

## Handbook of Operating Procedures

### TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION

---

#### A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to specify procedures regarding the annual review, comprehensive periodic evaluation, and promotion to the rank of professor at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV).

#### B. Persons Affected

This policy applies to all tenured faculty members of UTRGV.

#### C. Policy

1. UTRGV is committed to serving society through the excellence of its faculty, students, and staff. To meet UTRGV's commitment to improving the quality of life of the Rio Grande Valley and beyond, faculty members are expected to perform at the highest levels in their respective disciplines and fields, continuously striving for distinction. Every UTRGV faculty member should present a distinguished record as a scholar, educator, and colleague. UTRGV faculty must attain a successful and high-quality record of research, scholarship, and/or creative work that projects a clear, coherent, and independent identity as a scholar. As educators, UTRGV faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success. With the awarding of promotion to the next rank, UTRGV expects that faculty members will continue providing intellectual leadership in their research and teaching, and model professionalism in all their work, including service and shared governance activities. It is the policy of UTRGV to cultivate tenured faculty who, through the performance of their duties, achieve these high standards and values with sustained commitment to professionalism and to UTRGV's mission. To this end, it is the policy of UTRGV to uphold academic freedom in the promotion decision and ensure that promotion of tenured faculty to the rank of professor is a recognition of and reward to faculty who have sustained meritorious records of professional accomplishment that contribute to the university's mission.
2. It is the policy of UTRGV to conduct annual reviews and comprehensive periodic evaluations of tenured faculty in teaching, research, service, university-related patient care (as applicable), and/or university-related administration (as applicable). It is the policy of UTRGV to conduct these evaluations in ways that provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to uphold academic freedom when evaluating tenured faculty; to assist tenured faculty in enhancing professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that tenured faculty are meeting their responsibilities to UTRGV.

#### D. Procedures

1. *General Principles*

- a. Regents' Rule Precedence – This policy is intended to be consistent with the policies set forth in [Rule 31007, Tenure](#); [Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member](#); and [Rule 31001, Faculty Appointments and Titles](#), of the *Rules and Regulations* of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System (“*Regents’ Rules*”).
- b. Values and Expectations – UTRGV adopts the Statement of Values and Expectations, pursuant to [Rule 10901, Statement of U.T. System Values and Expectations](#), of the *Regents’ Rules*.
- c. Ethics – UTRGV receives guidance for evaluation of professional ethics from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) [Statement on Professional Ethics](#), originally adopted in 1966, and revised in 1987 and 2009, in determining standards for professionalism.
- d. Academic Freedom – UTRGV receives guidance for evaluation of academic freedom from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (with 1970 Interpretive Comments) in defining and upholding the academic freedom of its faculty.

2. *Categories of Performance*

- a. Tenured faculty are evaluated based on accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship/creative-works, service/shared-governance, and, if applicable, university-related patient care and/or university-related administration.
- b. Teaching
  - i. Teaching activities may include, but are not limited to (a) classroom (including traditional, online, and hybrid) and laboratory instruction; (b) development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; (c) development or publication of instructional materials; (d) supervision of undergraduate students, graduate students, medical students, or post-docs; (e) mentoring, advising, and coaching students; (f) experiential learning and community engagement activities pertaining to teaching/instruction, such as service learning, student research (including community-based research), and internships/co-ops; (g) competitive funding for instructional and pedagogical development; implementation of tools/practices acquired through professional development workshops; and, (h) innovative teaching and pedagogy.
  - ii. As educators, tenured faculty must establish a teaching profile that demonstrates growth, impact, and student success. UTRGV values and holds high expectations for the quality and impact of faculty members’ teaching on student success. To that end, the categories of performance in Teaching are as follows: (a) pedagogy, (b) continued

development of teaching skills, (c) use of peer feedback in teaching, which includes compliance with UTRGV's [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#) (d) alignment of curricular practices to student needs, (e) engagement with student learning outside the classroom, and (f) participation in development of curricula.

c. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Works

- i. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Work activities are characterized by the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or creative works and may include but are not limited to: (a) peer-reviewed publications of the faculty member's research that have been published or accepted for publication in department-determined appropriate outlets; (b) visual or other artistic contributions in competitive regional and national exhibitions; (c) adjudicated performances; (d) development of intellectual property, such as patents and licenses; (e) competitive, external research funding; (f) community-based participatory research; and, (g) other community-based research, scholarship, and/or creative work activities appropriate to the faculty member's academic discipline.
- ii. Upon earning tenure, UTRGV faculty seeking promotion must sustain a successful and high-quality record of research, scholarship, and/or creative work that projects a clear, coherent, and independent identity as a scholar. The work of faculty in this area should lead to the advancement of knowledge. By achieving these expectations, the faculty member will have demonstrated intellectual leadership. UTRGV values and holds high expectations for the quality and productivity of tenured faculty seeking promotion in research, scholarship, and creative work. To that end, the categories of performance in Research are as follows: (a) significance and national reputation, (b) consistent and increasing record of accomplishment with increasing significance and impact, (c) sustainability of agenda and trajectory, (d) scholarly independence, and (e) quality and impact.

