12.06.99.C1 Post-Tenure Review

Revised: December 4, 2025
Next Scheduled Review: December 4, 2030
Revision History

Rule Summary

Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty is required by *Texas Education Code* Section 51.942 and system policy *12.06, Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*, both of which establish that the overriding purpose for faculty evaluation is to support tenure and promote faculty development. Comprehensive periodic review of tenured faculty is intended to enhance and protect, not diminish, the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom through a positive, thorough, fair, and transparent process. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC) is recognized for the outstanding quality of its faculty; therefore, it is expected that the vast majority of faculty will be found to meet or exceed expectations during a comprehensive review.

Rule

1. GENERAL

    1.1. The following guidelines are to be used for post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty at TAMU-CC. Faculty members with administrative assignments, such as department chairs, assistant/associate deans/directors, and directors of programs, must be evaluated on the faculty portion of their appointments only.

    1.2. Individuals returning to tenured faculty roles from a fully administrative position will undergo post-tenure review no sooner than three years and no later than five years after entering the new role as determined by the individual in consultation with the dean/director.

    1.3. Nothing in these guidelines must be interpreted or applied to infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights, nor to establish new term-tenure systems or to require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure.

2. PURPOSE

    The purpose of this comprehensive evaluation is to:

(a) Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member

(b) Provide guidance for continual and meaningful faculty development

(c) Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals

(d) Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate

(e) Provide assurance that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to the university and the State of Texas

3. RESPONSIBILITY AND SCOPE

3.1. Each academic unit (e.g., college, school) will develop its post-tenure review process and submit it to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) for review and approval. The process will include a description of the process for naming peer-review committees, academic unit-specific criteria agreed upon by the faculty, a description of responsibilities of those involved in the process, and a schedule for review of the process. Academic unit-specific criteria, responsibilities, and processes must augment, not replace, or contradict, the processes outlined in this procedure.

3.2. The peer-review committee will be formed at either the department or academic unit level, as determined jointly by the faculty and dean/director of each academic unit. The peer-review committee must consist of at least three (3) tenured faculty members at the candidate's rank or higher, the majority of whom must be elected by the faculty. The academic unit promotion and tenure committee may serve as the peer-review committee for post-tenure review.

3.3. For joint positions, the primary department will be the locus of the evaluation.

3.4. Every tenured member of the faculty will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review every six years or following the second *Unsatisfactory* rating in the annual performance review in any category within six years of the first *Unsatisfactory* rating in that category. The post-tenure evaluation may not be waived for any active faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period coincides with approved leave or based on significant extenuating circumstances. A deferral request must be submitted by the faculty member to the Office of the Provost through the department chair (if applicable) and academic unit dean/director and be for a period of no more than one year from the scheduled review. Subsequent extensions, as necessary, will require separate application and approval. A

successful promotion to professor will serve in place of this post-tenure review process. An unsuccessful attempt for promotion to professor does not alter the post-tenure review schedule or process.

3.5. The six-year period starts with the first full academic year of appointment in a tenured position. The period restarts at the time of promotion to full professor but will include the academic year in which the promotion request was under review.

3.5.1. The review period for tenured faculty who have not been promoted to full professor will begin the academic year when their tenure became effective. The post-tenure review will be conducted in their seventh academic year after receiving tenure.

3.5.2. The review period for a tenured faculty member who has either been promoted to full professor or has previously completed a post-tenure review will begin the academic year the successful promotion request or previous post-tenure review process started. The post-tenure review will be conducted in their sixth academic year after the promotion went into effect or the previous post-tenure review was completed.

3.5.3. If post-tenure review is triggered by a second *Unsatisfactory* rating as outlined in section 3.4 of this rule, then the review period will begin the academic year their (a) tenure became effective, (b) successful promotion to full professor request review process started, or (c) previous post-tenure review process started, whichever is most recent. The post-tenure review will be conducted in the Spring following the second *Unsatisfactory* rating and follow the same timeline outlined in section 5 of this rule.

3.6. Except for leaves occurring in the final academic year under review, periods when a faculty member is on leave will still count towards the six-year requirement.

3.7. Faculty due for post-tenure review must be provided notice no later than October 15th that the review will be conducted the following Spring. Unless a deferral has been requested and approved by the Office of the Provost, Faculty undergoing post-tenure review will be notified as follows:

(a) in October of their seventh full year of service after tenure went into effect if not promoted to full professor, or

(b) in October of their sixth full year of service since their promotion to full professor went into effect or their last post-tenure review was completed.

3.8. The basis of the review is the record of teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA), and service. The following materials are to be assessed for the six years under review:

- Current curriculum vitae
- Annual performance evaluations for the five calendar years preceding the notice of post-tenure review stated in section 3.9
- Annual Faculty Activity Reports as determined by each academic unit

Results of previous post-tenure reviews will not be included as part of the evaluation.

3.9. Faculty members will receive an evaluation for each category of responsibility (teaching, RSCA, and service) as well as a comprehensive evaluation. Evaluations must focus on individual performance relative to assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload.

