

THE TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER INTERNAL POLICIES

12.06.99.Z1.01 Post Tenure Review

Approved March 11, 2003
Revised August 15, 2007

Supplements System Policy 12.06 and HSC Rule 12.06.99.Z1

1. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 1.1 If the HSC Component Head determines upon the recommendation of the component Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Review Committee that a professional development plan is required for a faculty member, including a department chair¹, 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 acceptable in the faculty member's assigned academic areas, i.e., two of the three academic areas (see HSC Post-tenure Review Rule 12.06.99.Z1), and in institutional service/leadership" or the institution will initiate dismissal procedures for cause 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*.
- 1.2 Within one month of the HSC Component Head's written 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 will not participate in the development

¹ If a chair is undergoing a development program the chair will also be referred to as a faculty member.

of the plan, the department chair, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the component's 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 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. This letter will start a two-year faculty professional development program. Copies of this letter will be sent to the department chair and the chair of the component APT Review Committee and placed in the faculty member's personnel 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 acceptable to the Component Head, the plan will be determined by the HSC APT Review Committee.
- 1.3 After each year on the professional development plan, the faculty member is required to submit to the department chair² 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 on 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).

² If a chair is undergoing a development program the oversight individual will be the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

- 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:
- i. The faculty member will submit the required information and an updated curriculum vita to the department chair and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
 - ii. The department chair will then set up a departmental committee of tenured faculty members equal to or senior in rank to the faculty member in the professional development plan. This 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 are still present, they will be documented in writing. The letter will also address whether or not the faculty member is "at least acceptable" 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's 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.

2. POST TENURE RE-REVIEW

2.1 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's 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 now "at least acceptable" 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's letter that placed the faculty member on the development program.

- b. During this 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 being 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 curriculum vita.

- 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's 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 acceptable" 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's 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 required to 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's 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 confidential 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 acceptable in all of the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership. A simple majority is required to find the individual has removed all the noted deficiencies and is acceptable in all of the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership. The component APT Review Committee chair will convey in writing the committee's findings, recommendation, and vote to the component's Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (see Appendix D).

2.2 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's performance has removed all deficiencies specified two years earlier and the faculty member is now acceptable in all of the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership, 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 permanent 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 acceptable in all the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership, then the Component Head must make a recommendation to the HSC APT Review Committee that tenure be withdrawn.

2.3 HSC Action Following Recommendation that Tenure Be Withdrawn

a. HSC APT Review Committee

- i. The HSC APT Review Committee shall be supplied with 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 take a confidential vote to accept or reject the Component Head's recommendation that tenure be withdrawn. A simple majority is required to uphold the recommendation from the Component Head.
- iii. The HSC APT Review Committee, through the HSC APT Review Committee chair, will convey in writing their findings, recommendation, and vote 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 withdrawn, the President will inform the Component's Head and the faculty member in writing that the HSC will initiate dismissal procedures for cause as described in System Policy 12.01.

3. 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.

4. VOLUNTARY POST TENURE REVIEW

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

5. 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.

6. RECOMMENDED TIME FRAME FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

6.1 Positive Decisions

<u>Action Required</u>	<u>Recommended Due Date</u>
The component's 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 decision to the Component Head.	Set by component
The Component Head makes a positive decision and this is reported to Vice President for Academic Affairs who gives this information to the Executive Vice President who later reports the number of faculty members who underwent post-tenure review to the Board of Regents.	Second Friday in May

6.2a Negative Decision

<u>Action Required</u>	<u>Recommended Due Date</u>
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
--	------------------------

6.2b Negative Decision - End of First Year Development Program

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

6.2c Negative Decision - End of Second Year Development Program

<u>Action Required</u>	<u>Recommended Due Date</u>
The faculty member sends required documentation and any other pertinent information they have to the chair. A departmental committee reviews all documentation and makes a recommendation to the chair.	Set by component
The 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

APPENDIX A – EXAMPLE OF AN ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

This is an EXAMPLE of an Annual Evaluation Report, which contains common items to help in the evaluation of a faculty member. The faculty member would complete and give this Annual Evaluation Report to their department chair. This Annual Evaluation Report must be customized for each component and/or department, **however the areas in bold must be included on all Annual Evaluation Reports.** *Note: Each component must supply the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a blank copy of their evaluation form(s) and any updates.*

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF XXXXX

Note: The following statement must be included on all Annual Evaluation Reports. **“As a faculty member you should be advised, that various review groups consider the items listed below during their deliberations at the time of promotion and tenure and post-tenure review.”**

ACADEMIC YEAR 200X – 200X

NAME:

POSITION:

% TIME

1. TEACHING ACTIVITIES

A. Courses Taught (*Course Director)

Course Title & Number	Approximate Enrollment	Lectures Given	Laboratories Taught	Total Classes Attended	You

B. Student Research Advisement

Student	Program (Graduation)	Role on Committee

C. Student Evaluations (attach copies):

2. RESEARCH

A. Grant/Research Support (List extramural grants first)

Title of Research Grant	Sponsor Number /	Active Dates	Role / % Effort	Total Direct Costs

B. Submitted and Planned (*)

Title and Type of Grant (e.g., R01, R03, etc.)	Planned Sponsor	Proposed Dates	Role / % Effort	Co-Investigators

