



12.06.99.00.01

POST-TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY

Approved: March, 2013

Reviewed: May, 2015

Reviewed: April, 2019

Reviewed: March, 2025

Next Scheduled Review: March, 2030

PROCEDURE STATEMENT

This Standard Administrative Procedure (SAP) for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) of faculty, which is a comprehensive performance review, provides the conditions under which tenured Texas A&M University-San Antonio (A&M-SA) faculty shall be subject to PTR and the steps that will be followed in such review.

REASON FOR PROCEDURE

The overarching purpose of university faculty receiving tenure at A&M-SA is to retain outstanding faculty who have contributed, and are likely to contribute, substantially to the mission of the university. Tenured faculty are valuable members of the university community in whom the university has invested, and it is in the mutual interest of the tenured faculty members and the university that they continue to perform at a high level. PTR, required by Section 51.942 of the Texas Education Code, is intended to ensure that tenured faculty continue to perform at a level consistent with their faculty rank and, if they are not, establish a Professional Development Plan (PDP) to restore their performance to a satisfactory level.

This procedure aims to promote a consistent process for PTR of all tenured faculty in compliance with Texas A&M University System (System) Policy 12.06 *Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*.

STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

1. POST-TENURE REVIEW

1.1 Overview

Every tenured member of the faculty will undergo PTR at least once every six (6) years regardless of their annual evaluation ratings with exceptions stated in 1.1.1. PTR and Annual Performance Evaluation of faculty are independent and separate processes and one does not substitute for the other. Wherever the word ‘faculty’ is used in this SAP without referring to the category of faculty it refers to ‘tenured faculty’.

- 1.1.1 The procedure exempts the following tenured faculty from their scheduled PTR in these circumstances: (1) they are being reviewed for promotion to a higher rank that same academic year; (2) they are within one year of announced retirement or are on phased retirement; (3) they are faculty members whose duties do not include teaching, service, scholarly research, or creative activities, to be collectively referred to as TSS, due to their responsibilities as full-time administrators, with 100% of their time committed to administrative responsibilities. In order to qualify for the exemption under (2), the department chair, the dean, and the provost must have approved the retirement plan.
- 1.1.2 Faculty members who are academic administrators, such as department chairs, assistant/associate deans, and directors/coordinators of programs whose time commitment to TSS is less than 100%, shall be evaluated only on the faculty portion of their appointments and their performance expectations will be directly related to their time committed to TSS.
- 1.1.3 An academic administrator, whose time was committed 100% to administration, returning to tenured faculty roles will undergo PTR no later than five (5) years after entering the new role, as determined by the individual in consultation with their department chair, the dean, and/or the provost.
- 1.1.4 PTR provides a mechanism to gauge tenured faculty members’ productivity and should be designed to encourage sustained performance. PTR at A&M-SA is based upon performance in the areas of TSS. Like the annual review process, evaluation of these areas of performance over the review period shall form the scope of the PTR. Performance will be evaluated relative to the faculty member’s specific roles and responsibilities within their respective college/s, department/s, and program/s and relative to performance standards for the faculty rank as stated in university, college, department, and program guidelines.

