

THE TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER INTERNAL POLICIES

12.06.99.Z0.01 Post Tenure Review

Approved October 24, 2001

Approved August 15, 2007

Revised March 2, 2011

Supplements System Policy 12.06

1. OVERVIEW

All tenured faculty members are subject, by State of Texas law (Texas Educational Code Section 51.942), to a comprehensive performance evaluation process that is to be conducted not more than once every year, but not less than once every six years after tenure was granted. The evaluation is to be based on the professional responsibility of the faculty member in teaching, research, service, patient care and administration. The comprehensive evaluation should be directed toward the professional development of the faculty member. The evaluation must include peer review and thus is separate from yearly departmental¹ chair² evaluations. No faculty member may have this evaluation process waived³. The faculty member's rights are protected by The Texas A&M University System (TAMUS) Policy 12.01, *Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure*; TAMUS Policy 12.06, *Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*; and TAMUS Health Science Center (HSC) Internal Policy 12.01.99.Z1.03, *Academic Freedom, Ethics, Responsibility, Rights and Tenure*.

2. CRITERIA FOR POST TENURE EVALUATIONS

Post-tenure review evaluations are made on the basis of the criteria and factors found in TAMUS Policy 12.06 and HSC Internal Policy 12.01.99.Z1.01, *Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*. Since the missions, goals and duties of each component of the HSC are somewhat different, there is not one set of criteria that can be applied to all components as to what is a good performance in the three academic areas, i.e., education, research/scholarship, or professional service. According to TAMUS Policy 12.06, the performance review of a faculty member provides a mechanism to gauge the productivity of the individual and to encourage a high level of sustained performance. It must also be noted that TAMUS Policy 12.06 allows that not all departments will use the same weighting of each review factor and these may be different depending on the faculty member's specific role and responsibilities. In exceptional cases, the Department Chair may decide that the faculty member's duties include only one of the three academic areas, i.e., education,

¹ Department=department or unit

² Chair=department chair

³ When tenured faculty members assume full-time (80% or more) administrative roles the post-tenure clock shall be stopped on the date the individual assumes the full-time administrative position. See Section 9

research/scholarship, or professional service. If this is the case, it must be in writing to the faculty member after being approved in writing by the Component Head⁴.

3. PEER REVIEW

- 3.1 At 5-year intervals the component Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Review Committee will assess the tenured faculty member's performance in two of the three academic performance areas that the faculty member has been assigned, i.e., education research/scholarship, or professional service. If a faculty member has been promoted to Professor during the 5-year period then that review is counted as a post-tenure review and the 5-year review interval will start from the date of the promotion. After reviewing the required documents (see Section 4), the component APT Review Committee will convene, deliberate, and vote. The vote will be based on the faculty member's performance, using the rating system in the HSC Policy 12.01.99.Z1. The vote will determine whether the faculty member warrants a rating of at least good in each of the pertinent academic areas and in institutional service. The voting must be by ballot and it takes a simple majority vote to find the faculty member at least good. The component APT Review Committee will send its recommendation to the Component Head (see Appendix C). The Component Head will make a decision as to whether to accept or overturn the recommendation of the component APT Review Committee. The Component Head must send a letter, by the second Friday in May, to the HSC Vice President for Academic Affairs notifying him of positive post-tenure review decisions (see HSC Internal Policy 12.01.99.Z1.01).
- 3.2 If the faculty member is not found to be at least good in the primary and secondary academic areas and institutional service by the Component Head then the faculty member will be required to undertake a two-year professional development plan (see Section 6). This written decision by the Component Head will be sent to the faculty member, Department Chair, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the chair of the component APT Review Committee.
- 3.3 At the end of the development plan the component APT Review Committee will make a recommendation to the Component Head as to whether the faculty member has successfully completed the development plan. If the faculty member successfully completed the development program the faculty member will be subject to post-tenure review at the regular scheduled time, i.e., 5-years from the date of the post-tenure review that lead to the professional development plan. If the component APT Review Committee recommends (see Appendix D) that faculty member did not successfully complete the development plan and the Component Head concurs, then the Component Head must send a recommendation to the HSC APT Review Committee that the faculty member's tenure be revoked (see Section 11).

Rating System:

⁴ Component Head=Dean or Director

Exceptional: Performance in the academic area is of the highest quality.
Excellent: Productivity and quality significantly exceed performance standards and expectations.
Good: Productivity and quality exceed routine performance standards and expectations.
Acceptable: Performance meets routine standards and expectations.
Unacceptable: Performance is not acceptable. Productivity and quality do not meet routine performance standards and expectations.

(These are the rating criteria noted in Appendix A of TAMUS HSC Internal Policy 12.01.99.Z1.01 *Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* document).

