based on the consideration of the extent and impact of the candidate's contributions to the University, as well as their stature in their professional community. Such consideration relies on evidence provided by the quality of the candidate's scholarly publications and funded research, their teaching performance, and their service to their professional community and the University, as applicable. Assessment of a candidate's accomplishments is performed according to the categories of their annual workload assignment for the period of PTR review. It may be based on evidence of performance regarding student perception of teaching (SPOT), supervision of Post-Doctoral fellows, Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses, new course development, proposal development and acquired research funding, refereed journal publications, refereed conference presentations and publications in conference proceedings, granted patents, authorship of scholarly books, development of new laboratory facilities and experiments, introduction of innovative methods of classroom and online instruction, student mentoring and supervision, and recognition by national/international professional bodies, etc.

The candidate should provide evidence of accomplishments and be evaluated in the categories of their annual workload assignment averaged over the PTR review period. Based on the candidate's dossier, the department committee, consisting of all eligible faculty members, votes on **the PTR candidate by choosing one of the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.**

The Department Chair shall review the candidate's dossier, along with the committee's report and recommendation. The Chair shall also review any additional records, if applicable, related to the candidate's professional conduct, academic concerns, and performance issues. Subsequently, the Chair will recommend to the Dean a performance rating of the PTR candidate from the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

Listed below are the PTR criteria.

PTR CRITERIA

The PTR Advisory Committee shall rate the PTR candidate by considering the following criteria:

A. Teaching and student mentoring, as evidenced by

- ◆ Quantitative data on teaching, including SPOT and peer teaching evaluations.
- ◆ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students.
- ◆ Publications in peer-reviewed engineering education journals and conferences.
- ◆ Development of new courses or laboratories in the candidate's field of expertise.
- ◆ Publication of textbooks, lab manuals or other instructional material.
- ◆ Teaching recognition.

B. Scholarship and research impact, as evidenced by

- ◆ A record of peer-reviewed publications in the journals and the international conferences in the candidate's field.
- ◆ Submission or approval of patents.
- ◆ Served as PI or co-PI of peer reviewed research grants, subawards or subcontracts from federal or state agencies. Grants from non-profit research organizations/foundations or industry will also be considered.
- ◆ Financial support of graduate students and postdocs through research grants.
- ◆ Submission of competitive research proposals to federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry.
- ◆ Ph.D. dissertations supervised by the candidate as an advisor.
- ◆ Supervision of master's theses to completion.
- ◆ Financial support and supervision of post-doctoral fellows.

c. Service, as evidenced by

- ◆ Participation on review panels at national funding agencies, e.g., NSF, NIH, etc.
- ◆ Serving on journal editorial boards, technical committees of national professional organizations.
- ◆ Reviewing for journals and/or conference proceedings.
- ◆ Serving on conference program committees and/or chairing conference technical sessions.
- ◆ Participation in Department, College, or University committees.
- ◆ Participation in community engagement.
- ◆ Participation in the local communities of the candidate's profession.
- ◆ Outreach efforts, for example in the form of workshops and presentations for K-12 and higher-education students.

The PTR Advisory Committee shall vote on the PTR candidate using one of the following rating scales:

- ◆ **Exceeds Expectations:** Demonstrates a clear and significant level of accomplishment in the categories of their annual workload assignment based on the above criteria, consistently surpassing the average performance of faculty across the department over the PTR review period.
- ◆ **Meets Expectations:** Achieves an expected level of accomplishment in the categories of their annual workload assignment based on the above criteria, compared to faculty in the

department.

- ◆ **Fails to Meet Expectations:** Performance falls below the average performance of the faculty in the department in the categories of their annual workload assignment but shows potential for improvement.
- ◆ **Unsatisfactory:** Performance fails consistently to meet the expectation based on the above criteria in the categories of their annual workload assignment. This reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

Note that a candidate who receives a rating of three or above for each annual evaluation during the review period may not receive a PTR rating below “Meets Expectation.”