d. Service and Shared Governance

- i. Service activities may include but are not limited to: (a) service to students, colleagues, the department, college, and UTRGV; (b) service to the profession, including academic or professionally related service to disciplinary-based societies, editorial boards, and other educational entities; and, (c) professionally related service and outreach to the community, state, nation, and beyond.
- ii. UTRGV expects faculty members to model professionalism in all their work, including service and shared governance activities. These activities are essential to the life of the university and an important component of faculty profiles. Faculty should conceive of their service and shared governance activities as occurring in three areas: the university and its students, university operations and shared governance, and the profession and community. Upon earning tenure, faculty must assume leadership roles in service toward university operations and shared governance and assume leadership roles in their respective disciplinary organizations. Documented

and sustained leadership and impact in service and shared governance is an essential component to promotion to the rank of Professor. To that end, the categories of performance in Service and Shared Governance are as follows: (a) service and student success, (b) service to university operations and shared governance, and (c) service to the profession and the community.

e. University-Related Patient Care

i. Factors in evaluating patient care can include, but are not limited to:

1. Patient satisfaction
2. Number of Patient Encounters
3. Telemedicine
4. UTRGV Clinic Work
5. Work Relative Value Units (wRVUs)

f. University-Related Administration

3. *Annual Review*

- a. Pathways – The Provost will post the Pathways for Review Deadlines on the office’s web site each year prior to the commencement of reviews and notify the Deans and Department Chairs of the posting. The Pathways will provide the schedule for each level and type of faculty performance review. It is the tenured faculty member’s responsibility to be aware of and to follow all Pathways deadlines.
- b. All tenured faculty will be evaluated for their work performance in the Categories of Performance as applicable to their workload, which may include teaching, research/scholarship/creative-works, service/shared-governance, and, if applicable, university-related patient care and/or university-related administration.
- c. Annual Review may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as when the review process will coincide with the faculty member’s approved leave, except Faculty Development Leave – faculty on Faculty Development Leave are not eligible for a deferral. A deferral of more than one year from the scheduled review will not be granted.
- d. To receive a deferral, tenured faculty must make a request in writing to their Department Chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost and receive written approval by the Chair, Dean, and Provost or designees by the deadline.
- e. Performance Ratings – Each review level shall rate the tenured faculty member in each evaluation category. Each review level shall combine those ratings in each category to provide an overall rating for the annual review period. The four ratings to choose from are:
  - i. Exceeds Expectations – reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty, rank, or any contractual

expectations as defined by the unit.

- ii. Meets Expectations – reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
  - iii. Does Not Meet Expectations – indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
  - iv. Unsatisfactory – means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member’s unit, rank, or contractual obligations in such a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. It also means failing to meet expectations based on findings of professional misconduct.
- f. Guidelines – Following Provost procedures for approval, department, school, or college guidelines must indicate clearly how (a) faculty workload and agreements link with (b) the work/accomplishments completed in the Categories of Performance during the academic year under review to produce (c) an overall Performance Rating. Academic units may choose to write guidelines that are quantitative (e.g., point based) and that require only minimum levels of documentation to help ensure that annual review can be conducted efficiently.
- i. Tenured faculty appointed to administrative positions outside of their department shall include a letter from their supervisor outlining the administrative component of their workload. Guidelines and evaluations must give appropriate consideration to the demands of the administrative assignment and the impact of these demands on level of research activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
  - ii. Revisions to annual review guidelines will not be applicable to tenured faculty for two full academic years after official adoption unless the tenured faculty member chooses to be evaluated by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to their Department Chair.
- g. Material Submitted – Tenured faculty shall submit their curriculum vitae, a summary statement of professional accomplishments, their teaching evaluations, and, if necessary, a peer observation of teaching. Tenured faculty may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials the tenured faculty member deems appropriate. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials directly to their Department Chair as specified in Pathways.
- h. Chair and Dean – The Chair and Dean must each provide an annual evaluation of tenured faculty using the guidelines that apply to the tenured faculty member. The Chair and Dean must each recommend a performance rating for the work completed during the academic year under review.

