

## Post-Tenure Review

TAMU-CC College of Education and Human Development  
(Last revised 06/01/2024)

### 1. Procedure

#### 1.1. General

1.1.1. All COEHD tenured faculty will be evaluated in accordance with university rule 12.06.99.C1 ([Post-Tenure Review](#)). Faculty members with administrative assignments, such as department chairs, assistant/associate deans, and directors of programs with greater than 49% administrative appointments, shall be evaluated based on the faculty portion of their appointment.

### 2. Responsibility and Scope

2.1. The COEHD post-tenure review process was approved by a COEHD vote and the Office of the Provost. The COEHD Curriculum Coordinating Committee will review this procedure every five (5) years as part of scheduled updates to COEHD Handbook policies and whenever there are significant changes in the policy.

2.2. The COEHD Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee elected by the faculty will serve as the Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee. Tenured faculty representatives from each of our COEHD departmental units serve on the P&T committee (see COEHD P&T Committee Election Procedure). The charge of the P&T committee will include peer reviews for Post-Tenure Review evaluations in the spring semester of each academic year.

2.3. Every tenured member of the faculty will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review every six (6) years or following the second *Unsatisfactory* rating in the annual performance review in any category within six (6) 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.

2.3.1. 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.

2.3.2. Except for leaves occurring in the sixth year, periods when a faculty member is on leave will still count toward the six-year evaluation period.

2.3.3. The COEHD Dean's Office maintains a roster that determines the timing for a post tenure evaluation.

2.4. The basis of the review is the record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Each candidate for COEHD post-tenure review will prepare a portfolio including the following materials for the six (6) years under review:

2.4.1. An executive summary (2 pages maximum) that clearly illustrates how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service have contributed to their yearly goals, and meet the

qualifications of each area.

2.4.2. Current curriculum vitae

2.4.3. Results of Annual performance evaluations (ADEPs) for the five (5) calendar years preceding the notice of Post-Tenure Review.

2.4.4. A chart indicating semester, date, course name and number, the yearly course evaluations overall score, and number of students.

2.4.5. Annual Faculty Activity Reports as submitted for ADEP process for each of the five (5) calendar years preceding the notice of Post-Tenure Review.

### 3. Post-Tenure Review Categories

3.1. The Peer Committee will evaluate faculty performance in each area: Teaching, Scholarship & service will be evaluated according to the COEHD rubric used in the annual ADEP process. The committee will prepare a report for each post-tenure candidate and submit to the COEHD dean. The report shall state the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive evaluation rating, and the basis for that determination. Ratings include:

3.1.1. *Satisfactory Performance (Averaging a 2 or above on ADEP Annual Review Rubric)*– Faculty member meets responsibilities and provides contributions comparable to that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Strengths are commended, and weaknesses are identified for near-term improvement.

3.1.2. *Unsatisfactory Performance (Averaging Below 2 on Annual Review Rubric)*– Faculty member does not meet minimum expectations for assigned responsibilities and contributions consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Reflects disregard of previous advice or efforts to provide correction, assistance, and/or professional misconduct, dereliction of duty or incompetence. Unsatisfactory reviews are subject to further evaluation and recommendation by the dean and provost.

3.2. As in the COEHD ADEP Process, a comprehensive rating of each Post-Tenure Review candidate's overall performance will be documented by the weighted average of ratings received in each of the three performance areas. The materials will be forward to the COEHD Dean for review.

3.3. The COEHD dean will review materials and recommendations, include their evaluation, and initiate any required remediation process.

3.4. If the peer committee evaluation is unsatisfactory in any category, the peer review committee evaluation report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) and details of the unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee's decision.

### 4. The COEHD Evaluation Process

4.1. The COEHD Dean's Office will maintain a record of faculty members' performance reviews and status (promotion and tenure status) to establish a timeline for each faculty review.