PTR Criteria by Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatics Engineering

(Draft)

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) CRITERIA

Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatics Engineering

College of Engineering and Computer Science

Florida Atlantic University

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the guidelines for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) for the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatics Engineering in the College of Engineering and Computer Science at Florida Atlantic University. The guidelines presented herein are consistent with the principles of inviolability of academic freedom to pursue academic endeavors commensurate with an individual's expertise, interests and abilities exercised in meeting the requirements of the Department, College, and the University. Portfolios prepared in pursuit of PTR should reflect a comprehensive record of the individual in supporting the academic and professional targets and criteria outlined in this document.

DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES

The general procedure for PTR is described in the Board of Governor (BoG)'s relevant regulations, Provost's PTR Guidelines memorandum and the College's guidelines. It is expected that all faculty, particularly all candidates for Post-Tenure Review, review and become familiar with the details of the following documents:

1. This document.
2. College of Engineering and Computer Science PTR Procedure.
3. The most recent documents, posted on the Provost's website:

- ◆ [BOG Regulation 10.003](#)
- ◆ [FAU Regulation 5.002](#)
- ◆ [Post-Tenure Review Policy](#)
- ◆ [PTR Coversheet for Departments](#)

All the University documents related to PTR are available on the Provost's web page:

<https://www.fau.edu/provost/for-faculty/post-tenure/>

Faculty workload assignments are in the following three categories: (i) teaching/instructional efforts, (ii) research and related scholarly or creative accomplishments and (iii) service. Candidates seeking

PTR shall be evaluated in the categories of their annual workload assignment averaged over the PTR review period.

In general, PTR is based on the consideration of the extent and impact of the candidate's contributions to the University, as well as their stature in their professional community. Such consideration relies on evidence provided by the quality of the candidate's scholarly publications and funded research, their teaching performance, and their service to their professional community and the University, as applicable. Assessment of a candidate's accomplishments is performed according to the categories of their annual workload assignment for the period of PTR review. It may be based on evidence of performance regarding student perception of teaching (SPOT), supervision of Post-Doctoral fellows, Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses, new course development, proposal development and acquired research funding, refereed journal publications, refereed conference presentations and publications in conference proceedings, granted patents, authorship of scholarly books, development of new laboratory facilities and experiments, introduction of innovative methods of classroom and online instruction, student mentoring and supervision, and recognition by national/international professional bodies, etc.

The candidate should provide evidence of accomplishments and be evaluated in the categories of their annual workload assignment averaged over the PTR review period. Based on the candidate's dossier, the department committee, consisting of all eligible faculty members, votes on **the PTR candidate by choosing one of the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.**

The Department Chair shall review the candidate's dossier, along with the committee's report and recommendation. The Chair shall also review any additional records, if applicable, related to the candidate's professional conduct, academic concerns, and performance issues. Subsequently, the Chair will recommend to the Dean a performance rating of the PTR candidate from the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

Listed below are the PTR criteria.

PTR CRITERIA

The PTR Advisory Committee shall rate the PTR candidate by considering the following criteria:

A. Teaching and student mentoring, as evidenced by

- ◆ Quantitative data on teaching, including SPOT and peer teaching evaluations.
- ◆ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students.
- ◆ Publications in peer-reviewed engineering education journals and conferences.
- ◆ Development of new courses or laboratories in the candidate's field of expertise.
- ◆ Publication of textbooks, lab manuals or other instructional material.
- ◆ Teaching recognition.

B. Scholarship and research impact, as evidenced by

- ◆ A record of peer-reviewed publications in the journals and the international conferences in the candidate's field.
- ◆ Submission or approval of patents.
- ◆ Served as PI or co-PI of peer reviewed research grants, subawards or subcontracts from federal or state agencies. Grants from non-profit research organizations/foundations or industry will also be considered.
- ◆ Financial support of graduate students and postdocs through research grants.
- ◆ Submission of competitive research proposals to federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry.
- ◆ Ph.D. dissertations supervised by the candidate as an advisor.
- ◆ Supervision of master's theses to completion.
- ◆ Financial support and supervision of post-doctoral fellows.

c. Service, as evidenced by

- ◆ Participation on review panels at national funding agencies, e.g., NSF, NIH, etc.
- ◆ Serving on journal editorial boards, technical committees of national professional organizations.
- ◆ Reviewing for journals and/or conference proceedings.
- ◆ Serving on conference program committees and/or chairing conference technical sessions.
- ◆ Participation in Department, College, or University committees.
- ◆ Participation in community engagement.
- ◆ Participation in the local communities of the candidate's profession.
- ◆ Outreach efforts, for example in the form of workshops and presentations for K-12 and higher-education students.

