

## Implementation Plan for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

### School of Health Professions University of Texas Medical Branch

In accordance with the *Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents* of the University of Texas System and UTMB's IHOP Policy 5.5.2 Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, this document provides the policies and procedures to govern the comprehensive periodic review of all tenured faculty members, including administrators with tenured faculty appointments in the School of Health Professions.

#### I. Intent

Comprehensive periodic evaluation of tenured faculty is intended to enhance and protect the important guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. The purpose of periodic evaluation is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; to re-focus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to UTMB and to the State of Texas (*Rules and Regulations*, Rule 31102, Section 3). Comprehensive periodic evaluation is distinct from annual review but may be done concurrently according to the policies and procedures provided for below.

#### II. General Policies

The following general policies will apply to the post tenure review process:

- Each tenured member of the faculty must be reviewed at least once every six years.
- Reviews must include a consideration of the faculty member's teaching, scholarly activity, service, administration, and, for faculty with clinical responsibilities, patient care (*Rules and Regulations*, Rule 31102, Section 5.2).
- Reviews must include evaluations by peers and students.
- The review process will include at least two levels of review.
- Evaluation of the comprehensive tenure review process will occur yearly coincident with the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) review process (See IHOP Policy 5.3.6 Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, or Membership in all Schools).

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

### III. General Procedures

- 1) Each tenured faculty member will be notified in writing by February 1st of the year in which he/she is to be reviewed.
- 2) All review materials must be submitted to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee by September 1.
- 3) The APT Committee will review materials and make a recommendation to the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee (a.k.a. tenure review committee or comprehensive periodic review committee) by November 30, forwarding all materials by that date.
- 4) Following receipt of the materials from the APT Committee, the PTR Committee will review the materials and render its recommendations to the Dean by January 15 of the following year.
- 5) The Dean will communicate the results of the process to the faculty member by February 1.
- 6) Faculty members to be reviewed must be notified at least 6 months before the review is to begin by the chairperson of the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee.
- 7) Required Materials
  - a. To satisfy requirements for review, the tenured faculty member must submit the following:
    - (1) a current curriculum vitae, which reflects a complete summary of professional accomplishments,
    - (2) summary statement covering the preceding six year period which includes a complete description of faculty activities in teaching, scholarly activities, and service,
    - (3) annual reviews (which typically include the planning document, reporting document, and faculty self-assessment) including peer evaluations,
    - (4) all teaching evaluations during the six year period,
    - (5) Chair's letter of review (see below).
      - i. Each review must also include a letter of appraisal by the department chair or administrative supervisor that summarizes and elucidates the chair's views of the faculty member's

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

achievement over the past six years, including overall contribution to the departmental mission in comparison to other faculty members of comparable rank.

- ii. Any expectations regarding performance by the faculty member that are unique to the department or the particular type of appointment held by the faculty member must be clearly defined in this letter.
- iii. The letter will be submitted by the department chairperson or appropriate supervisor directly to the Chair of the APT Committee.

b. These materials may be supplemented by copies of:

- (1) proposed professional goals,
- (2) a proposed professional development plan,
- (3) publications,
- (4) course outlines,
- (5) lists of continuing education activities with documentation,
- (6) and any other supplemental materials the faculty member wishes to submit as part of the comprehensive review.

c. At their discretion, review committees may also request additional information.

d. Faculty members may provide an oral summary of their written submission to the APT Committee and/or the PTR Committee.

e. Failure to submit required materials in a form and manner acceptable to the Committee will ordinarily result in an unsatisfactory recommendation.

### IV. Review by the APT Committee

- 1) The APT Committee will review all material submitted by the faculty member and Department Chair or Administrative Supervisor.
- 2) The faculty member's Chair or Supervisor may be present during the deliberations for the purpose of providing information and clarification, but will not be present during the faculty member's oral presentation, nor during the voting process.
- 3) Based on this review, the APT Committee will provide the PTR Committee with a written summary of its deliberations, recommendations and formal

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

vote regarding the performance of the faculty member.