- 4.2. By **October 15**, tenured faculty member will be notified that he or she will undergo a comprehensive periodic review during the following spring semester.
- 4.3. Faculty members requesting a deferral of a scheduled post-tenure review as specified in section 3.4 of university rule 12.06.99.C1 ([Post-Tenure Review](#)), must submit a request in writing (2 pages maximum) to the COEHD dean specifying rationale for deferral request within ten (10) business days of receiving notification of the scheduled Post-Tenure Review. The COEHD dean or designate may request to meet with the faculty member to discuss the deferral request. Upon review, the deferral request will be forwarded to the provost for review alongside a recommendation from the dean related to disposition on the deferral. Deferrals of scheduled Post-Tenure Reviews will only be granted after receiving provost approval.
- 4.4. By **January 20**, all Post-Tenure Review candidates will submit their current curriculum vitae, summary of teaching evaluations as well as their annual faculty activity reports to the electronic faculty review system. The Office of the Dean will upload the candidate's annual (ADEP) evaluations. Each review candidate's department chair will provide a statement regarding the faculty members' workload assignments during the six (6) year review period to the dean or designate. If a faculty member has written a response to any annual evaluation during the review period, the response letter(s) will be included.
- 4.5. By **February 1**, the dean or designate will provide the COEHD Promotion and Tenure committee (P&T) with a copy of the submitted documents (see composition of P&T committee) to enable a peer review of candidate's performance in all areas of faculty responsibility.
- 4.6. By **March 1**, the P&T committee will upload their evaluation report for each faculty member to that candidate's case in the electronic faculty review system. The report shall state the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive evaluation rating, and the basis for that determination. In reviewing the Post-Tenure Review candidate's portfolio, the promotion and Tenure Committee shall consider annual performance criteria and review results specified in the COEHD Annual Review Process (Annual Development Plan; ADEP) process for each of the six years which are considered in the review.
  - 4.6.1. Results of Peer Review Evaluation. If the peer-review evaluation is *Unsatisfactory* in any category, the peer- review committee evaluation report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) and particulars of the unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee's decision. The report shall refrain from speculating on the reasons why the performance is unsatisfactory.
- 4.7. After reviewing the P&T committee's evaluation report, the dean shall prepare an individual evaluation for each faculty member under review. This report will be uploaded to the candidate's case in the electronic faculty review system.
- 4.8. The dean will meet with the Post-Tenure Review candidate to inform them of the dean's and P&T committee's recommendations. The faculty member will be provided a copy of the P&T committee's and dean's written evaluations.
  - 4.8.1. Upon request by the faculty member, the dean shall inform them of the numerical results of the P&T committee's vote.
  - 4.8.2. The faculty member may submit a written response to the P&T committee's and dean's

written evaluations through their case in the electronic faculty review system. Responses must be uploaded within five (5) business days of the meeting with the dean and will be included in the reports and recommendations forwarded to the provost.

4.9. By **April 1**, the dean's and peer-review committee's reports and recommendations and faculty response if applicable will be submitted along with a copy of the college post-tenure review process to the Office of the Provost.

4.10. By **April 30**, the provost will review the provided documentation and prepare a final decision regarding each faculty member's post-tenure review rating to be communicated to the COEHD dean and the COEHD P&T committee. The provost will upload the final Post-Tenure Review rating to the candidate's case in the electronic faculty review system.

## 5. The Professional Development Plan

5.1. If the faculty receives an *unsatisfactory* rating in any area, or an overall rating of Unsatisfactory, the faculty member, in collaboration with the P&T committee and department chair shall establish a professional development plan within 30 days of receiving the final decision. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the dean. Should the 30-day period end after the conclusion of the spring semester the deadline will be extended until September 15 in accordance with university rule 12.06.99.C1 ([Post-Tenure Review](#)).

5.2. The plan will:

5.2.1. Indicate the university resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member in achieving the goals of the plan

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

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

5.3. The original written evaluation and development plan shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost with a copy maintained in the COEHD Dean's Office.

5.4. Normally, the development plan period will be for two (2) years. The department chair/dean, with input from the P&T Committee, will assess evidence of improvement after one year. The faculty member's department chair will be responsible for writing a one-year status report, and a final report will be submitted to the dean and provost by **May 15** of ensuing years.

5.5. The successful completion of the PDP is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. However, if the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period, the department chair/dean will take appropriate administrative action, up to including recommendation for dismissal proceedings.

## 6. Disciplinary Action

6.1. 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 rule 12.01.99.CO.05 ([Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments](#)) and System Policy 12.01 ([Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure](#)).