

UNIVERSITY RULE

12.06.99.M1 Post-Tenure Review

Approved November 13, 2006

Supplements [System Policy 12.06](#)

1. GENERAL

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University applies to tenured faculty members and is comprised of annual performance reviews benchmarked to faculty and administrator generated standards for satisfactory performance. 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 development plan and return to expected productivity.

2. POST-TENURE ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted for all faculty members and must result in a written document stating the department head's evaluations of performance in scholarship, teaching, service, and other assigned responsibilities. In addition, the expectations for the ensuing evaluation period for each faculty member, commensurate with his or her rank and seniority, must also be in the document. In order for the annual review to be an integral part of post-tenure review, it will have the additional characteristics:

- 2.1 In each department, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in annual review will be established by departmental faculty and approved by department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. The categories established will range from "most meritorious" to "unsatisfactory" by departmental standards. The department process or criteria will clearly state how peer evaluations of performance are incorporated in the annual review or in a review that occurs no less frequently than once every six years. (For example, departments may have peer committees to advise the department head for annual reviews, or departments may gather specific elements of external or internal evaluations by peers of the work of the faculty member.)
- 2.2 An annual review in which an unsatisfactory performance is determined shall state the basis for the ranking in accordance with the criteria.
- 2.3 A report to the dean of unsatisfactory performance as assessed by annual review will be accompanied by a written plan for near-term improvement.

3. PROFESSIONAL REVIEW PLAN

- 3.1 Professional Review. A professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the professional review process.
- 3.1.1 The purposes of professional review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
- 3.1.2 The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
- 3.1.3 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 within one month of notification of professional review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. 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.
- 3.1.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. 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. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 3.1.5 The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The professional review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

- 3.1.5.1 no deficiencies identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
- 3.1.5.2 some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean,
- 3.1.5.3 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 head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a professional development plan (see section 4) acceptable to the dean.

4. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 4.1 The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental 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 head 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. 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 development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- 4.1.1 identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- 4.1.2 define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- 4.1.3 outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;

- 4.1.4 set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
- 4.1.5 indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
- 4.1.6 identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

4.2 Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the dean. 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 development plan.

4.3 Completion of the Plan.

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 development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development 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. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development 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.

5. APPEAL

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4 "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."

If the faculty member wishes to contest the professional review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a professional

development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee.

6. VOLUNTARY POST-TENURE REVIEW

A tenured faculty member desirous of the counsel of a professional review committee in evaluating his or her career may request such counsel by making a request to the department head.

OFFICE OF RESPONSIBILITY: [Dean of Faculties](#)