

POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV).

B. Persons Affected

This policy applies to tenured faculty members of UTRGV.

C. Policy

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.

D. Procedures

1. *Review frequency and schedule*

- a. Comprehensive performance evaluations must occur every six years following the award of tenure. When they coincide, the comprehensive review will include the Faculty Annual Evaluation (See ADM 6-502: Annual Faculty Evaluation). When they coincide, the information provided for the review of an endowed position (e.g., endowed professor or endowed chair) may be incorporated into the appropriate elements of the comprehensive review.
- b. The schedule for the review will follow the “Pathways for Review Deadlines” posted on the website of the appropriate Executive Vice President (EVP).
- c. In accordance with the date established in the Pathways for Review Deadlines, the office of the appropriate EVP will provide the deans’ offices with the list of their faculty members who are due for post tenure review during the next academic year. The Deans’ offices shall then notify their respective faculty members accordingly.
- d. The 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 approved leave.
- e. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.

- f. Periods when a faculty member is on unpaid leave, medical leave, or assigned a full-time administrative position will not be counted toward the six-year period between successive comprehensive performance reviews, within the following guidelines:
 - i. If the total time on leave or assigned to a full-time administrative position is more than four months, the comprehensive performance review will be delayed for one year, unless the dean or appropriate EVP approve a longer delay.
 - ii. If a period of leave of at least three months duration occurs within the six months immediately prior to a scheduled comprehensive performance review period, the comprehensive performance review will be delayed by at least one year, unless the faculty member requests that the comprehensive performance review not be delayed.
 - iii. Other circumstances that might be considered cause for modifying the comprehensive performance review schedule are subject to the approvals of the dean and appropriate EVP.

2. *Department Review Committee*

- a. Comprehensive performance reviews will be carried out at the department level by a Department Review Committee that will include at least three tenured faculty members at an equivalent or higher rank of each of the faculty member(s) undergoing review.
- b. When there are fewer than three tenured faculty members at an equivalent or higher rank of the faculty member(s) undergoing review, the department chair, in consultation with the dean, may invite full professors from other departments to participate as members of the Department Review Committee.
- c. When the faculty member undergoing review is the department chair, that level will be skipped and the file will move to the next level (i.e., the dean).
- d. The Department Review Committee is elected by the voting members of the department faculty.
- e. The chair of the Department Review Committee will be elected by the committee members.
- f. Faculty members with part-time administrative positions (with the exception of the college's associate deans) are eligible to serve on the Department Review Committee.

3. *Comprehensive Performance Review Process*

- a. Faculty will be evaluated based on the department's approved criteria and using the evaluation categories described in ADM 6-502, Annual Faculty Evaluation.
- b. Information to be submitted for the annual review includes:
 - i. A current curriculum vita;
 - ii. Updated summaries of professional achievements (e.g., Summary of Teaching Evaluations, Summary of Teaching Achievement, Summary of Research/Scholarship, Summary of Service) according to the department guidelines for the review period;
 - iii. Student evaluations of teaching for the period under review;
Peer evaluations of teaching as per the department or college, or in the case of departments and colleges without such guidelines of the *University Guidelines*;
 - v. Any other materials or supporting documentation as per the department or college criteria.
- c. Faculty members appointed to part-time administrative positions will be reviewed with appropriate consideration given to the demands of administrative assignments and their impact on the level of research/creative activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
- d. The Department Review Committee will review the submitted materials and make a determination concerning the quality of the faculty member's contribution to the mission of the department and college using the criteria developed by the department. The Department Review Committee will consider all activities and accomplishments of the faculty member from the previous six years.
- e. If the Department Review Committee concludes that the faculty member "Does not meet expectations" or is "Unsatisfactory" in any category, the committee may ask the faculty member to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in the areas of concern.
- f. The chair of the Department Review Committee will communicate the Review Committee's evaluation and recommendation to the faculty member and the department chair.
- g. The department chair will conduct an independent review of the faculty member and communicate his other recommendation to the faculty member and the dean.
- h. Upon review of the Department Review Committee's and chair's recommendations, the dean will make a decision concerning the results of the comprehensive performance review.
- i. If the dean's decision is "Does not meet expectations" or "Unsatisfactory" in overall, then the dean may appoint, either at the request of the faculty member or if the dean believes

one is needed, a college Review Committee to review the case. If a college Review Committee is appointed:

- i. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in the area(s) of concern to the college Review Committee;
 - ii. The college Review Committee will submit its report to the dean; and
 - iii. The dean will then determine results of the comprehensive performance review and, recommend any necessary actions or follow-up.
- j. The dean will communicate the results of the comprehensive performance review to the appropriate EVP for review and approval.
 - k. Once reviewed and approved by the appropriate EVP, he or she will communicate the final comprehensive performance review results in writing to the faculty member, the department chair, and the President. The appropriate EVP is also required to send a summary of the institutional post-tenure review outcomes to The University of Texas System.

4. *Outcome of Comprehensive Performance Evaluation*

- a. Faculty will be evaluated based on the approved departmental criteria and using the evaluation categories described in *Regents' Rule 31102*.
- b. If the final result of the comprehensive performance review is "Exceeds expectations," or "Meets expectations," the faculty member will not undergo another comprehensive performance review for six years unless a comprehensive review is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews.
- c. If a faculty member receives a rating of "Does not meet expectations" or "Unsatisfactory" in any of the three evaluation areas, the faculty member must develop an action plan to be reviewed and approved by the chair and dean, to address any weaknesses or concerns and enhance or strengthen the faculty member's portfolio 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.
- d. If a faculty member receives a rating of "Does not meet expectations" on the comprehensive performance, it may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, mentoring in research issues or service expectations, or adjustment of assigned duties. Such arrangements should be built into the action plan.

- e. If the comprehensive performance review 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 appropriate EVP.
- f. If the overall result of a comprehensive performance review is an “Unsatisfactory” rating, this may result in an additional review by the appropriate EVP or designee to determine if good cause exists for termination under Regents’ *Rules* 31008 and 31102.
- g. The comprehensive performance review outcome is not subject to resolution outside of this process. The outcome may be appealed through each of the review levels up to the appropriate EVP as outlined in the “Pathways for Review Deadlines.” The decision of the EVP is final.

E. Definitions

1. College – An academic unit organized within the university, 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 EVP.
2. 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, school, or center, and the unit’s head (usually a chair or director) reports to the dean of the college.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Meets expectations - reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
6. Tenure - refers to a faculty status that assures that the faculty will be able to perform their professional institutional responsibilities without the fear of arbitrary dismissal. Tenure provides an employment framework that reinforces academic freedom and promotes a professional climate conducive to the success of UTRGV in fulfilling its mission.
7. Unit - refers to a school, department, program, or other academic equivalent.
8. 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 involves *prima facie* professional misconduct,

dereliction of duty, or incompetence. The same units that specify the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

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

[The University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31102](#), Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

[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 31008](#), Termination of a Faculty Member

Texas Government Code Section 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

G. Dates Reviewed or Amended

Amended on July 15, 2019