4. DOCUMENTATION

Documentation for post tenure review must include:

- 4.1 Faculty member's current Faculty Record
- 4.2 The Department Chair written annual evaluation of the faculty member's performance since the last time the faculty member underwent post-tenure review or was tenured. The Department Chair must conduct comprehensive annual evaluations of performance for all tenured faculty members. The faculty member must be made aware that the Annual Evaluation Review Report (see Appendix A) is also used in making post-tenure review decisions. Each Annual Evaluation Review Report (see Appendix A) must provide the faculty member with the opportunity to write a statement expanding on their accomplishments listed in the Annual Evaluation Review Report in the assigned areas of education, research/scholarship, or professional service, and institutional service/leadership (limited to one page for each pertinent area). If the faculty member chooses not to write a statement this must be noted, in writing, on the Annual Evaluation Review Report. The annual review by the chair must result in a written evaluation of performance and documentation of future expectations, commensurate with the faculty member's rank and seniority (see Appendix B). The Department Chair review must state whether the individual's performance is at least good, acceptable or unacceptable in each of the pertinent academic areas: education, research/scholarship, or professional service, and institutional service/leadership. It must also contain an overall evaluation.
- 4.3 Annual student course/instructor evaluations.
- 4.4 Statement by faculty member and any other pertinent materials that the faculty member may want to submit to the component APT Review Committee.
- 4.5 Overall letter of evaluation by the Department Chair.

5. NEGATIVE DECISIONS

After the faculty member has completed his or her professional development plan and he or she has been reviewed at the component level, only negative decisions by the component

APT Review Committee or Component Head will be forwarded to the HSC APT Review Committee for review. The HSC APT Review Committee, after reviewing all required documentation (see Section 7.3), will vote and make a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will then make a recommendation to the President. The President will decide whether or not tenure is to be revoked and will notify the faculty member, Department Chair, Vice President for Academic Affairs and the chair of the component APT Review Committee of the decision in writing.

6. PROCESS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 6.1 If the HSC Component Head determines upon the recommendation of the component APT Review Committee that a professional development plan is required for a faculty member, including a department chair⁵, a letter will be sent to the faculty member, the department chair, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the component APT Review Committee; and will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file. The letter will delineate specific deficiencies in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership, as identified by the component APT Review Committee (see Appendices A, B and C), and will state that the faculty member must participate in a faculty development program. The letter will state that by the end of the two-year development period, the faculty member "must correct the specified deficiencies and be at least good in the faculty member's assigned academic areas, i.e., two of the three academic areas, and in institutional service" or the institution will initiate revocation of tenure as described in TAMU System Policy 12.01, *Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure* and HSC Internal Policy 12.01.99.Z1.03, *Academic Freedom, Ethics, Responsibilities, Rights and Tenure*.
- 6.2 Within one month of the HSC Component Head determination that the faculty member needs a professional development plan, the department chair, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the component APT Review Committee will meet jointly with the faculty member to discuss specific performance deficiencies and proposed remedies.
 - a. The plan should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the HSC component. The plan should 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. The HSC Component Head has final authority for approval of the professional development plan. If the faculty member chooses not to participate in the development of the plan, the department chair, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the component APT Review Committee will formulate the plan.
 - b. Each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances. The written plan will: (1) identify specific deficiencies to be addressed; (2) define

⁵ If a chair is undergoing a development program the chair will also be referred to as a faculty member.

specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; (3) outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes; (4) set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes; (5) indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan; and (6) identify institutional resources, if necessary, to be committed in support of the plan.

- c. It should be noted that System Policy 12.06 Post-tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness allows that not all departments will use the same weighting for each academic area and the weighting may be different depending on the faculty member's specific role and responsibilities within the component.
 - d. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the Component Head, will send a letter that includes the written professional development plan to the faculty by certified mail thus, starting a two-year faculty professional development program. Copies of the letter will be sent to the department chair and the chair of the component APT Review Committee and placed in the faculty member's file.
 - e. If the faculty member, department chair, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and component APT Review Committee fail to agree on a professional development plan, the plan will be developed by the HSC APT Review Committee.
- 6.3 After each year of the professional development plan, the faculty member is required to submit to the department chair⁶ written documentation of progress made to successfully remove any deficiencies. The faculty member is required to meet with the department chair to discuss progress made towards achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.
- a. At the end of first year of the development plan:
 - i. Utilizing the above information and any other pertinent documentation the faculty member wants to supply, the department chair will write an evaluation of the faculty member's progress. This letter will specifically note any continued deficiencies. This letter will be sent to the faculty member and to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (or for a chair to the Component Head).
 - ii. Utilizing the above information and any other pertinent documentation the faculty member wants to supply, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (or for a chair, the Component Head) will make a written evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward removing all deficiencies. This letter will be sent to the faculty member, the department chair and the chair of the component APT Review Committee.
 - b. At the end of the two-year professional development plan:

⁶ If a chair is undergoing a development program the oversight individual will be the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

- i. The faculty member will submit the required information and an updated Faculty Record to the department chair and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
- ii. The department chair will appoint a departmental committee of tenured faculty members equal to or senior in rank to the faculty member. The departmental committee will review the above documentation and will make a recommendation to the chair.
- iii. Utilizing the above information and other pertinent documentation the faculty member wants to supply, the department chair will write a letter evaluating the faculty member's progress toward removing all deficiencies. If deficiencies still exist, they will be documented in writing. The letter will also address whether or not the faculty member is "at least good" in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and in institutional service/leadership. The letter will discuss in detail the deficiencies specified in the HSC Component Head letter that placed the faculty member on the development program. The department chair will make a recommendation to either continue or withdraw tenure. This letter will be sent to the faculty member, the component APT Review Committee and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

7. POST TENURE RE-REVIEW

7.1 Component APT Review Committee

- a. At the end of the two-year professional development plan, the faculty member's performance will be reviewed by the component APT Review Committee. The component APT Review Committee will make a decision based on:
 - i. Whether the faculty member achieved the written objectives of the professional development plan.
 - ii. Whether or not the faculty member met the written expectations and is "at least good" in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership. The committee should pay particular attention to the area(s) specified in the Component Head letter that placed the faculty member on the development program.
- b. During the evaluation the component APT Review Committee will consider:
 - i. The written recommendation that the component APT Review Committee made two years earlier and written outcomes of any appeals that were made to their decision.
 - ii. The Component Head letter of notification that the faculty member was placed on a development program.
 - iii. The faculty member's written professional development plan.
 - iv. The faculty member's letter at the end of each year of the professional development plan.

- v. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (or for a chair the Component Head) letter of evaluation at the end of the first year of the professional development plan.
 - vi. The department committee review and recommendation to the department chair at the end of the two-year development program.
 - vii. The department chair letter of the faculty member's evaluation and recommendations after each year of the development program and the chair's letter of overall evaluation to the chair of the component's APT Review Committee.
 - viii. The faculty member's complete Faculty Record.
- c. The following procedure is to be followed by the component APT Review Committee during post-tenure re-review at the end of the two-year development period:
- i. The component APT Review Committee will meet at least three times to complete the post-tenure re-review process.
 - ii. During the first meeting (Meeting 1), the component APT Review Committee will meet with the component Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to discuss the upcoming process. The component APT Review Committee then will have at least five business days to review the above noted documentation.
 - iii. At the next meeting (Meeting 2), the component APT Review Committee will discuss whether or not the faculty member has successfully removed all deficiencies and whether or not the faculty member is "at least good" in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership. The committee should pay particular attention to the deficiencies specified in the Component Head letter that placed the faculty member on the development program. The component APT Review Committee will also decide whether it needs additional documentation. No vote will be taken at this meeting.
 - iv. At the third meeting (Meeting 3), the component APT Review Committee is will allow the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to meet with the committee to review and make comments on the documentation. The component Associate Dean for Academic Affairs must give the faculty member advance written notice of the time, date, and location of the meeting by certified mail. The faculty member is not required to meet with the component APT Review Committee. If the faculty member chooses to not meet with the component APT Review Committee, the faculty member should notify the committee in writing. If the faculty member meets with the component APT Review Committee the faculty member may make a presentation and may be asked questions by the Committee. The component APT Review Committee may meet with the department chair, but is not required to do so. If the component APT Review Committee meets with the department chair to ask questions, then the committee must have the faculty member present so the faculty member can comment on any statements made by the chair.

After the faculty member leaves the meeting, the component APT Review Committee will again discuss whether or not the faculty member has successfully completed the development program. Unless another meeting is necessary, a vote will be taken as to whether or not the faculty member has corrected the deficiencies specified in the Component Head letter that placed the faculty member on the development program and is now “at least good” in all of the assigned academic areas and institutional service. A simple majority is required to find the individual has removed all the noted deficiencies and is “at least good” in all of the assigned academic areas and institutional service. The component APT Review Committee chair will convey in writing their vote and recommendation to the component Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (see Appendix D).

7.2 Component Administrative Action

- a. After receiving the letter from the APT Review Committee, the component Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will make a recommendation to the HSC Component Head.
- b. If the Component Head finds the faculty member has removed all deficiencies specified two years earlier and the faculty member is “at least good” in all of the assigned academic areas and institutional service, then the faculty member has fulfilled the requirement of the development plan. A letter from the Component Head that specifies this action will be sent to the faculty member and a copy will be placed in the faculty member’s file. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President will also be notified that the faculty member has successfully completed post-tenure review.
- c. If the HSC Component Head finds the faculty member has not removed all deficiencies specified two years earlier and the faculty member is not “at least good” in all the assigned academic areas and institutional service, then the Component Head must make a recommendation to the HSC APT Review Committee that tenure be revoked.