- i. Reconsideration of Department Chair's Annual Evaluation Performance Rating – From the time Department Chairs submit their annual evaluation, tenured faculty will receive five business days to either request reconsideration or advance their review to the Dean. After five business days, the materials and evaluation will auto-advance to the Dean. Within this window of five business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their annual review materials. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Department Chair. From the time that Department Chairs receive this request, they have five business days to respond and move the materials and evaluation to the Dean. After those five business days, the materials and evaluation auto-advance to the Dean. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of Department Chairs' annual evaluations is ten business days (five business days for the tenured faculty and five additional business days for the Department Chair).
- ii. Reconsideration of the Dean's Annual Evaluation Performance Rating – From the time Deans submit their annual evaluation, tenured faculty will receive ten business days to request reconsideration. After those ten business days, the annual evaluation process ends. Within this window of ten business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their annual review materials. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Dean. From the time that Deans receive this request, they have ten business days to respond. The annual evaluation process ends after the Dean's response. Unless the outcome satisfies the conditions for appeal, the Dean's annual performance rating is final.
- i. Appeal – If the Dean's performance rating is "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" and that rating is inconsistent with the Chair's Performance Rating, tenured faculty may appeal to the Provost who will review the information and provide a final decision.
- j. Outcomes
  - i. Merit – The outcome of the annual evaluation may be considered in determining eligibility for a merit pay increase, should merit pay increase be available. To be eligible for a merit pay increase, tenured faculty must be in good standing, "meet" or "exceed expectations", and meet the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.
  - ii. Remediation Plan – Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of "does not meet expectations" in one or more Categories of Performance may be required by the Dean to draft an Annual Review Remediation Plan in consultation with their Department Chair and Dean. The Dean must approve of the plan before the end of the semester in which the Performance Rating was given. The plan shall address the changes and support necessary to increase the tenured faculty member's performance (for example, teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research or service expectations). The Department Chair and Dean, in

consultation with a peer review committee, will use the plan to measure the tenured faculty member's performance during the ensuing annual review process. For tenured faculty under an Annual Review Remediation Plan, the ensuing annual review process is as follows:

1. Tenured faculty must include their Annual Review Remediation Plan as part of their annual review materials that are otherwise specified in D.3.g. The plan may call for tenured faculty to provide additional materials.
  2. A Peer Annual Remediation Committee forms according to the procedures outlined in D.4.j.i and D.4.j.ii. The actions of this committee follow the procedures in D.4.j.iii through D.4.j.vii. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials to this committee as designated in Pathways.
  3. The Peer Annual Remediation Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall use the plan in conjunction with the approved annual review guidelines to provide Performance Ratings in the Categories of Performance.
  4. Once the Peer Annual Remediation Committee submits its annual review to the Department Chair, the annual review proceeds as stipulated in D.3.h and D.3.i.
  5. This prescribed annual review process continues until performance is elevated to "meets" or "exceeds expectations." If the tenured faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" rating while under the Annual Review Remediation Plan, then other disciplinary actions may result (see D.3.j.iii through D.3.j.v below).
- iii. Tenured faculty receiving a rating of "unsatisfactory" may, with Dean approval, draft (or continue with) a remediation plan and undergo the process in D.3.j.ii and/or be subject to appropriate administrative action. If the rating of "unsatisfactory" is a result of incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken (see D.3.j.v below).
  - iv. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (CPE) – Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of "unsatisfactory" for two consecutive annual reviews may be required to undergo a CPE. The decision regarding whether to require the CPE in this circumstance will be made by the Dean after consultation with the Provost.
  - v. Disciplinary Action – Tenured faculty may be subject to the appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Regents' Rule 31008 and 31102, for poor performance or when other good cause exists.
4. *Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (CPE)*
- a. All tenured faculty will undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation (CPE) of their professional responsibilities in the Categories of Performance as applicable to their



workload, which may include teaching, research/scholarship/creative-works, service/shared-governance, and, if applicable, university-related patient care and/or university-related administration, at least every six years after the award of tenure and following the schedule set forth in Pathways.