- 1.1.5 Faculty members are evaluated annually to determine whether they meet performance expectations in all three areas of TSS.
 - 1.1.5.1 An annual evaluation rating of 3 on a 5-point scale in any area of TSS is equivalent to the qualitative score 'Meets Expectations' in that area, which is the minimum score that will be considered as 'satisfactory' for that area. A score of less than 3 in any one area of TSS will be considered as 'unsatisfactory' for that area.
 - 1.1.5.2 For tenured faculty members, an unsatisfactory rating in the annual performance evaluation by the department chair in any one area of TSS requires the implementation of a Professional Development Plan (PDP) for the following year, extendable by an additional year, up to a maximum of three years, for the faculty member. The PDP will include performance benchmarks for returning to satisfactory performance. Faculty members who receive a second unsatisfactory rating in the annual performance evaluation in any category during the conventional six-year period between two successive periodic PTRs will be subject to additional assessment and may be recommended for early PTR, to be initiated during the PTR cycle immediately following the second unsatisfactory rating in any area of performance.
 - 1.1.5.3 If the faculty member under PTR is participating in a PDP due to unsatisfactory rating/s in annual evaluation/s in a TSS category at the time of PTR, then that PDP will continue regardless of the outcome of the PTR.
- 1.1.6 The PTR process will be administered by a Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) comprised of tenured faculty members, as detailed in 1.2. Following review and recommendations by this committee, the department chair, the college dean, and the provost will perform their own reviews of faculty performance for the period under review.
- 1.1.7 The relative weights that may be assigned to, and the distribution of the faculty member's workload for, the three TSS categories according to the departmental or college standards, or as stated in the annual Notification of Salary, should be a factor in determining if the faculty member met the performance standards for the review period.
- 1.1.8 A faculty member undergoing PTR has a right to request that their scholarship, research, and creative activity, to be collectively referred to as SRCA, during the review period be reviewed by external subject matter experts. Such external review of SRCA is optional and is not a requirement for PTR. Subject matter experts chosen for review are respected and recognized leaders in the applicant's discipline who are qualified to speak with authority about the quality and significance of the candidate's SRCA.

- 1.1.8.1 A potential external expert is an arms-length expert if they are not former advisors, students, coauthors, coeditors, research collaborators, current/former colleagues, a relative or close friend of, or have a personal relationship with, the faculty member.
- 1.1.8.2 The faculty member may provide the names of four arms-length subject matter experts with whom they do not have a conflict of interest to the department chair and the college dean. The department chair will provide to the dean the names of four other arms-length subject matter experts. The dean contacts all the eight subject matter experts and solicits their reviews of the faculty member's SRCA record during the review period.
- 1.1.8.3 The faculty member may provide a 'do not contact' list of experts, with reasons, to the department chair and the college dean.
- 1.1.8.4 There are cases when reviews from arms-length experts are not possible or feasible, for example, in a new or emerging field of study. It is recognized that in the context of collaborative research in certain fields, it may be difficult to find external subject experts who have no connection whatsoever with the candidate. However, external experts should not include individuals who have collaborated closely and frequently with the candidate in the production of SRCA. In cases of unavoidable conflicts, an explanation should be provided in the application portfolio.
- 1.1.8.5 University faculty who are arms-length experts should be at or above the rank of the faculty member. If the faculty member is an associate professor, the majority of the letters should be from professors. Letters from associate professors should only be used when that person is the leading expert in a particular area, and no professors are available with related expertise.
- 1.1.8.6 External reviewers will be provided with an extract of the faculty member's CV that has only the section on SRCA. They will also be provided with the performance standards for teaching, SRCA, and service for faculty in the faculty member's rank along with the faculty member's workload distribution during the review period. They will be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of the faculty member's SRCA during the period under review, keeping in view the faculty member's workload distribution.
- 1.1.9 The provost will consider the recommendations provided by all reviewers – the PTRC, the department chair, and the college dean – and determine whether the faculty member, based on the evidence presented in the PTR application, has met the standards of performance for the review period with a 'satisfactory' or higher rating.

