



UNIVERSITY RULE

12.06.99.M1 **Post-Tenure Review**

Approved November 13, 2006

Revised July 14, 2014

Revised October 6, 2016

Reviewed July 22, 2021

Revised April 14, 2022

Revised October 9, 2024

Next scheduled review: October 9, 2029

Rule Statement

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty at Texas A&M University. It is intended to affirm 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 levels of productivity. The post-tenure review includes annual performance reviews by the department head (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation, such as program director, dean, section head, or designated supervisor; hereafter referred to as department head) and a review by a peer review committee, which occurs at least once every six years.

This rule does not supersede University Rule *12.01.99.M1, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*, which defines tenure policies and the process under which dismissal for cause proceedings may be initiated.

Expectations and Review Process

1. UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS

- 1.1. Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily in the categories of teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., patient care, extension, and administration).
- 1.2. Percentage effort of these categories may vary as careers change but should not go to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be balanced with a concomitant increase in another category. Except in the case of significant other responsibilities, tenured faculty should retain a minimum of 25% research, scholarship, or creative work. Quality performance is expected in all assigned areas.

- 1.3. Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of the department head and dean. Faculty are to be reviewed based on the assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.

2. ANNUAL REVIEW BY DEPARTMENT HEAD

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted per University Rule *12.01.99.M1, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*.

- 2.1. Criteria for rating faculty performance in an annual review will be established by departmental or college/school faculty and approved by the department head, dean, and Office of Faculty Affairs and will be published and disseminated in advance of the academic year in which they are to be used. At a minimum, rating categories for annual reviews must include “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, and “Satisfactory”, each defined according to departmental standards, and consistent with university policy. Additional meritorious categories (e.g., exceeds expectations, significantly exceeds expectations, and outstanding) may also be considered but should be limited to a small percentage of the faculty.
- 2.2. An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single category, or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories.
- 2.3. An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance must state the basis for the rating in accordance with the published department or college/school criteria. Each unsatisfactory review must be reported to the dean and to Faculty Affairs.
- 2.4. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan for short-term improvement, including performance benchmarks for returning to satisfactory performance. This plan should be developed in collaboration between the faculty member and department head, no later than forty-five (45) days after the evaluation is completed. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (Section 3) of the faculty member. Faculty members who receive a second unsatisfactory rating in the annual performance review in any category within six (6) years of the first will be subject to additional assessment and the department head may recommend an early periodic peer review, to be initiated no later than the next academic year.
- 2.5. If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single category, they must work with their department head immediately to develop an improvement plan, no later than forty-five (45) days after the evaluation is completed. For teaching or service, this plan should take one (1) year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may but is not required to take up to three (3) years to complete successfully with clearly identified milestones at least yearly. The rating of “Needs Improvement” will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”

if the predetermined milestones in the improvement plan have not been met; otherwise, the rating will be changed to “Satisfactory”.

- 2.6. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, department heads or program directors of the appropriate units will collaborate to develop accurate annual reviews (12.01.99.M1), if budgeted joint appointments are within the same college/school. If the budgeted joint appointments involve multiple colleges/schools then the colleges/schools will coordinate annual evaluations.

3. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW

Texas Education Code Section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at state of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six (6) years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution. The evaluation must be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research, scholarship, or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include a peer review of the faculty member.

- 3.1. The purpose of the Periodic Peer Review is to:
 - 3.1.1. Evaluate and affirm that the individual is making contributions consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member;
 - 3.1.2. Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, when needed;
 - 3.1.3. Recognize faculty members who continue to exceed expectations;
 - 3.1.4. Develop a plan for near-term improvement if the performance is “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” (see Sections 3.4-3.7).
- 3.2. Schools/colleges must have post-tenure review guidelines that clearly state the subparts below (3.2.1 to 3.2.4). Guidelines could also be warranted at the department level. If there is a contradiction between the school/college and department guidelines, the school/college guidelines will be followed.
 - 3.2.1. How peer evaluation of performance is incorporated in the Periodic Peer Review process, including the peer review committee use selection process.
 - 3.2.2. Criteria for rating of faculty performance, which must agree with those established for annual review and clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty;
 - 3.2.3. Review procedures and timelines;
 - 3.2.4. The materials to be reviewed in accordance with the faculty member’s assigned duties (research, teaching, service, other activities, and/or administration).