- b. CPE materials will serve as annual evaluation materials.
- c. At the time of promotion to Professor, the six-year period will restart.
- d. The Provost will provide the Dean with the list of their tenured faculty members who are due for a CPE at least six months prior to the date established in Pathways for the reviews to begin. The Dean shall then notify their tenured faculty of their upcoming CPE. Tenured faculty are also responsible for ensuring their CPE is conducted at least every six years. If a tenured faculty member is due for a CPE but does not receive notice as provided by this section, it is the duty of the tenured faculty member to immediately inform their Chair and Dean. The Dean will review and reconcile records with the Provost so that if the CPE is due, it can be initiated in a timely manner.
- e. The CPE may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as:
  - i. When the review process will coincide with the tenured faculty member's approved leave, except Faculty Development Leave – faculty on Faculty Development Leave are not eligible for a deferral;
  - ii. When the tenured faculty member is on approved leave for more than four months during the six-year period;
  - iii. When the tenured faculty member is on an approved leave of at least three months duration within the six months immediately prior to the date established in the Pathways for the review to begin; or
  - iv. When the tenured faculty member is undergoing a review for appointment to an endowed position.
- f. To receive a deferral, the tenured faculty member must make a request in writing to their Chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost and receive written approval by the Chair, Dean, and Provost or designees by the deadline.
- g. A deferral of the CPE of an active faculty member must not extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.
- h. Guidelines – Following Provost procedures for approval, department, school, or college comprehensive periodic evaluation guidelines shall follow the guidelines for annual review. Guidelines should indicate clearly how previous performance ratings from the years under review are to be combined to issue an overall rating for comprehensive periodic evaluation.



Guidelines for comprehensive periodic evaluation must identify if there are any cumulative benchmarks in the Categories of Performance that tenured faculty must meet to demonstrate the successful, high-quality record of sustained productivity and professionalism that is required of tenured faculty at UTRGV. Any cumulative benchmarks must relate to tenured faculty workload. Guidelines for comprehensive periodic evaluation should seek as much detail and documentation as needed to apply the standards of judgment, but not so much as to impose additional burdens.

- i. Tenured faculty appointed to administrative positions outside of their department shall include a letter from their supervisor evaluating the administrative component of their workload. Guidelines and evaluations using those guidelines must give appropriate consideration to the demands of the administrative assignment and the impact of these demands on level of research activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
  - ii. Revisions to the comprehensive periodic evaluation guidelines will not be applicable to tenured faculty for two full academic years after official adoption unless the tenured faculty member chooses to be evaluated by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to their Department Chair.
- i. Material Submitted – Tenured faculty shall submit their curriculum vitae, a summary statement of professional accomplishments, their previous annual evaluations with performance ratings, their teaching evaluations, and their requisite Peer Observations of Teaching. Tenured faculty may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials the tenured faculty member deems appropriate. Tenured faculty submit their comprehensive periodic evaluation materials directly to their Peer Review Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Committee as specified in Pathways.
- j. Peer Review Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Committee
- i. The peer review committee must include at least three tenured faculty members at the same rank or higher than the tenured faculty under review. In addition, the peer review committee shall have a tenured, non-voting Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL). The EOL shall be at the same rank or higher than the tenured faculty under review. The EOL attends all meetings of the peer review committee and has access to all of the submitted materials. Neither Department Chairs nor Associate Deans may be members, chairs, or EOLs of peer review committees.
  - ii. In consultation with the tenured faculty member and the tenured faculty of the department who are at the same rank (or higher) as the faculty member under review, the Department Chair appoints the members of the peer review committee, and the non-voting Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL), based on their objectivity and academic strength. In lieu of this departmental committee and in consultation with the tenured faculty member and the tenured faculty of the college who are at the same rank (or higher) as the faculty member under review, the Dean may appoint

the members of the peer review committee, and the non-voting EOL, based on their objectivity and academic strength. Members of the peer review committee select the chair of the committee.

- iii. The tenured faculty under review shall be provided with an opportunity to meet with the peer review committee.
- iv. The peer review committee provides a performance rating in each of the Categories of Performance using the guidelines and submits its evaluation to the Department Chair as specified in Pathways.
- v. All members of the peer review committee must participate in committee discussions and formulate committee recommendations. Proxy voting is not permitted. Abstentions should be exercised only in limited and unusual circumstances, such as when a conflict of interest has been reported to the Department Chair or College Dean, or other applicable administrator (see section D.7).
- vi. Any minority reports shall be included with the submission of the evaluation. A minority report is a separate report prepared by the member(s) of the committee representing the minority if they disagree with the rating given by the majority.
- vii. From the time the peer review committee submits its evaluation, tenured faculty will receive two business days to advance their materials to the Department Chair. After two business days, the review will auto-advance to the Department Chair. Tenured faculty may add new information to their materials during those two business days. Tenured faculty are not able to appeal or request reconsideration of the peer review committee evaluations.
- k. Review Levels – Materials submitted for comprehensive periodic evaluation shall be reviewed by the peer review comprehensive periodic evaluation committee, the Department Chair, and Dean. The Dean sends a report to the Provost for approval.
- l. Request for Reconsideration of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation – Tenured faculty may request a reconsideration of the comprehensive periodic evaluation recommendation made by the Department Chair and Dean. For all other levels of review, tenured faculty are given two business days from the time that the evaluation is posted to move their materials to the next level of review. Tenured faculty may add new information to their materials during those two business days. Their materials auto-advance after two business days. For reconsideration requests of the Department Chair and Dean evaluations, the written request for reconsideration must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence that will be included in the comprehensive periodic evaluation. The written response to the tenured faculty member must address the substance of the reconsideration request, explaining why the evaluator found the request either to be convincing or unconvincing. The tenured faculty member will have the opportunity to view the response.