- 1.1.10 A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory PTR rating shall be required to follow a PDP developed by the faculty member in cooperation with their department chair, the college dean, and an ad hoc review committee appointed by the dean. The committee will take into consideration the reasons for the 'unsatisfactory' PTR rating, which includes the reasons provided by the external subject matter experts in some cases, in developing the PDP.
- 1.1.11 Except as stated in 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 neither the annual faculty performance evaluation nor the implementation of a PDP following an annual evaluation shall interrupt or affect the timing of the periodic PTR process.
- 1.1.12 If a faculty member's application for promotion to a higher rank is not recommended by a reviewing authority during the year the faculty member is due for PTR, then they should treat the application for promotion as a PTR application and submit their report on whether the faculty member meets the standards of performance for faculty in their rank for the review period. The faculty member's application for promotion will continue to progress through the normal course of review. A positive recommendation for promotion at any such stage necessarily implies a corresponding positive recommendation on meeting the standards for performance for the review period.
- 1.1.13 The final decision on whether the faculty member met the standards for performance during the review period is determined by the outcome of the PTR performed by the provost. If the provost recommends that the faculty member has met the standards of performance during the review period, then the faculty member has successfully completed the PTR.
- 1.1.14 At each level of review, the faculty member shall be given an opportunity to add their own written comments/response to the recommendation received from the reviewing authority. The response shall be limited to addressing the shortcomings in performance noted in a recommendation, without restating the information already included in the PTR portfolio. Such response shall be submitted to the reviewing authority within five (5) business days from receipt of the recommendation and shall be added to the PTR portfolio. Following such a response from the faculty member, the reviewing authority may amend their recommendation.
- 1.1.15 If there is a recommendation from a reviewing authority that a faculty member's performance during the review period was unsatisfactory, the faculty member may request a hearing, within five business days from receipt of the recommendation, to be conducted by that reviewing authority. That reviewing authority will schedule a hearing within three business days from such a request, where the faculty member may provide rationale and evidence for a satisfactory rating on PTR. The faculty member may also bring to the hearing an advocate who can provide rationale and evidence for the candidate having met the requirements for satisfactory performance

during the review period. The reviewing authority shall issue a decision on any changes to its recommendation and communicate that to the faculty member within three business days from the completion of the hearing. The faculty member's submission of evidence during the hearing and the reviewing authority's decision on the appeal should be added to the PTR portfolio.

1.2 PTR Process

1.2.1 Post-Tenure Review Committee Structure

- 1.2.1.1 PTRC for a faculty member under review will consist of at least three (3) tenured faculty members within the faculty member's college, with some members nominated from the faculty member's department or discipline. The PTRC shall be appointed by the department chair in consultation with the dean.
- 1.2.1.2 Only tenured faculty members with the same or higher rank as the faculty member under PTR are eligible to serve on that faculty member's PTRC.
- 1.2.1.3 More than one PTRC may be formed within a college to accommodate the necessary faculty expertise and faculty rank requirements of PTR.
- 1.2.1.4 The department chair nominates prospective PTRC members, in consultation with the dean according to the following order: (a) tenured peers from the faculty member's discipline; (b) if there are insufficient tenured faculty within the discipline, tenured peers from the faculty member's department; (c) if there are insufficient tenured faculty within the department, tenured faculty within the college. If there are fewer than three (3) tenured faculty holding the appropriate rank in the college, the department chair and the dean, in consultation with the provost, shall nominate the other prospective members of the PTRC from outside the college.
- 1.2.1.5 Tenure faculty with administrative responsibilities, such as associate department chairs, associate deans, or department chairs shall not serve on their own college PTR committees but may serve on PTR committees of colleges outside their own.
- 1.2.1.6 Once the department chair has nominated the prospective PTRC members, their service on the PTRC should be endorsed by the college tenure-track faculty by a majority vote, with a quorum of voting faculty.

1.2.2 Exceptions

In the case of substantive mitigating circumstances, such as serious illness, the PTR may be postponed upon review and approval by the dean.

1.2.3 Portfolio Development

- 1.2.3.1 The faculty member who is required to prepare and submit a portfolio for PTR will include all documents, materials, and statements the faculty member deems relevant and necessary covering all work and accomplishments during the review period. All materials submitted by the faculty member shall remain in the portfolio. Although review portfolios may differ, each will include the annual self-evaluations during the review period, a current curriculum vitae, and evidence of performance in TSS areas expected of the rank that the faculty member holds.
- 1.2.3.2 The department chair will add copies of the faculty member's annual evaluations, conducted during the review period, to the portfolio by (a) the Faculty Evaluation Committees and (b) the department chair. If, for any reason, the department does not have a record of the annual evaluations of a faculty member, the department chair should insert a letter into the application portfolio stating that, along with a reason for the missing evaluation. If the faculty applicant has preserved their copy of the annual evaluation documents, they may send that to the department chair who should add that to the portfolio with the note 'Received from Faculty Member' written prominently on top.
- 1.2.3.3 The department chair and the dean may add additional materials at any stage during the review process with the approval of the PTRC chair. The committee chair will notify the faculty member when any documents are added to the portfolio. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to additions to the portfolio, with the written response being included in the portfolio.
- 1.2.3.4 The PTRC may request clarification from the faculty member regarding any of the evidence provided in the portfolio.

