

**STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE**

**12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review**

*Approved November 13, 2006*

*Revised July 14, 2014*

*Next scheduled review: July 14, 2019*

---

**Procedure Statement**

---

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University applies to tenured faculty members and is comprised of annual performance reviews by the department head (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation) as well as a review by a committee of peers that occurs not less frequently than once every six years. 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 levels of productivity.

This procedure does not supersede the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (12.01.99.M2) that defines tenure policies and the process under which dismissal for cause proceedings may be initiated.

---

**Official Procedure/ Responsibilities/ Process**

---

1. UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS

- 1.1 Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily at teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e. g. patient care, extension, administration...) throughout their career.
- 1.2 Modifications to these assignments may be expected as a career changes but should not go to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.
- 1.3 Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories in limited situations but only with the written approval of Department Head and Dean. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon 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 by Department Heads for all faculty members and must result in a written document stating the Department Head's evaluations of performance in teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e. g. patient care, extension, administration...) (12.01.99.M2). 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.

- 2.1 In each department or college, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in the annual review will be established by departmental or college faculty and approved by department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties. The categories established should at a minimum include categories of Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Satisfactory, each defined according to departmental standards.
- 2.2 An overall unsatisfactory ranking is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single category: teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e. g. patient care, extension, administration...), or a ranking of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories.
- 2.3 An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the ranking in accordance with the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review should be reported to the dean.
- 2.4 The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a "Peer Review" (section 3) of the faculty member.
- 2.5 A ranking of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies in writing and should include a plan for near term improvement developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.
- 2.6 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, department heads or program directors of the appropriate units will collaborate to develop accurate annual reports (12.01.99.M2).

### 3. PEER REVIEW

As part of the post-tenure review process, a review, by a committee of peers must occur not less frequently than once every six years.

- 3.1 The purpose of the peer review is to:

- 3.1.1 assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;
  - 3.1.2 provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;
  - 3.1.3 assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and
  - 3.1.4 refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.
- 3.2 Departments and/or colleges must have post-tenure review guidelines which will clearly state:
- 3.2.1 how peer evaluation of performance is incorporated in the Peer Review process. For example, departments may use peer committees that advise the department head for annual reviews, post-tenure review committees, or promotion and tenure committees;
  - 3.2.2 criteria for categories of performance, which must be in agreement with those established for annual review and clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty;
  - 3.2.3 review procedures and timelines;
  - 3.2.4 materials to be reviewed. This may, but need not, include materials beyond those submitted for the annual reviews. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon their assigned duties.
  - 3.2.5 how a peer review that is incorporated into the annual review process will fulfill the requirements of a Peer Review for post-tenure review purposes (e.g. once every six years the committee will assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member; use the average of 3 consecutive annual peer reviews; 3 consecutive unsatisfactory annual peer reviews...).
- 3.3 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department/college guidelines. An unsatisfactory review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (section 4).
- 3.4 A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department/college guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (section 4).

- 3.5 A ranking of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.
- 3.6 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department the department head will share the report with the department head of the secondary department.
- 3.7 By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>, each department will provide to the Dean of the college and the Dean of Faculties the list of those faculty who underwent Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review.

#### 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 an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is 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 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 Development Review process.
  - 4.1.1 The purposes of Professional Development 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.
  - 4.1.2 The Professional Development 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.

- 4.1.3 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.
- 4.1.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems 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 during the review process.
- 4.1.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:
  - 4.1.5.1 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,
  - 4.1.5.2 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 to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4,
  - 4.1.5.3 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 5) acceptable to the dean.

## 5. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 5.1 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 procedure) 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:

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

## 5.2 Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet regularly 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.

## 5.3 Completion of the Plan.

5.3.1 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 shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the Professional 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.

5.3.2 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.

6. APPEAL

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this procedure 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 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 Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

7. VOLUNTARY POST-TENURE REVIEW

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

---

**Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements**

---

*Supplements* [System Policy 12.06](#)

---

**Contact Office**

---

[Office of the Dean of Faculties](#)