C. Summary of Research Area of Interest (Approximately one-half page)

3. PUBLICATIONS

A. Peer-Reviewed Scientific Journals

B. Manuscripts Submitted for Publication

C. Books

D. Chapters in Books

E. Abstracts

F. Other

4. SERVICE

A. Committees (*Chair)

1) Department/unit

2) Component

3) Local Institutional Other than Component

4) Health Science Center

5) TAMU System

6) State, National, and International

- B. Participation in Clinics and Service Units (*Director)
 - C. Continuing Education Courses Taught (*Director)
 - D. Invited Lectures and Research Presentations
 - E. Programs and Symposia Organized
 - F. Editorial Positions and Ad-Hoc Journal Reviews
 - G. Grant Review Boards
 - H. Other
5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- A. Scientific Meetings Attended
 - B. Postgraduate and C.E. Courses Attended
6. HONORS, AWARDS, & RECOGNITIONS
7. ***Note the following paragraph must be included on all Annual Evaluation Reports: OTHER: “The Texas A&M University System Health Science Center Post Tenure Review Document states: “Each faculty member must submit an Annual Evaluation Review Report to the department chair. Each Annual Evaluation Review Report 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 areas of research/scholarship, education, or professional service (where appropriate) and institutional service/leadership (limited to one page for each area). If the faculty member chooses to not write a statement this must be noted, in writing, on the Annual Evaluation Review Report. The candidate may also include additional documentation. (See Texas A&M University System Policy 12.06 Post-tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness).”***

Note the following must be included on all Annual Evaluation Reports:

“I choose to not send additional information. _____”
Signed **Date**

8. GOALS: Indicate your general and, to the extent possible, your specific professional goals for the next academic year. In what way can the department and college facilitate achievement of these goals?
9. CHANGE IN APPOINTMENT: Describe any anticipated request for consideration of a change in your rank and percent appointment in the next academic year?

APPENDIX B – A. Department chair's annual letter of evaluation, B. Department chair discussion of evaluation with faculty member and C. Opportunity for faculty member to send chair and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs a response to the chair's letter of evaluation

A. The chair's letter of evaluation must contain at least the following:

1. Expectations that the chair has for the faculty member in each of the faculty member's assigned academic areas (see HSC Post-tenure Review Rule 12.06.99.Z1) and institutional service/leadership.
2. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in research/scholarship.
3. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in education.
4. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in professional service (where appropriate).
5. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in institutional service/leadership.
6. Evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each of the above assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership using the rating criteria in Appendix A of the HSC APT document.
7. An assessment of the faculty member's overall contribution to the department's (and component's) mission.
8. A statement regarding whether last year's goals were met and a list of the goals for the coming year.
9. An overall evaluation and a description of future expectations.
10. A place that the faculty member signs that they have received the evaluation letter. Note: Above the signage line at the bottom of the letter it must state, "Signing this document merely means that you have receive the letter and in no way does it mean that you agree or disagree with the contents."

B. The chair must meet with the faculty member and discuss the evaluation. After the discussion the faculty member must sign that they have received the evaluation (see above - this does not mean that the faculty member agrees or disagrees with the evaluation it simply means they have receive an evaluation). Note: The chair keeps a signed copy and the faculty member keeps a copy.

C. After reading the evaluation and discussing the evaluation with the chair the faculty member has the right to send the chair and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs a response to the chair's letter of evaluation. The letter will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file.

APPENDIX C - Component's APT Review Committee's peer review letter to responsible component official

This letter must contain at least the following:

1. Faculty member's name, rank and department affiliation and the date review was conducted.
2. Description of chair's letter of recommendation.
3. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in research/scholarship.
4. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in education.
5. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in professional service (where appropriate).
6. Evaluation of the faculty member's duties and performance in institutional service/leadership.
7. A report stating the committee vote regarding whether the faculty member's performance was "at least acceptable" in each of the faculty member's assigned academic areas (see HSC Post-tenure Review Rule 12.06.99.Z1) and in institutional service/leadership.
8. Recommendation as to whether the faculty member needs to complete a faculty development program.

APPENDIX D - Component's APT Review Committee's letter to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

This letter must contain at least the following:

1. Give the date that the previous component's APT Review Committee voted to not recommend approval of post-tenure review and note area(s) of deficiencies.
2. Give date of and a brief description of the content of the Component Head's letter to the faculty member. Note the specific deficiencies that need to be corrected.
3. Give date of and a brief description of the faculty member's professional development plan.
4. Give date of the faculty member's letter to department chair at the end of the first year of the professional development plan and brief description of the letter's contents.
5. Give date of and a brief description of the content of the department chair's letter of evaluation at the end of the first year of the professional development plan and state how the chair rated the faculty member in the faculty member's assigned academic areas (see HSC Post-tenure Review Rule 12.06.99.Z1) and institutional service/leadership.
6. Give date of and a brief description of the content of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs' letter of evaluation at the end of the first year of the professional development plan and state how the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs rated the faculty member in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership.
7. Give date of the faculty member's letter to department chair at the end of the second year of the professional development plan and brief description of the letter's contents.
8. Give date of and a brief description of the content of the department chair's letter of evaluation at the end of the second year of the professional development plan and state how the chair rated the faculty member in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership.
9. Give date of and a brief description of the content of the department chair's over-all evaluation letter to the chair of the APT Review Committee. State how the chair rated the faculty member in the faculty member's assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership and give the department chair's recommendation on whether tenure should be continued or withdrawn.
10. Give date of and a brief description of the first meeting (Meeting 1) of the APT Review Committee that met with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to discuss the post-tenure review process.

11. Give date of second meeting (Meeting 2) of APT Review Committee and state that no vote was taken.
12. Give date of third meeting (Meeting 3) of APT Review Committee and state whether the faculty member met with the committee. Give the individual confidential ballot vote on whether the faculty member had removed all the specified deficiencies and whether the faculty member was “at least acceptable” in the faculty member’s assigned academic areas and institutional service/leadership. Give a brief explanation of the rationale behind the vote in each area.
13. If additional meetings were required, give dates and outcomes.