



Rule Summary

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University-Central Texas (A&M-Central Texas) applies to tenured faculty members and is comprised of annual performance reviews by the department chair (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation) as well as a comprehensive review by a committee of peers that occurs not less frequently than once every six years. Post-tenure review 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 growth plan and return to expected levels of productivity.

Rule

1. ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted for all tenured faculty members and must result in a written document stating the department chair's evaluations of performance in scholarship, teaching, service, and other assigned responsibilities (Administrative Evaluation of Faculty guidelines).

- 1.1 In each department or college, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in the annual review will be established by departmental or college faculty and approved by department chair, dean, and provost.
- 1.2 An annual review resulting in an unsatisfactory performance (i.e., any rating below "meets expectations") in any area must state the basis for the ranking in accordance with the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review should be reported to the dean.
- 1.3 The report to the dean of each unsatisfactory performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan (known as the short-term development plan and described below in section 2), developed by the faculty member and department chair (in consultation with the dean), to bring the faculty member to satisfactory performance. Faculty members who receive a second unsatisfactory rating in the annual performance review in any category within six years of the first unsatisfactory rating will be subject to additional assessment and may be recommended for professional review, to be initiated no later than the next academic year.
- 1.4 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, department chairs or program directors of the appropriate units will inform faculty of the criteria for evaluation that apply to their shared activities, and they will collaborate to develop accurate annual reviews that give appropriate consideration to shared activities.

2. SHORT-TERM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 2.1 The short-term development plan must indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental and college criteria developed under the provision of this rule) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member, and it must be possible to complete the plan prior to the deadline for the faculty submitting their next self-evaluation for the regular annual evaluation process. The plan should be constructed in a way to remedy a deficiency as quickly as possible.

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.

Although each short-term development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- 2.1.1 identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- 2.1.2 define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- 2.1.3 outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
- 2.1.4 set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
- 2.1.5 indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
- 2.1.6 identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

2.2 Assessment.

The faculty member and department chair will meet monthly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the dean after each of these meetings. At the subsequent regularly scheduled review of the faculty member's performance (i.e., annual review), the chair will document the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the short-term development plan. The successful completion of the growth plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire university community.

2.3 Completion of the Plan.

- 2.3.1 Meeting the objectives of the growth plan typically indicates the faculty will at least meet expectations in the areas the growth plan specifically targeted. However, if an unsatisfactory rating in any area of the annual evaluation is received, this constitutes a second unsatisfactory annual review within six years of

another unsatisfactory rating. As such, the faculty member will be subject to additional assessment and may be recommended for professional review (as described in section 3.4), to be initiated no later than the next academic year.

2.3.2 If prior to annual evaluation that occurs subsequent to the development of the growth plan, the department chair and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to complete the required activities and meet the goals of the short-term development plan, the faculty member will be subject to additional assessment and may be recommended for professional review (as described in section 3.4), to be initiated no later than the next academic year.

2.4 If a faculty member receives a rating of unsatisfactory performance on their annual review while in the process of completing a professional growth plan (referenced below in section 5), an additional short-term development plan is not required unless the deficiencies resulting in an unsatisfactory rating are not sufficiently addressed in the current professional growth plan.

3. SIX-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE PEER REVIEW

As part of the post-tenure review process, a review by a committee of peers must occur not less frequently than once every six years.

3.1 The purpose of the comprehensive peer review is to:

3.1.2 provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;

3.1.3 assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals;

3.1.4 refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and

3.1.5 assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with what is expected of a tenured faculty member.

3.2 Departments and/or colleges must have post-tenure review guidelines, which will be published and distributed to faculty members within the respective colleges and clearly state:

3.2.1 how the peer review committee will be formed to ensure it includes faculty at the rank or higher than the candidate reviewed, with appropriate credentials for assessing the faculty member's performance;

3.2.2 the role of the dean in coordinating the peer review process;

3.2.3 how input from the department chair is incorporated in the comprehensive peer review process;

3.2.4 criteria for categories of performance, which must be in agreement with those established for annual review;

3.2.5 review procedures and timelines;

3.2.6 materials to be reviewed.

- 3.3 A report of unsatisfactory performance in any area of the comprehensive peer review must state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the guidelines. Unsatisfactory performance in any area of the comprehensive peer review indicates an unsatisfactory review and will trigger the initiation of a professional growth plan.
- 3.4 A copy of the comprehensive peer review and the professional growth plan, as applicable, must be submitted by the dean to the Office of the Provost by May 31st.
- 3.5 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, a comprehensive evaluation will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointments unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department, the department chair will request that the peer review committee give appropriate consideration to shared activities in their review and will share the report with the department head of the secondary department.

4. PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

Tenured faculty may be recommended for a professional review whenever they receive two unsatisfactory annual reviews within a six-year period and/or when a faculty member fails to successfully complete a short-term development plan. The department chair will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review, and of the nature and procedures of the review.

- 4.1 The purposes of professional review are to identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance, develop a specific professional growth plan by which to remedy deficiencies that include performance benchmarks, and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional growth plan.
- 4.2 The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) comprised of three members. The review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member to be reviewed and must include tenured faculty at the rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed, with appropriate credentials for assessing the faculty member's performance. When appropriate, the review committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
- 4.3 Within one month of notification of professional review, 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. 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, and service.
- 4.4 The department chair 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.

4.5 The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The professional review will result in one of two possible outcomes:

4.5.1 The deficiencies identified are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean to better inform the creation of a short-term development plan (as referenced above),

4.5.2 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department chair, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department chair must then work together to draw up a professional growth plan acceptable to the dean.

5. THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN

5.1 The Professional Growth Plan must indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental and college criteria developed under the provision of this rule) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department chair, and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member and must take no longer than three years to complete. The plan should be constructed in a way to remedy a deficiency as quickly as possible.

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.

Although each professional growth plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

5.1.1 identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;

5.1.2 define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;

5.1.3 outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;

5.1.4 set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;

5.1.5 indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;

5.1.6 identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

5.2 Assessment.

The faculty member and department chair will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee, the dean, and the provost. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g., annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional growth plan.

5.3 Completion of the Plan.

5.3.1 When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the growth plan, the department chair must make a final report to the faculty member, dean, and provost. The successful completion of the growth plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire university community.

5.3.2 If, after consulting with the review committee, the department chair and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional growth plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

6. APPEAL

6.1 If at any point during the process prescribed by this rule, the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of SAP 32.01.01.D0.01, *Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members*.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

System Policy [*12.06 Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*](#)

[*University Procedure 32.01.01.D0.01, Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members*](#)

Contact Office

Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
254-519-5447