7.3 HSC Action Following Recommendation that Tenure Be Revoked

- a. HSC APT Review Committee
 - i. The HSC APT Review Committee shall be provided all the documentation that was provided to the component APT Review Committee, including the letter of recommendation from the component APT Review Committee to the component Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the letter of recommendation from the component Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to the Component Head, and a letter of recommendation from the Component Head to the HSC APT Review Committee.
 - ii. After deliberation, the HSC APT Review Committee will vote to accept or reject the Component Head recommendation that tenure be revoked. A

simple majority is required to uphold the recommendation of the Component Head.

iii. The HSC APT Review Committee, through the HSC APT Review Committee chair, will convey in writing their vote and recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

b. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will make a recommendation to the President.

c. If the President rules that tenure should be revoked, the President will inform the Component Head and the faculty member in writing that the HSC will initiate revocation of tenure as described in System Policy 12.01.

8. VOLUNTARY POST TENURE REVIEW

A tenured faculty member seeking the counsel of a peer review in evaluating his or her performance may request, at any time, such counsel by making a request to the department chair.

9. TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS WHO ASSUME FULL-TIME ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

When tenured faculty members assume full-time (80% or more) administrative roles the post-tenure clock shall be stopped on the date the individual assumes the full-time administrative position. The HSC Component Head must approve this action in writing. If the individual resumes the position of a full-time faculty member, then the post-tenure clock will be restarted and a new letter of appointment will be provided to define the individual's academic responsibilities and to notify the individual in writing when the next post-tenure review will occur. The HSC Component Head must also notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs, in writing, of the decision to stop or restart post-tenure review on the tenured faculty member. In the latter case, the HSC Component Head will also state the date when the faculty member will again be subject to post-tenure review.

10. RECOMMENDED TIME FRAME FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

10.1 Positive Decisions

Action Required	<i>Recommended Due Date</i>
The component APT Review Committee makes a positive decision.	Set by component
Documentation is sent to Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.	Set by component
The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs makes positive decision and sends positive recommendation to the Component Head.	Set by component

The Component Head makes a recommendation to Vice President for Academic Affairs who reports the number of faculty members who underwent post-tenure review to the Board of Regents.	Second Friday in May
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

10.2a Negative Decision

Action Required	<i>Recommended Due Date</i>
The component APT Review Committee recommends to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs that the faculty member should participate in a 2-year professional development plan.	Set by component
The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs makes a recommendation to the Component Head that the faculty member should participate in a 2-year professional development plan.	Set by component
The Component Head determines the faculty member should participate in a 2-year faculty development program, and then the faculty member's professional development plan is formulated and presented officially to the faculty member.	Second Friday in April

10.2b Negative Decision - End of First Year Development Program

Action Required	<i>Recommended Due Date</i>
The faculty member sends required documentation and any other pertinent information to the chair.	Set by component
The department chair sends the faculty member a written evaluation of their progress toward completing the development program.	Second Friday in May

10.2c Negative Decision - End of Second Year Development Program

Action Required	<i>Recommended Due Date</i>
The faculty member sends required documentation and any other pertinent information to the department chair. A departmental committee reviews all documentation and makes a recommendation to the chair.	Set by component
The department chair sends the faculty member a written evaluation of their progress toward completing the development program.	Set by component
The APT Review Committee reviews all documentation and makes a recommendation to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.	Set by component
The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs makes a recommendation to the Component Head.	Set by component
The Component Head sends a negative recommendation to the HSC APT Review Committee.	Second Friday in June

The HSC APT Review Committee sends a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.	First Friday in July
The Vice President for Academic Affairs sends a recommendation to President.	Second Friday in July
The President makes a decision and informs the faculty member, Component Head, and the Executive Vice President who reports the number of faculty members who have undergone post-tenure review to the Board of Regents.	End of July

11. REVOCATION OF TENURE

State of Texas law (Texas Education Code Section 51.942) states that a faculty member is subject to revocation of tenure or other appropriate disciplinary actions if incompetency, neglect of duty (meaning continued or repeated substantial neglect of professional responsibilities), or other good cause is determined to be present (System Policy 12.01).

12. APPEAL

After the President has made a decision, if the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied the faculty member may have the concern addressed as outlined in HSC Internal Policy 12.01.99.Z1.03.

OFFICE OF RESPONSIBILITY

Vice President for Academic Affairs