

Recommendations of the Provost's Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is intended to promote academic career development necessary for faculty success, sustain the degree of excellence expected by our students and our stakeholders, and maintain fairness and equity for the faculty. This necessitates a uniform and thorough process of review across the various departments of Texas A&M University and clear expectations for faculty performance. Therefore this Task Force recommends the following modifications to the existing post-tenure review policy.

- 1) Tenured faculty are expected to perform adequately at teaching, research and service (or clinical duties if relevant) throughout their career.
- 2) Modifications to these assignments may be expected as a career changes, but normally would not be reduced to less than 20% effort in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category may be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.
- 3) Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories, but only with the written approval of Department Head and Dean. All tenured faculty are to be reviewed based upon the assigned duties (this would include administration assignments) of their position.
- 4) Every tenured faculty member will be evaluated annually by their Department Head and/ or immediate supervisor, who may take advice from a faculty committee on the evaluation.
- 5) Faculty performance will be evaluated by a periodic peer review which occurs ideally every third year but no less than every fifth year, as agreed by the Department. This peer review may be incorporated into the annual review process and/or may be performed by the departmental Tenure and Promotion committee. If done annually, the departmental or college guidelines should address how it will be used to replace the periodic peer review (i.e. every third year, or the average of 3 years retrospectively).
- 6) Both the annual review and the periodic peer review should evaluate faculty performance in each area: teaching, research, and service. For the purpose of post-tenure review, performance in each category will be rated as Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. The results of both the peer and annual reviews should be provided in writing as formative feedback for the faculty member.
- 7) Unsatisfactory in any single category or Needs Improvement in two categories will result in an overall unsatisfactory evaluation and will be reported to the Dean along with plans and expectations for improvement and a timeline.
- 8) Three consecutive overall unsatisfactory annual evaluations or a single negative peer evaluation will automatically trigger a Professional Review in accordance with SAP 12.06.99.M0.01.