- 3.3. A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any category must state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the college/department guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (Section 4).
- 3.4. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories must state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the college/department guidelines. A needs improvement Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (Section 4).
- 3.5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies to better inform the immediate development of a near-term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.
- 3.6. A finding or rating above meets expectations will be recognized appropriately, as per college or department guidelines.
- 3.7. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the college/department where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (*ad loc*). If a faculty member holds tenured appointments in two departments, the review should be conducted by both units.
- 3.8. Each department, by May 31st, will provide to the dean of the college and the Office of Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the Periodic Peer Review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a peer review.
- 3.9. Consistent with The Texas A&M University System Policy 12.06, periodic peer review should include reviews by the peer committee composed of tenured faculty at the same rank or higher than the candidate with appropriate credentials for assessing the faculty member’s performance. The assessment is submitted through the department head and the dean for their review; and then submitted to the provost or provost’s designee. Cases of disagreements between the peer review committee’s recommendation, and that of the head and/or dean will trigger independent evaluations by the department head, dean, and provost or provost’s designee. The final decision rests with the provost.
- 3.10. For tenured faculty with administrative appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per university policies for department heads (*12.99.99.M0.03, Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Department Heads*), deans (*12.99.99.M0.02, Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Deans*) and provosts (*12.99.99.M0.05, Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation of Provost and Executive Vice President*). For other administrative positions (e.g., assistant and associate deans; assistant and associate provosts; assistant and associate vice presidents;) Periodic Peer Review will be conducted by a committee to include other university administrators and department faculty as appropriate for the position. Faculty administrators must be evaluated in scholarship, teaching, service,

and administrative effort, in alignment with their job expectations and assigned percentage of effort.

4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

- 4.1. A Professional Development Review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (Section 2) or one “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (Section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (Section 7). The department head will inform the faculty member that they are subject to a Professional Development Review and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, approval of the dean, and approval of Office of Faculty Affairs under extenuating circumstances (e.g., serious illness). The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.
- 4.2. The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an *ad hoc* faculty review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three (3) member *ad hoc* faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member undergoing review. When appropriate, the review committee membership may include faculty from other departments and colleges/schools.
 - 4.2.1. The faculty member undergoing review will prepare a dossier within one month of notification of the Professional Development Review. This dossier includes all documents, materials, and statements they deem relevant and necessary for the 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 a current curriculum vitae, and statements on current teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; and service/administration.
 - 4.2.2. The department head will add to the dossier any further materials they deem 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. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time prior to the date of the review committee meeting.
- 4.3. The purposes of the Professional Development Review are to: acknowledge if substantial or chronic deficits in performance exist; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan. The Professional Development Review by the review committee will be completed normally within three (3) months after submission of the dossier. The department should provide copies of the prior six (6) years of annual reviews to the review committee. The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

- 4.3.1. No deficiencies are identified. The ad hoc review committee informs the faculty member, department head, and dean in writing, and this report supersedes the outcome of the prior annual review;
- 4.3.2. Some deficiencies are identified but 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 head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4, which must be put in place no later than forty-five (45) days after the committee's final report; or
- 4.3.3. 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 should then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 5) acceptable to the dean. A copy of the plan should be sent to Faculty Affairs.

5. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 5.1. The Professional Development Plan must indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated college/department criteria developed under the provision of this rule will be remedied. The plan will be developed and agreed upon by the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, and the dean. 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. 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 directed by Faculty Affairs. Should mediation fail, the plan will be determined by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Although each Professional Development Plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan must:
 - 5.1.1. List 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. Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan;
 - 5.1.5. Set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and
 - 5.1.6. Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan.
- 5.2. The faculty member and department head will meet regularly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. The faculty member provides an annual progress report to the review committee and to the department head. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance

evaluation process (e.g., annual review) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set forth in the Professional Development Plan. If a faculty member does not make sufficient progress on the Professional Development Plan yearly, this may constitute good cause for dismissal.

- 5.3. 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 Professional Development Plan, the department head must a final report to the faculty member and dean, with a copy to Faculty Affairs. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflect a success for the entire university community.
- 5.4. If, after consulting with the review committee, both 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.

6. APPEALS

If at any point during the post-tenure review procedure, the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 *Procedure for Appeal of Faculty Complaints and Appeal of Dismissals and Sanctions for Misconduct or Serious Misconduct*.

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to a specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (Note: Such challenges relate to the ability of a member to render an unbiased decision. The mere existence of friendships or other contacts between committee members and other individuals does not necessarily constitute bias.) After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the dean, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will make the final determination on the committee composition.

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development 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 directed by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Should mediation fail, the plan will be determined by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

7. VOLUNTARY POST-TENURE REVIEW

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review (Section 3) or a Professional Development Review (Section 4), by making a request to the department head.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

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

Contact Office

[Faculty Affairs](#)

Texas A&M University

(979) 845-4274