- i. Reconsideration of Department Chairs' Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation – From the time Department Chairs submit their evaluation, tenured faculty will receive five business days to either request reconsideration or advance their recommendation to the Dean. After five business days, the materials will auto-advance to the Dean. Within this window of five business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Department Chair. From the time that Department Chairs receive this request, they have five business days to respond and move the materials to the Dean. After those five business days, the materials auto-advance to the Dean. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of Department Chairs' evaluation is ten business days (five business days for the tenured faculty and five additional business days for the Department Chair).
  - ii. Reconsideration of Dean's Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation – From the time that the evaluation is submitted by the Dean, tenured faculty will receive ten business days to either request reconsideration or accept the Dean's evaluation. Within this window of ten business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Dean. From the time the Dean receives this request, the Dean has ten business days to respond. After those ten business days, the Dean's evaluation and response is final. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of the Dean's evaluation is twenty business days (ten business days for the tenured faculty and ten additional business days for the Dean).
- m. Outcomes
  - i. Merit – The outcome of a tenured faculty member's CPE may be considered in determining eligibility for a merit pay increase, should a merit pay increase be available. To be eligible for a merit pay increase, faculty must be in good standing, "meet" or "exceed expectations," and satisfy the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.
  - ii. If the outcome of the CPE is "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations" then the tenured faculty member will not undergo another CPE for six years unless a CPE is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews.
  - iii. Remediation Plan – Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of "does not meet expectations" in one or more Categories of Performance may be required by the Dean to draft a CPE Remediation Plan in consultation with their Department Chair and Dean. The Dean must approve of the plan before the end of the semester in which the Performance Rating was given. The plan shall address the changes and support necessary to increase the tenured faculty member's performance (for example, teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research or service expectations). The Department Chair and Dean, in consultation with a peer review committee, will use the plan to measure the tenured faculty member's

performance during the ensuing annual review process. For tenured faculty under a CPE Remediation Plan, the ensuing annual review process is as follows:

1. Tenured faculty must include their CPE Remediation Plan as part of their annual review materials that are otherwise specified in D.3.g. The plan may call for tenured faculty to provide additional materials.
  2. A Peer CPE Remediation Committee forms according to the procedures outlined in D.4.j.i and D.4.j.ii. The actions of this committee follow the procedures in D.4.j.iii through D.4.j.vii. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials to this committee as designated in Pathways.
  3. The Peer CPE Remediation Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall use the plan in conjunction with the approved annual review guidelines to provide Performance Ratings in the Categories of Performance.
  4. Once the Peer CPE Remediation Committee submits its annual review to the Department Chair, the annual review proceeds as stipulated in D.3.h and D.3.i.
  5. This prescribed annual review process continues until performance is elevated to “meets” or “exceeds expectations.” If the tenured faculty member receives an “unsatisfactory” rating while under the CPE Remediation Plan, then they are subject to the Short-Term Development Plan or other disciplinary actions (see D.4.m.v below).
- iv. Unsatisfactory Performance and Short-Term Development Plan – Tenured faculty who receive a Performance Rating of “unsatisfactory” in one or more Categories of Performance in their CPE as a result of incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause, may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action (see D.4.m.v below). Tenured faculty receiving a Performance Rating of “unsatisfactory” in one or more Categories of Performance in their CPE or while under a CPE Remediation Plan may be required to draft a Short-Term Development Plan in consultation with their Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. The Provost must approve of the plan before the end of the semester in which the Performance Rating was given. The plan establishes long-term objectives for developmental improvement and specifies meaningful short-term criteria for assessing progress towards these long-term objectives. Meaningful short-term criteria refer to performance benchmarks that will return the tenured faculty member to satisfactory performance when met. The plan must establish meaningful criteria to be met by the next annual review and then meaningful criteria for the following annual review. The Short-Term Development Plan encompasses a cycle of two annual evaluations, but the Provost may establish a plan that extends for a longer period of time with meaningful criteria for each annual review under the plan. The Department Chair and Dean, in consultation with a peer review committee, will use the plan to measure the tenured faculty member’s performance during the ensuing annual review process. For tenured faculty under a Short-Term Development Plan, the ensuing annual review process is as follows:

1. Tenured faculty include their Short-Term Development Plan as part of their annual review materials that are otherwise specified in D.3.g. The plan may call for tenured faculty to provide additional materials.
  2. A Peer Short-Term Development Committee forms according to the procedures outlined in D.4.j.i and D.4.j.ii. The actions of this committee follow the procedures in D.4.j.iii through D.4.j.vii. Tenured faculty submit their annual review materials to this committee as designated in Pathways.
  3. The Peer Short-Term Development Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall use the plan in conjunction with the approved annual review guidelines to provide Performance Ratings in the Categories of Performance.
  4. Once the Peer Short-Term Development Committee submits its annual review to the Department Chair, the annual review proceeds as stipulated in D.3.h and D.3.i.
  5. This prescribed annual review process continues for the duration approved by the Provost. Tenured faculty failing to satisfy the criteria of the Short-Term Development Plan may be subject to other disciplinary action (see D.4.m.v below).
- v. Disciplinary Action – A tenured faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Regents' Rules 31102 and 31008 Termination of a Faculty Member for poor performance or when other good cause exists.
- n. The Provost will send a summary of the institutional CPE outcomes to the University of Texas System.

5. *Promotion to Professor*

- a. The standard time in the associate professor rank for promotion to professor is six years. Promotion to professor is an acknowledgment that tenured associate professors have (1) performed with excellence and leadership in all areas of responsibility, (2) produced quality, significant, and impactful work that demonstrates scholarly growth beyond what was accomplished to earn tenure, and (3) demonstrated their reliability that this excellence, leadership, and growth will continue after promotion.
- b. A tenured associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of professor may apply early if the tenured faculty member believes that they attained the extraordinarily rare achievement of fulfilling the high standards and values articulated in this policy before the end of the customary six-year period. To be considered for an early promotion review, the tenured faculty member must submit the external review request and dossier in accordance with Pathways.

- c. Future considerations for the promotion to professor are not affected by a denial of an application for early promotion.
- d. The promotion review dossier will serve as the comprehensive periodic evaluation and annual evaluation materials.
- e. Guidelines – Following Provost procedures for approval, colleges, schools, and departments may draft and distribute Evaluation Guidelines articulating disciplinary criteria for promotion to full professor for the purpose of faculty mentoring. Such criteria should address all faculty performance categories using the template “Promotion to Full Professor Guidelines for Associate Professors,” draw on national practices in the discipline, and align with the Categories of Performance in this policy.
  - i. Disciplinary criteria must not be expressed in lists of requirements, but in the form of general principles and/or multiple comprehensive scenarios of successful cases, either actual (with the faculty member’s name removed) or hypothetical. Such statements will be drafted by the Dean or Department Chair in consultation with appropriate faculty.
  - ii. College, school, and department Evaluation Guidelines are advisory and do not substitute for or take precedent over the individualized review and decision of evaluators designated in Pathways.
  - iii. As the faculty members of the university develop, definitions of excellence and expectations for promotion should change. If a tenured faculty member’s accomplishments do not keep pace with evolving standards of performance for promotion, then that individual may not be awarded promotion.
    - 1. Tenured faculty appointed to administrative positions outside of their department shall include a letter from their supervisor articulating the administrative component of their workload. Evaluations must give appropriate consideration to the demands of the administrative assignment and the impact of these demands on level of research activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
    - 2. Revisions to the college, school, or department Evaluation Guidelines will not be applicable to tenured faculty for two full academic years after official adoption unless the tenured faculty member chooses to be mentored or advised by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to their Department Chair.
- f. Dossier – Tenured faculty applying for promotion to professor create a dossier of the materials that form the basis for the review at all levels of evaluation. The dossiers of tenured faculty must provide clear documentation of their effort and success in the Categories of Performance. In Teaching, a successful profile that documents growth, impact, and student success will include evidence of ongoing development and

improvement in teaching quality, which should result in both student success and a positive and professional reputation as an educator. In Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Work, documenting this achievement requires more than enumerating a list of scholarly products. Tenured faculty must demonstrate their achievement in ways that allow for rigorous evaluation of the quality and impact of their work by professional peers both internal and external to the university. In Service and Shared Governance, tenured faculty must document the outputs and outcomes of their effort and leadership, and when participating in shared governance, they must document their role in the development of policies and decision-making that affect UTRGV. It is important that tenured faculty members under consideration for promotion make every effort to ensure that the material contained in the dossier is complete, accurate, professional in presentation, and submitted by the deadline contained in Pathways.

