

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 (post-tenure review), 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. It is the policy of UTRGV to conduct periodic performance evaluations of tenured faculty to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty in enhancing professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to UTRGV and the State of Texas.
2. Promotion 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 mission.

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.

2. *Schedule of Reviews*

- a. Pathways for Review Deadlines – The Provost/VP will post Pathways for Review Deadlines (Pathways) on their 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 of faculty performance review. It is the faculty member's responsibility to be aware of and to follow all Pathways deadlines.

b. Annual Review

- i. All tenured faculty will be evaluated for their work performance in teaching, research, service, and patient care, as applicable, each academic year following the schedule set forth in Pathways.
- ii. The annual evaluation 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.
- iii. To receive a deferral, the faculty member must make a request in writing to their chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost/VP and receive written approval by the chair, dean, and Provost/VP or designees by the deadline.

c. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Post-tenure Review)

- i. All faculty will undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation of their professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service, and patient care, as applicable, at least every six years after the award of tenure and following the schedule set forth in Pathways.
- ii. The comprehensive periodic evaluation dossier will serve as the annual evaluation dossier.
- iii. At the time of promotion to Professor, the six-year period will restart.
- iv. The office of the Provost/VP will provide the deans' offices with the list of their faculty members who are due for a comprehensive periodic evaluation at least six (6) months prior to the date established in Pathways for the review(s) to begin. The deans' offices shall then notify their respective faculty members of their upcoming comprehensive periodic evaluation. Faculty members are also responsible for ensuring their comprehensive periodic evaluation is conducted at least every six years. If a faculty member is due for a comprehensive periodic evaluation but does not receive notice as provided by this section, it is the duty of the faculty member to immediately inform their chair and dean. The dean will review and reconcile records with the Provost/VP so that if the comprehensive periodic evaluation is due, it can be initiated in a timely manner.
- v. The comprehensive periodic evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as:

1. 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;
 2. when the faculty member is on approved leave for more than four months during the six-year period;
 3. when the 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
 4. when the faculty member is undergoing a review for appointment to an endowed position.
- vi. To receive a deferral, the faculty member must make a request in writing to their chair prior to the deadline established by the Provost/VP and receive written approval by the chair, dean, and Provost/VP or designees by the deadline.
 - vii. A deferral of the comprehensive periodic evaluation of an active faculty member must not extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.
- d. Promotion Review
- i. The standard time in the associate professor rank for promotion to professor is six years.
 - ii. A tenured associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of professor may apply early if the faculty member believes their performance record substantially exceeds the department's evaluation guidelines for promotion to professor. To be considered for an early promotion review, the faculty member must submit the external review request and dossier in accordance with Pathways.
 - iii. Future considerations for the promotion to professor are not affected by a denial of an application for early promotion.
 - iv. The promotion review dossier will serve as the comprehensive periodic evaluation and annual evaluation dossiers.

3. *Department Evaluation Guidelines*

Each department must develop its own evaluation guidelines that address performance criteria, requirements, and procedures for the annual review of tenured faculty, the comprehensive periodic evaluation, and promotion to Professor. The department guidelines must be in accordance with [Appendix A – Department Guideline Requirements](#) and [Appendix B –](#)

[Evaluation/Review Categories and Standards](#). A college may vote to develop guidelines that will be used by all departments within the college.

4. *Annual Review*

- a. Dossier – The faculty member must compile and submit their dossier, meeting the requirements outlined in [Appendix D – Dossier Requirements](#), by the deadline stated in Pathways.
- b. Department Review Committee – A department committee will be established in accordance with [Appendix E – Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review](#).
- c. Department Committee and Chair Review – The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee and chair levels. Each review level must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member’s accomplishments in each review category for their assigned duties (e.g., teaching, research, service, etc.). In each review category, the assessment should highlight strengths and weaknesses, provide recommendations for improvement, and provide recommendations for progress toward the next comprehensive periodic evaluation or promotion review.
- d. Performance Ratings – Each review level shall also rate the faculty member in each evaluation category with one of the following four (4) ratings: exceeds expectations; meets expectations; does not meet expectations; or unsatisfactory. An overall rating must also be provided.
- e. Dean Review of Evaluation – After the department chair’s review, the results of the department committee and chair evaluations will be reported to the dean for review and approval. The dean’s review is final except as provided below.
- f. Reconsideration – A faculty member may request a reconsideration at the department committee and chair levels of review in accordance with the Request for Reconsideration section in [Appendix E](#).
- g. Appeal. If in the dean’s review the overall rating is unsatisfactory or does not meet expectations and that rating is inconsistent with the previous level, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost/VP who will review the information and provide a final decision. If the organizational structure does not support the levels of review provided for in the policy and the administrative leader of the unit has not designated an additional reviewer (such that an appeal to the Provost/VP as provided above is not available), the faculty member may ask for reconsideration by the dean.
- h. Annual Review Outcomes
 - i. *Merit* – The outcome of a faculty member's annual performance evaluations will be considered in determining eligibility for a merit pay increase, should merit pay increase be available. To be eligible for a merit pay increase, the faculty member must be in good

standing, meet or exceed expectations, and meet the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.