- 4) Only those members of the APT Committee who are tenured will participate in the vote.
- 5) Each faculty member being reviewed will be placed in one of the following categories:
  - a. exceeds expectations;
  - b. meets expectations;
  - c. does not meet expectations; or
  - d. unsatisfactory.
- 6) Expectations are set according to the faculty member's rank, discipline and institution/School.
- 7) The vote will be recorded by written ballot.
- 8) The exact vote including abstentions will be recorded along with the number of voting and non-voting members present during the review and deliberations.
- 9) The APT Committee evaluation and vote will be forwarded to the PTR Committee and will be part of the final documentation submitted to the Dean.

### V. Review by the Post Tenure Review Committee

- 1) The PTR Committee will provide a complete and independent review of all materials submitted to the APT Committee (i.e. the faculty member's dossier, the letter from the departmental Chairperson or administrative supervisor, and the recommendations and vote of the APT Committee). Review will take place independently in the PTR Committee regardless of the decisions or findings of the APT Committee.
- 2) The faculty member's Chair or Supervisor may be present during the deliberations for the purpose of providing information and clarification, but will not be present during the Faculty member's oral presentation, nor during the voting process.
- 3) Each faculty member being reviewed will be placed in one of the following categories:

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

- a. exceeds expectations;
  - b. meets expectations;
  - c. does not meet expectations; or
  - d. unsatisfactory. Expectations are set according to the faculty member's rank, discipline and institution/School.
- 4) The PTR Committee at their discretion may request that the APT Committee reconsider their recommendation and review additional information, e.g. invite qualified external reviewers to comment on the merit and significance of a faculty member's teaching, scholarship or service.
  - 5) When the APT and PTR findings are markedly divergent, the PTR Chair will call a joint meeting of the APT and PTR committees.
    - a. The members of both committees involved in the review will consider the findings of both committees and if possible resolve significant and major differences in the findings and/or perceived implications of those findings.
    - b. If there is still a significant difference, a detailed explanation and rationale for the different recommendations will be signed by both Committee Chairs and must accompany the reports forwarded to the Dean.

### VI. PTR Committee Membership

- 1) The PTR Committee will consist of the following members:
  - a. three tenured faculty members elected from the faculty assembly
  - b. one tenured department chair elected by the Chairs' Council, and
  - c. one tenured representative from another school within the University.
- 2) The Chairperson of the PTR Committee will be elected by the members.
- 3) Standard operating procedures and terms of office will be determined by the committee and made available for public review.

### VII. Recommendations of the Post Tenure Review Committee

- 1) The PTR Committee will forward their recommendation to the Dean, not later than January 15 of the year following the initiation of review.
- 2) This recommendation will take one of four forms: The faculty member's performance:
  - a. exceeds expectations;
  - b. meets expectations;

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

- c. does not meet expectations; or
  - d. is unsatisfactory.
- 3) When requested, the PTR Committee will provide the faculty member's chair, supervisor, and/or Dean with those areas (teaching, research, service) that could benefit from support or remediation.
  - 4) Given that the stated purpose of periodic evaluation is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, and to refocus academic efforts, when appropriate, the PTR Committee will, at the request of any individual faculty member, also provide a separate letter that includes commendations for outstanding work and suggestions for development possibilities that emerge from the review.
  - 5) If the faculty member receives a satisfactory recommendation (a. or b.) that includes suggestions for improvement; or a recommendation of c. does not meet expectations; or d. unsatisfactory, the PTR Committee must provide specific written recommendations for faculty development and a clear statement of areas of deficiency and the standards of performance necessary for a satisfactory review.
  - 6) A recommendation of 'does not meet expectations' will necessitate an annual monitoring by the chair or supervisor for evidence of improvement or insufficient improvement, which will be forwarded to the PTR Committee; that Committee may request further documentation.
  - 7) If after two annual monitoring's by the chair/supervisor and PTR Committee, the faculty member has demonstrated insufficient improvement, then the faculty member will be subject to a comprehensive review by the PTR Committee. During this period the faculty member would have the opportunity to initiate change and provide new documentation of progress (Regent's Rules, Section 5.1.g.3).
  - 8) In those instances where a Chair/supervisor finds the annual review of a tenured faculty member to be rated 'unsatisfactory' for two consecutive annual reviews, the faculty member may be subject to a comprehensive review by the PTR Committee (Regent's Rules, Section 5.1.g.4 )Individuals whose performance is rated 'unsatisfactory' may be subject to further review and/or appropriate administrative action. If incompetence, neglect of duty, or

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

other appropriate causes are determined to be present, appropriate disciplinary action may be taken (Regents' Rules, Section 5.3.). All proceedings for termination of tenured faculty on the basis of periodic performance evaluation shall be only for incompetency, neglect of duty or other good cause shown and must be conducted in accordance with the due process procedures of the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, Series 31108, including an opportunity of referral of the matter to alternative dispute resolution. Such proceedings must also include a list of specific charges by the chief administrative officer and an opportunity for a hearing before a faculty tribunal. In all such cases, the burden of proof shall be on the institution, and the rights of a faculty member to due process and academic freedom shall be protected.