4. REVIEW CATEGORIES

1. Satisfactory – meets or exceeds expectations for assigned responsibilities and provides contributions that always meet or exceed those expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload.

2. Unsatisfactory – does not meet minimum expectations for assigned responsibilities and contributions are not consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Evaluations may reflect disregard of previous advice or development efforts and/or professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

5. EVALUATION PROCESS

5.1. The tenured faculty member is notified by October 15th that they will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review during the following spring semester.

5.2. The faculty member submits their current curriculum vitae as well as the Faculty Activity Report to the academic unit dean/director or their designee in the electronic faculty review system by January 20th. The academic unit dean/director or designee uploads copies of the completed annual reviews for the previous five calendar years to the faculty member's case. If a faculty member has written a response to any annual evaluation during the review period, the response letter(s) will be uploaded.

5.3. By February 1st, the academic unit dean/director or their designee meets with the peer-review committee to provide instructions for conducting the review.

5.4. By March 1st, the peer-review committee will review cases for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review and upload an evaluation report to their case in the electronic faculty review system. The report must state the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive evaluation rating, and the basis for that determination. If the peer-review evaluation is *Unsatisfactory* in any category, the peer-review committee evaluation report must contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s), details of the unsatisfactory performance, and the basis for the committee's decision. The report must refrain from speculating on the reasons why the performance is unsatisfactory.

5.5. After reviewing the peer-review committee's evaluation report, the dean/director must prepare an individual evaluation for each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review and upload it in the electronic faculty review system. The academic unit dean/director will meet with the faculty member to inform them of the academic unit dean/director's and peer-review committee's recommendations including a breakdown of the committee's vote. The faculty member will be provided with a copy of the peer-review committee's and academic unit dean/director's written evaluations via the electronic faculty review system.

5.6. The faculty member may submit a written response to the peer-review committee's and academic unit dean/director's recommendations through the electronic faculty review system. Responses must be submitted to the academic unit dean/director within five business days of the meeting with the academic unit dean/director and will be included in the faculty member's case.

5.7. The faculty member's case, including the academic unit dean/director's and peer-review committee's reports and recommendations and faculty response if applicable, will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by April 1st.

5.8. The provost will review the faculty member's case and prepare a final decision regarding each faculty member's post-tenure review rating by April 15th.

5.9. By April 30th, the provost will share the final post-tenure review rating with the faculty member, academic unit dean/director, the department chair, and the peer-review committee via the electronic faculty review system.

6. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

6.1. If the faculty member receives an *Unsatisfactory* rating in any category/categories (teaching, RSCA, or service) or an overall rating of *Unsatisfactory* from the provost, the faculty member, in collaboration with the peer-review committee and department chair (or academic unit dean/director

if the faculty member has an administrative assignment of 50% or greater), must establish a professional development plan. This professional development plan should address any *Unsatisfactory* area(s) (individual category or overall rating) and be completed within 30 days of receiving the final decision. This plan must be subject to review and approval by the academic unit dean/director. Should the 30-day period end after the conclusion of the Spring semester the deadline will be extended until September 15th.

6.2. The plan will:

(a) Indicate the university resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member to achieve the goals of the plan;

(b) Indicate who will monitor the implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (e.g., a faculty mentor, the department chair, or academic unit dean/director); and

(c) Include a follow-up schedule with specific dates, benchmarks, and tangible goals for evaluating improved performance.

6.3. The original written evaluation and development plan must be submitted to the Office of the Provost with a copy maintained in the academic unit.

6.4. Normally, the development plan period will be for two years. With provost approval, plans may be longer than two years if the situation warrants it. The plan should follow department guidelines for development plan implementation. The department chair or academic unit dean/director, with input from the peer-review committee, will assess evidence of improvement after each year of the plan. Annual status reports and a final report will be submitted to the academic unit dean/director and Office of the Provost by May 15th of ensuing years.

6.5. 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 department chair or academic unit dean/director, with input from the peer-review committee, will assess evidence of improvement at the completion of the development plan. If the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period, the department chair, in conjunction with the academic unit dean/director, or the academic unit dean/director as applicable, will take appropriate administrative action up to and including recommendation for dismissal.

7. DISCIPLINARY ACTION

If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including review for termination, may be initiated in accordance with due process described in university procedure *12.01.99.C0.05, Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments* and system policy *12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure*.

8. PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

Periodic reviews of the post-tenure review process will be conducted by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to provide feedback on academic unit post-tenure review committees' adherence to their established standards and processes.

Related Statues, Policies, or Requirements

Texas Education Code 51.942 Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
System Policy *12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure*
System Policy *12.06, Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*
University Rule *12.01.99.C1, Tenure*
University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.02, Academic Freedom*
University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.03, Responsibilities of Faculty Members*
University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.05, Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments*
University Procedure *12.01.99.C0.06, Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members*
University Procedure *12.99.99.C0.03, Designation of Graduate Faculty*
University Procedure *33.99.04.C0.02, Promotion of Full-Time Faculty Members*

Contact Office

Contact for clarification and interpretation:	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs 361.825.2722