

Implementation Plan for Periodic Performance Evaluation  
of Tenured Faculty  
School of Allied Health Sciences  
University of Texas Medical Branch

In accordance with the Guidelines of the Regents of the University of Texas System, this document provides for policies and procedures to govern the periodic review of all tenured faculty members including administrators with tenured faculty appointments in the School of Allied Health Sciences.

### Intent

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 the University and to the State of Texas. Periodic evaluation is distinct from annual review but may be done concurrently according to the policies and policies provided for below.

### 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, and, for faculty with clinical responsibilities, patient care.
- Reviews must include evaluations by peers and students.
- The review process will include at least two levels of review.

### General Procedures

Each tenured faculty member will be notified in writing by February 1st of the year in which he/she is to be reviewed. All review materials must be submitted by September 1. The APT Committee will review materials and make a recommendation to the Tenure Review Committee by November 30, forwarding all materials by that date. The Tenure Review Committee will review materials following receipt of the materials from the APT Committee and render its recommendations to the Dean by January 15 of

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty-SAHS 5/2005

the following year. The Dean will communicate the results of the process to the faculty member by February 1.

Faculty members to be reviewed must be notified at least 6 months before the review is to begin by the chairperson of the tenure review committee (TRC). 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 including peer evaluations, (4) all teaching evaluations during the six year period, (5) Chair's letter of review -see below.

These materials may be supplemented by copies of proposed professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, publications, course outlines, lists of continuing education activities with documentation, and any other supplemental materials the faculty member wishes to submit. At their discretion, review committees may also request additional information.

Faculty members may provide an oral summary of their written submission to the APT committee and/or the Tenure Review committee.

Each review must also include a letter of appraisal by the department chair that summarizes and elucidates the chair's views of the faculty member's achievement over the past six years, including overall contribution to the departmental mission in comparison to other faculty members of comparable rank. 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. The letter will be submitted by the department chairperson or appropriate supervisor directly to the Chairman of the APT Committee. Failure to submit required materials in a form and manner acceptable to the committee will ordinarily result in an unsatisfactory recommendation.

### Review by the APT Committee

The APT Committee will review all material submitted by the faculty member and Department Chair or Administrative Supervisor. The 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. Based on this review, the APT Committee will provide the Tenure Review

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty-SAHS 5/2005

Committee with a written summary of its deliberations, recommendations and formal vote regarding the performance of the faculty member. Only those members of the APT Committee who are tenured will participate in the vote. The vote will address the following question: Is the faculty member performing in a manner consistent with expectations? The vote will be recorded by written ballot. The exact vote including abstentions will be recorded along with the number of voting and non-voting members present during the review and discussion. The APT Committee evaluation and vote will be forwarded to the Tenure Review Committee and will be part of the final documentation submitted to the Dean. Review will take place in the Tenure Review Committee even if the APT Committee review indicates satisfactory performance.

### Review by the Tenure Review Committee

The Tenure Review 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, and the recommendations and vote of the APT Committee). The Tenure Review 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. The recommendations of the Tenure Review Committee will prevail in the event that they differ from those forwarded by the APT Committee. In such cases a detailed explanation and rationale for the different recommendations must accompany the report forwarded to the Dean.

The Chair or Supervisor will 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.

### Membership

The Tenure Review 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. The Chairman of the Tenure Review Committee will be elected by the members. Standard operating procedures and terms of office will be determined by the committee and made available for public review. Evaluation and review of the tenure review process will occur yearly coincident with the APT review

process.

#### Recommendations of the Tenure Review Committee

The Tenure Review Committee will forward the recommendation to the Dean not later than January 15 of the year following the initiation of review. This recommendation will take one of two forms:

(A) That the faculty member is performing in a manner consistent with expectations, with no further recommendations or with recommendations that the faculty member would benefit from additional institutional support.

(B) That the faculty member is performing in a manner inconsistent with expectations.

If the faculty member receives a recommendation of performance inconsistent with expectations, the Tenure Review 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. A recommendation of unsatisfactory performance will automatically result in a second review two years after the original submission. During this period the faculty member would have the opportunity to initiate change and provide new documentation of progress. Two consecutive recommendations by the Tenure Review Committee indicating substandard performance will result in a recommendation to the Dean that sanctions be imposed, up to and including termination.

For individuals found to be performing unsatisfactorily, review to determine if good cause exists for termination under the current Regents' Rules and Regulations may be considered. 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 Regents' Rules and Regulations, Part One, Chapter III, Section 6 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.

#### Role of the Dean

The Dean shall report the recommendation of the Tenure Review Committee to

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty-SAHS 5/2005

the faculty member by letter not 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 the conclusion is that performance has been unsatisfactory, the letter will inform the faculty member that a subsequent review will take place two years after the original submission and that a subsequent finding of substandard performance may lead to termination, according to current provisions of the Regent's Rules and Regulations (Section 6.3). A recommendation for termination or change in status of a tenured member of the faculty will automatically be reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and must be approved before a letter of termination is implemented.

### Expected Standards of Performance

Expected standards of performance will include, but not be limited to:

- Evidence that teaching is satisfactory as judged by students, peers and department chairs.
- 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 chairman.

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.

Ordinarily, documented weaknesses or deficiencies in two or more areas will indicate unsatisfactory overall performance.

### Scheduling of Reviews

Ordinarily, a tenured faculty member 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 1996-1997 academic year, they would be reviewed during the 2002-2003 academic year. That is, they would be notified of

## Implementation Plan for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty-SAHS 5/2005

review in February of 2002 and notified of the Dean's recommendation in February of 2003.

### Exemptions

Promotion to associate professor or professor, or 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.

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

### 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, review for termination for good cause is possible at any time. Due process procedures must be followed.

### Flow Chart of Process