g. Promotion to Full Evaluation and Advisory Committee (PFEAC)

- i. Tenured faculty shall have a Promotion to Full Evaluation and Advisory Committee (PFEAC) formed one academic year before tenured faculty apply for promotion. The Department Chair, in consultation with the tenured faculty member, appoints three to five full professors whose research expertise is related to the tenured faculty member's expertise. PFEAC should be composed of full professors from within the tenured faculty member's department but may also include full professors from cognate fields within the college and/or university. A majority of PFEAC members must be full professors from within the same department as the tenured faculty member unless the department lacks the requisite number of full professors. The chair of PFEAC must be a full professor from within the same department unless no full professors exist. In addition, PFEAC shall have a full professor, non-voting Equal Opportunity Liaison (EOL). The EOL attends all meetings of PFEAC and has access to the dossier and all former evaluations. Neither Department Chairs nor Associate Deans may be members, chairs, or EOLs of PFEAC.
- ii. The tenured faculty under review shall be provided with an opportunity to meet with the peer review committee. The purpose of PFEAC is to advise the tenured faculty member about the content and structure of the promotion dossier.
- iii. PFEAC is responsible for making the recommendation for promotion to the Department Chair. All members of PFEAC must participate in committee discussions and formulate committee recommendations. Proxy voting is not permitted. Abstentions should be exercised only in limited and usual circumstances, such as when a conflict of interest has been reported to the Department Chair or College Dean, or other applicable administrator (see section D.7).
- iv. Any minority reports shall be included with the submission of the promotion recommendation. A minority report is a separate report prepared by the member(s) of the committee representing the minority if they disagree with the recommendation of the majority.



- v. From the time PFEAC submits its promotion recommendation, tenured faculty will receive two business days to advance their dossier to the Department Chair. After two business days, the review will auto-advance to the Department Chair. Tenured faculty may add new information to their dossier during those two business days. Tenured faculty are not able to appeal or request reconsideration of PFEAC's promotion recommendation.
- h. External Reviews – Tenured faculty submitting their dossiers for promotion must follow UTRGV's External Review Selection Guidelines.
- i. Additional Evidence in Categories of Performance – Once tenured faculty submit their dossier, they may request to update information contained in their dossier at any time during the review process by contacting their Department Chair. The opportunity to update dossiers is independent of any request for reconsideration or appeal during the review process. Newly included materials cannot be reconsidered by previous review levels.
- j. Review Levels – Tenured faculty dossiers for promotion shall be reviewed by PFEAC, their Department Chair, Dean, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Provost.
- k. Request for Reconsideration of Promotion Recommendation – Tenured faculty may request a reconsideration of the promotion recommendation made by the Department Chair and Provost. For all other levels of review, tenured faculty are given two business days from the time that the review is posted to move their dossier to the next level of review. Tenured faculty may add new information to their dossier during those two business days. The dossier auto-advances after two business days. For the reconsideration requests of the Department Chair and Provost recommendations, the written request for reconsideration must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence that will be included in the tenured faculty member's dossier. The written response to the tenured faculty member must address the substance of the reconsideration request, explaining why the evaluator found the request either to be convincing or unconvincing. The tenured faculty member will have the opportunity to view the response.
- i. Reconsideration of Department Chair's Promotion Recommendation – From the time Department Chairs submit their promotion recommendation, tenured faculty will receive five business days to either request reconsideration or advance their recommendation to the Dean. After five business days, the dossier will auto-advance to the Dean. Within this window of five business days, tenured faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their dossier. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Department Chair. From the time that Department Chairs receive this request, they have five business days to respond and move the dossier to the Dean. After those five business days, the dossier auto-advances to the Dean. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of Department Chairs' promotion recommendation is ten business days (five business days for the tenured faculty and five additional business days for the Department Chair).

- ii. Reconsideration of Provost's Promotion Recommendation – From the time that the promotion recommendation is submitted by the Provost, tenured faculty will receive ten business days to either request reconsideration or accept the Provost's recommendation. Within this window of ten business days, tenure-track faculty may request reconsideration and include new information in their dossier. Their request for reconsideration goes back to the Provost. From the time the Provost receives this request, the Provost has ten business days to respond. After those ten business days, the Provost's recommendation, and response if necessary, is sent to the President. The maximum length of time for reconsideration of the Provost's recommendation for promotion is twenty business days (ten business days for the tenure-track faculty and ten additional business days for the Provost).
- l. President's Review – The Provost will make a recommendation to the President, who will make the final decision. This decision will be reported to the UT System, as applicable. This decision will be timely communicated to the tenured faculty member.

