

POST-TENURE REVIEW

University Rule 12.06.99.C1 - Approved July 31, 2000

**Note: The rules marked with an asterisk will be renumbered. See list at end of document.*

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

- 1.1 Post-tenure review is designed to provide a periodic comprehensive evaluation of tenured faculty members. It is a supplement to the usual annual evaluation of faculty performance for merit evaluation. The underlying philosophy is to help tenured faculty members to continue to be productive members of the University community. Post-tenure review is not designed to pre-empt Rule #2.5.1.5,* “Faculty Dismissals, Non-Reappointments, and Terminal Appointments”
- 1.2 Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi is committed to academic freedom and tenure as stated in University Statement #12.01.99.C1.02, “Academic Freedom” and Rule #2.5.1.4,* “Tenure.” Simultaneously, all faculty members have an obligation to fulfill their responsibilities as stated in “Responsibilities of Full-time Faculty Members” (#12.01.99.C1.03). Faculty members are also expected to support the University’s commitment to “the pursuit of excellence in instruction, research, and other forms of scholarly activity and public service,” as expressed in the University mission statement.

2. RELATIONSHIP TO ANNUAL REVIEW

Post-tenure review is designed to supplement annual evaluations which should provide regular feedback for the faculty member’s continuous development. However, post-tenure review is more comprehensive. In fact, the two processes reinforce each other. The annual evaluation provides the continuity, follow-up, and motivation needed to carry out the long-range continuous improvement and development goals of this rule.

3. WHO WILL BE REVIEWED

- 3.1 All tenured, full-time faculty members with teaching responsibilities specified in their contracts who do not hold administrative positions of Dean or above are subject to post-tenure review. Post-tenure review shall be required of all tenured faculty who receive two consecutive annual reviews with ratings of “unsatisfactory.” After the first “unsatisfactory” review, it is expected that a developmental meeting will occur between the faculty member, the department chair, and the Dean. It is incumbent on the faculty member to immediately begin addressing the issues involved.
- 3.2 Administrators who return to full-time teaching will be subject to performance evaluations after two years.

3.3 Under unusual circumstances, the Provost may grant a postponement of post-tenure review.

4. PROCEDURE FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

4.1 The post-tenure review process shall be conducted at the college level. The Dean of each college shall advise the individual, in writing, of his or her selection for post-tenure review no later than September 1 following the second unsatisfactory annual review. The notification will identify the reason(s) for the individual's selection. The faculty member must provide, by October 1, the documents needed to allow the post-tenure review to be conducted. The documents provided by the faculty member must include the following items as a minimum:

- (1) A current resume.
- (2) A summary statement on teaching effectiveness, philosophy, and how the candidate is contributing to the learning achievements of the students.
- (3) A summary statement on scholarship and how the candidate is considered current in his/her field and any supporting documents to that effect.
- (4) A description of how the candidate is contributing to the current mission and objectives of the college and University.
- (5) A summary statement of the service component and other contributions the candidate is making.

The department chair must provide a description of the faculty member's performance from the department chair's perspective.

4.2 A standing post-tenure review committee established by each college shall review the specified faculty members. The committee shall consist of five individuals; the faculty elects three members and the Dean appoints two other individuals. The respective department chair is not eligible, and all members of the committee must be tenured. Committee members will serve three-year terms.

4.3 The review committee shall convene by October 15. The review committee shall determine if the faculty member's performance warrants a rating of "acceptable" (or better) or "needs improvement." By November 15, the committee shall submit its recommendation to the Dean. By December 1, the Dean shall submit the committee's recommendation and the Dean's recommendation to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, who makes the final decision. The Provost shall issue a decision within ten working days after receiving the committee's recommendation.

- 4.4 If the performance is rated at least “acceptable,” a letter noting the review shall be sent to the faculty member and included in his/her permanent file. If the individual’s performance is rated as “needs improvement,” the specific deficiencies shall be noted in a letter placed in the faculty member’s permanent file. Within ten working days after the Provost’s action, the department chair and college Dean shall meet jointly with the faculty member and discuss the deficiencies and develop a plan for improving performance to include specific goals and time deadlines.
- 4.5 Normally, the developmental plan period will be for one year. At the completion of the developmental plan period, the faculty member’s performance shall be reviewed according to the regular post-tenure review procedures. The Dean will notify the faculty member and the review committee that the review will take place and will set a date for the faculty member to provide the required documents (see 4.1) for the review. The committee will convene within 10 working days after that date. Within 21 days after convening, the committee will make its recommendation to the Dean. Within 7 working days, the Dean will submit the review committee’s recommendation and the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost. If the review committee judges the individual’s performance to be “unsatisfactory,” it may recommend either an additional developmental period or initiation of the dismissal procedures of Rule #2.5.1.5,* “Faculty Dismissals, Non-Reappointments, and Terminal appointments.” The Provost will issue a decision within ten working days after receiving the recommendations of the committee and the Dean.
- 4.6 There will be a limit of two developmental periods amounting cumulatively to no longer than eighteen months. The second development period will follow the same process described in 4.5. If, at the end of the second developmental period, the performance is still rated “unsatisfactory,” the dismissal procedures will be initiated.
- 4.7 A faculty member whose tenure is revoked under the provisions of this post-tenure rule shall be given a one-year terminal contract. Those who are asked to improve are required to submit an annual report to show continuous improvement.

5. BASIS FOR JUDGMENT

The committee shall base its recommendation on a combined in-depth evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service. (Refer to ADescriptions of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service [#2.5.1.5* or #12.01.99.C1.04], AEvaluation and Promotion of Full-time Faculty Members [#12.01.99.C1], and “Academic Rank Descriptors” [#12.01.99.C1.01] for details regarding demonstration of achievement in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.) Evaluation may include but is not limited to evidence provided by the faculty member, student evaluation, and peer review. The committee should be guided in its deliberations by the faculty member’s effectiveness and total contribution to the department, college, and University.

6. APPEALS

Existing university appeal and grievance procedures specified in Rule #2.5.1.5,* “Faculty Dismissals, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments,” are available to any faculty member who feels aggrieved by the outcome of the review process. Also, as stated in Section 51.942 of the Texas Education Code, a faculty member subject to termination on the basis of a post-tenure review “must be given the opportunity for referral of the matter to a nonbinding alternative dispute resolution process as described in Chapter 154, Civil Practice and Remedies Code.” The Civil Practice and Remedies Code describes various processes, including mediation facilitated by an impartial third party.

7. DOCUMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS

7.1 Expectations and documentation for teaching, scholarship, and service used for the post-tenure review of faculty are contained in Rule #2.5.1.1,* “Descriptions of Teaching, Service, and Scholarship.”

7.2 Originals of all documentation submitted by the faculty member and recommendations shall be included in the faculty member’s official permanent file which is held in the Provost’s office.

8. REVISIONS

This document will be reviewed periodically by the Faculty Senate and College Deans’ Council to address issues that may arise during its early implementation. The guidelines and procedures may be amended as needed to ensure that the goals of continuous productivity and development are supported by the post-tenure review process.

Note: Rule or document numbers will change as follows:

2.5.1.1, Descriptions of Teaching, Service, and Scholarship, to 12.01.99.C1.04, Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

2.5.1.5, Faculty Dismissals, Non-Reappointments, and Terminal Appointments, to 12.01.99.C3

2.5.1.4, Tenure, to 12.01.99.C2