The PTR Advisory Committee shall vote on the PTR candidate using one of the following rating scales:

- ◆ **Exceeds Expectations:** Demonstrates a clear and significant level of accomplishment in the categories of their annual workload assignment based on the above criteria, consistently surpassing the average performance of faculty across the department over the PTR review period.
- ◆ **Meets Expectations:** Achieves an expected level of accomplishment in the categories of their annual workload assignment based on the above criteria, compared to faculty in the

department.

- ◆ **Fails to Meet Expectations:** Performance falls below the average performance of the faculty in the department in the categories of their annual workload assignment but shows potential for improvement.
- ◆ **Unsatisfactory:** Performance fails consistently to meet the expectation based on the above criteria in the categories of their annual workload assignment. This reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

Note that a candidate who receives a rating of three or above for each annual evaluation during the review period may not receive a PTR rating below “Meets Expectation.”

Appendix: COLLEGE PTR PROCEDURE

(Ratified by the College Faculty Assembly on April 15, 2024)

Each department shall establish Post Tenure Review (PTR) criteria for evaluating faculty every 5 years after tenure. The PTR criteria should align with the University's mission, state regulations, university policies, and the standards used for assessing tenure and promotion which reflect performance expectations in the discipline. The PTR criteria should be reviewed and revised as needed every 5 years to reflect the evolution of the disciplines and expectations. In post tenure review, academic performance of faculty is evaluated in all areas of annual workload assignments over the period of evaluation and averaged over that period.

To draft the PTR criteria, the department Chair shall form an ad hoc committee—the PTR Criteria Development Committee—comprising three to five members, with at least one of them at the Associate Professor level if possible.

The department's PTR criteria must receive approval from the Dean and the Provost.

1. A PTR candidate shall compile a dossier highlighting their accomplishments based on the department's criteria and demonstrating their performance relative to assigned duties. The candidate shall then submit the dossier to the department Chair, which includes:
 - A comprehensive CV;
 - A self-evaluation document presenting the candidate's research, teaching, and service accomplishments during the five most recent years preceding the PTR evaluation (including the SPOT score for each course);
 - The candidate's corresponding workload assignments (and reports) in the form of percentages on a year-by-year basis in the three categories of teaching/instructional efforts, research and related scholarly or creative accomplishments, and service; and
 - The candidate's five most recent annual evaluations (in the category of Teaching, Research and Service, as well as Overall) by the Dept. Chair.
2. The Dept. Chair shall convene the PTR Advisory committee, which includes all eligible* faculty members and assigns a faculty, preferably in the area of specialization of the candidate, as the Committee Chair. The committee reviews the PTR case based on the department's PTR criteria and votes on the PTR candidate by choosing one of the following options: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory. The Committee Chair prepares a report reflecting the Committee's discussion and the faculty vote and submits the report to the Dept. Chair.

* For PTR of full professors, all full professors are eligible faculty; for PTR of associate professors all associate and full professors are eligible faculty – in both cases, individuals with conflict of interest are excluded from PTR Advisory Committee.
3. The Dept. Chair shall review the candidate's dossier, and the committee's report and recommendation. The Chair shall also review any additional records, if applicable, related to the

candidate's professional conduct, academic concerns, and performance concerns. Subsequently, the Chair shall submit a letter to the Dean assessing the candidate's level of achievement and certifying any concerns regarding the candidate's professional conduct, academic matters, and performance issues, if applicable. The Chair's letter will also include a performance rating of the PTR candidate from the following list: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

4. The Dept. Chair's letter shall be available to the PTR candidate who can submit a rebuttal within a designated time frame (typically 5 business days).
5. The Dept. Chair's letter together with the PTR candidate's portfolio and any applicable rebuttal letter are submitted to the Dean who makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Dean's letter shall be available to the PTR candidate who can submit a rebuttal within a designated time frame (typically 5 business days) before the case is forwarded to the Provost.