#### 6. *Disputing Results*

- a. This policy provides the procedures for disputing professional judgements provided by reviewer(s) in the reviews addressed by this policy; thus, such disputes must be brought in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in this policy. Complaints concerning other matters addressed by UTRGV or UT System rules or (e.g., discrimination or sexual misconduct) must be brought in accordance with the applicable policy and its procedures (e.g., UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy ADM 03-100 Non-discrimination and Complaint Procedure or ADM 03-300 Sexual Misconduct). A grievable action or decision for which there is no other applicable procedure may be brought under ADM 06-111 Faculty Grievances. A faculty member may consult with their chair, dean or designee, or the Faculty Ombuds with questions about applicable procedures.

#### 7. *Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Standards, and Confidentiality*

- a. All individuals involved in the review process are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the material under review, the substance of review committee discussions, and the final recommendation. Records related to the review process will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Any person who knowingly and intentionally makes an unauthorized disclosure of review information is subject to disciplinary action.
- b. It is incumbent on each person involved in the review process to adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct, focus on factual information, avoid practices that would conflict with the ability to be fair and unbiased, and guard against inaccuracies caused by either undue emphasis or omission of information. This requirement includes:
  - i. The responsibility of each reviewer to identify a situation that would implicate a potential conflict of interest or violation of policy as soon as it arises by reporting it to the appropriate Chair and Dean so that a determination can be made,

- ii. The responsibility of each reviewer to ensure that they do not participate in a review in violation of [Rule 30106](#), Nepotism, of the Regents' Rules, which prohibit a reviewer from reviewing and taking employment actions with respect to family relations. For example, when the faculty member undergoing review has a family relation with the Department Chair or the Dean, the level where the conflict of interest exists will be skipped, and the file will move to the next level, and
- iii. The responsibility of each reviewer to ensure that they do not participate in a review in violation of UTRGV and UT System rules including a review in violation [Rule 30104](#), Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, and Outside Activities, of the Regents' Rules, which prohibit an employee from having a direct or indirect interest, including financial and other interests, or engaging in a business transaction or professional activity, or incurring any obligation of any nature that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of the employee's duties in the public interest.

#### **E. Definitions**

1. *Academic year* – the period from September 1 through the following August 31.
2. *College* – an academic unit organized within UTRGV, which is usually comprised of many departments or provides programs in multiple academic specialties/professional instruction. This academic unit may be referred to as a college or school, and is led by a dean reporting to a designated Provost or Vice President (VP).
3. *Department* – an academic unit organized within a college, usually devoted to a particular academic discipline. This academic unit may be referred to as a department or school and the unit's head (usually a chair or director) reports to the dean of the college.
4. *Department Chair* – administrative leader of an academic unit appointed by the dean with the concurrence of the Provost; may refer to the chair of a department, the director of a school, or other equivalent academic unit.
5. *Department Evaluation Guidelines* – the guidelines developed by the department or college in accordance with this policy that specify performance criteria, requirements and procedures related to the performance reviews of faculty.
6. *Pathways for Review Deadlines or Pathways* – The schedule distributed by the Provost or VP each year that provides the dates for each level of faculty performance review, e.g., department committee, chair, dean, etc.
7. *Vice President (VP)* – The Vice President with administrative authority regarding the faculty in a college.

#### **F. Related Statutes or Regulations, Rules, Policies, or Standards**

The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 10901, Statement of U. T. System Values and Expectations

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations](#)  
[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31001, Faculty Appointments and Titles](#)  
[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member](#)  
[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)  
[Texas Education Code Section 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)  
[Texas Government Code Section 552.102, Public Information Exception: Confidentiality of Certain Personnel Information](#)  
[AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#)

#### **G. Dates Reviewed or Amended**

July 15, 2019 – Amended.

September 7, 2022 – Amended and restated in its entirety ADM 06-504 Post-Tenure Review (which focused only on comprehensive periodic evaluations) to address tenured faculty annual reviews (incorporating relevant elements of ADM 06-502 Annual Faculty Evaluation), comprehensive periodic evaluations (post-tenure reviews), and reviews for promotion of tenured associate professors to the rank of professor (incorporating relevant elements of former ADM 06-505 Faculty Tenure and Promotion), and re-naming appropriately.