### VIII. Role of the Dean

- 1) The Dean shall report the recommendation of the PTR Committee to the faculty member by letter no later than February 1 of the year in which the recommendation has been made. This letter shall include the conclusions of the committees and any recommendations for improvement, if requested.
  - a. A recommendation of 'does not meet expectations' will necessitate an annual monitoring by the chair or supervisor for evidence of improvement or insufficient improvement.
  - b. If the PTR recommendation is that performance has been rated 'unsatisfactory', the letter will inform the faculty member that he/she may be subject to further review and/or appropriate administrative action, according to current provisions of the *Regent's Rules and Regulations (Section 5.3)*.
- 2) A recommendation for termination or change in status of a tenured member of the faculty will automatically be reviewed by the Provost and must be approved before a letter of termination is implemented.

### IX. Expected Standards of Performance

- 1) Expected standards of performance will include, but not be limited to:
  - Evidence that teaching is satisfactory as judged by students, peers and department chairs.

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

- Evidence that administrative functions are satisfactory.
  - Evidence that scholarship is at a level and quality commensurate with that found for tenured faculty at peer institutions.
  - Evidence that service to the department, school, university and community is satisfactory. Evidence that clinical work, if applicable, is deemed acceptable by qualified peers or supervisors.
  - Indication that the faculty member has met collegial expectations and agreements as indicated by the departmental chair.
- 2) Additional standards for satisfactory performance may be determined by a majority vote of the faculty and approval of the Dean. All standards of performance used in post tenure review must be consistent with any guidelines adopted by the Board of Regents and the University of Texas System.
  - 3) Ordinarily, documented weaknesses or deficiencies in two or more areas will indicate unsatisfactory overall performance.

### X. Scheduling of Reviews

Ordinarily, tenured faculty members will be scheduled for review during the sixth academic year following their consideration and awarding of tenure. Therefore, if a faculty member was awarded tenure during the 2006-2007 academic year, he/she would be reviewed during the 2012-2013 academic year. That is, the individual would be notified of review in February of 2012 and notified of the Dean's recommendation in February of 2013.

### XI. Exemptions

Promotion of tenured faculty to associate professor or professor can serve as a periodic comprehensive review, and can re-start the 6 year cycle of post tenure review; appointment to an endowed position will ordinarily defer scheduled tenure review for a one-year period. Deferments of one year may be granted for faculty on leave of absence. No exemptions will be granted for administrative assignments or titles.

### XII. Appeals

The multiple levels of review described in this document are designed to protect the integrity of both the faculty member and the standards of the school and institution.

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty – 3/18/15

Every attempt will be made in the comprehensive tenure review process to make all relevant information regarding faculty members being evaluated available to the review committees and responsible administrative officers.

### XIII. Subrogation of Policies to Existing Rules and Regulations

No part of this document is intended to change existing policies concerning termination of faculty for good cause. According to long-standing *Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents and IHOP Policy 5.3.10 Termination*, review for termination for good cause is possible at any time. Due process procedures must be followed.

#### **SHP APT & PTR Committee Timelines**

**NOTE:** Seeking promotion or tenure is in part a career decision and as such should include planning on the part of the individual, in concert with his/her chair. This will permit advanced planning and ideally will be a part of the annual review leading up to the time of application. Individuals are encouraged to plan in advance for either of these career decisions.

Please refer to the [Timeline APT-PTR Process](#) link below for the timeline of the APT/PTR process.

[http://shp.utmb.edu/faculty\\_handbook/Timeline%20APT-PTRprocess%2006-27-2012.pdf](http://shp.utmb.edu/faculty_handbook/Timeline%20APT-PTRprocess%2006-27-2012.pdf)

**NOTE:** Unless extenuating circumstances can be documented, the APT & PTR Committee will strictly adhere to these published deadlines.