- ii. *Support or Remediation* – If the annual review raises concerns about the faculty member’s performance in one or more areas, as indicated by “does not meet expectations” or “unsatisfactory,” this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support or remediation. The faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VP to the chair and dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member’s performance in the designated area(s). The faculty member’s progress in response to the additional support will be monitored and addressed by the review levels in subsequent annual evaluations. The faculty member’s progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions, as outlined below.
 - iii. *Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation* – A tenured faculty member who receives an "unsatisfactory" rating for two consecutive annual reviews may be required to undergo a comprehensive periodic evaluation. The decision regarding whether to require the comprehensive periodic evaluation in this circumstance will be made by the dean after consultation with the Provost/VP.
 - iv. *Disciplinary Action* – A faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with Regents’ Rule 31008, for poor performance or when other good cause exists.
5. *Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Post-Tenure Review)*
- a. Dossier – The faculty member must compile and submit their dossier meeting the requirements outlined in [Appendix D](#) by the deadline stated in Pathways.
 - b. Review Committees – Review committees will be established in accordance with [Appendix E – Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review](#).
 - c. Department Committee, Chair, and Dean Reviews – The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee, chair, and dean levels. Each review level must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member’s accomplishments in each review category (e.g., teaching, research, and service). In each review category, the assessment should highlight strengths and weaknesses, provide recommendations for improvement, and recommendations for progress toward the next post-tenure or promotion review.
 - d. Performance Ratings – Department-level reviews will rate the faculty member in each evaluation category and with an overall rating for the annual evaluation period with one of the following four (4) ratings: exceeds expectations; meets expectations; does not meet

- expectations; or unsatisfactory. The department committee, chair, and dean will also provide an overall rating for the comprehensive evaluation period.
- e. Additional Evidence of Work Performance – If the department review committee, chair, or dean concludes that the faculty member “does not meet expectations” or is “unsatisfactory” in any category, they may ask the faculty member to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in any areas of concern.
 - f. Reconsideration – A faculty member may request a reconsideration at each of the above levels of review in accordance with the Request for Reconsideration section in [Appendix E – Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review](#).
 - g. Appeal – If the faculty member is not satisfied with the results of the evaluation, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost/VP who will review the file, including evaluations provided by the previous review levels, and provide a final decision.
 - h. The dean will communicate the results of the comprehensive periodic evaluations to the Provost and VP or their designee for review and appropriate action.
 - i. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Outcomes
 - i. *Merit* – The outcome of a faculty member's comprehensive periodic evaluation 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 meet or exceed the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.
 - ii. *Remediation Plan* – If a faculty member receives a rating of “does not meet expectations” or “unsatisfactory” in any of the evaluation areas, the faculty member must develop and submit an action plan by the deadline established by the Provost/VP to the chair and dean for their review and approval. The plan must address the performance weaknesses or concerns and any support to enhance or strengthen the faculty member’s performance in the designated area(s). The faculty member’s progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions, as outlined below. If the comprehensive periodic evaluation is “unsatisfactory” in any of the areas, the dean, in consultation with the department chair may recommend a change in the faculty member’s workload or recommend additional actions to the Provost/VP.
 - iii. *Disciplinary Action* – A faculty member may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including termination in accordance with [Rule 31008](#), Termination of a Faculty Member, of the *Regents’ Rules* for poor performance or when other good cause exists.

- j. The Provost will send a summary of the institutional comprehensive review outcomes to The University of Texas System.

6. *Promotion to Professor*

- a. Dossier – The faculty member must compile and submit their dossier meeting the requirements outlined in [Appendix D](#) by the deadline stated in Pathways.
- b. Review Committees – Review committees will be established in accordance with [Appendix E – Review Committee Composition and Requirements Regarding the Review](#).
- c. External Reviews – Faculty going up for promotion are required to include external reviews of their research in accordance with the department guidelines, or in departments without such guidelines, in accordance with the university guidelines (*Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers for Faculty Promotion and Tenure*) posted on the Provost’s website. The process for obtaining external reviews should start in the long semester prior to the application year as outlined in Pathways.
- d. Review Levels – The faculty member will be evaluated at the department committee, chair, college committee, dean, university committee, and Provost/VP levels. Each level of review must include a written narrative providing an assessment of the faculty member’s accomplishments in each review category. In each review category, the assessment should highlight strengths and weaknesses, provide recommendations for improvement, and provide a recommendation regarding promotion. In the promotion review, the department committee, chair, and dean will provide performance ratings for the comprehensive period and the annual evaluation period, following the guidelines for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Section D.5.d). All levels of review are not required if the organizational structure does not support it.
- e. Additional Evidence of Work Performance – Once the promotion dossier is submitted, the faculty member may request to update information such as publications or grants with the permission of the departmental committee or chair. Each level of review may also submit a request through the faculty portfolio system for additional information from the faculty member to be included in the dossier. The correspondence and the additional information shall be included with the dossier for subsequent review levels to consider.
- f. Request for Reconsideration of Promotion Decisions – A faculty member may request a reconsideration at each of the above levels of review in accordance with the Request for Reconsideration section in [Appendix E](#).
- g. President’s Review – The Provost/VP will make a recommendation to the President, who will make the final decision. This decision will be reported to UT System, as applicable. This decision will be timely communicated to the faculty member.

7. *Disputing Review/Evaluation Results*

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 Office of the Faculty Ombuds with questions about applicable procedures.

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 appropriate Provost or VP; 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.