1.2.4 PTR Reports by Reviewers

- 1.2.4.1 The PTRC chair will submit its report to the department chair in the format provided in Appendix A, with a copy to the faculty member being evaluated and members of the PTRC.
- 1.2.4.2 The department chair will review PTR portfolios, prepare their own PTR report on each application, commenting on the faculty member's performance in each of the three TSS areas, and will submit the PTRC report and their own report to the college dean.

Simultaneously, the department chair will also provide a copy of their own report to the faculty member being evaluated.

- 1.2.4.3 The dean will review PTR portfolios, prepare their PTR report on each application, commenting on the faculty members' performance in each of the three TSS areas, and will submit the reports from the PTRC and the department chairs, along with their own reports, to the provost, while simultaneously providing their reports to the respective faculty members being evaluated and the corresponding department chairs.
- 1.2.4.4 The department chair and the dean will meet with the faculty member to discuss the three evaluations and recommendations – from the PTRC, the department chair, and the dean.
- 1.2.4.5 The provost will review PTR portfolios, consider all the review reports submitted, take into utmost consideration the PTRC recommendations, and make a determination on whether the faculty members being evaluated have met the performance standards in the three TSS areas and rate their performance as 'satisfactory,' 'unsatisfactory,' or 'exemplary.' The provost will provide their PTR reports to the faculty members being evaluated with copies to the corresponding college deans and the department chairs.

2. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOLLOWING POST-TENURE REVIEW

2.1 Creation of the Professional Development Plan and its Rationale

- 2.1.1 When a tenured faculty member receives a PTR rating of 'unsatisfactory' in any of the TSS areas, the dean, the department chair, an ad hoc professional review committee appointed by the dean, and the faculty member shall collaboratively develop a PDP. The plan should be intended to restore the PTR applicant's performance at the level expected of faculty members in the PTR applicant's rank, as stated in program, department, college, and university guidelines.
- 2.1.2 If the faculty member, department chair, and the review committee fail to agree on a PDP acceptable to the dean, the PDP will be determined through mediation directed by the provost or their designee.
- 2.1.3 The PDP shall then be implemented by the start of the semester following the semester during which PTR was conducted. The purpose of the plan is to improve the faculty member's performance rating to a minimum of 'satisfactory' in the respective areas(s) within the timeframe stipulated by the PDP.

- 2.1.4 The PDP should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member and the college, to regain professional effectiveness by the faculty member that would result in satisfactory contributions to the university. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good-faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

2.2 Specifications of the PDP and its Implementation

- 2.2.1 The PDP shall be in writing and shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance, as measured against stated program, departmental, and college performance criteria, will be remedied. Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, all plans will include:

- Identification of specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- Articulation of specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- Professional development activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
- Criteria for assessment of progress in the plan and timelines for achieving goals or outcomes; and
- List of institutional resources, if any, to be committed in support of the plan.

- 2.2.2 The academic interests and abilities of tenured faculty members are likely to vary over time as they progress through their careers. For example, tenured faculty members might seek to increase their teaching loads if they become less effective in scholarly research and creative activities after contributing satisfactorily in that area for a substantial period, and the university would benefit from their substantial teaching experience and their mentorship of junior faculty in teaching and service. Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to negotiate such changes in their job responsibilities in TSS during the course of their career and as part of their PDP.

- 2.2.3 The PDP will be signed by the department chair, the dean, the chair of the ad hoc review committee, and the faculty member.

2.3 Assessment of the PDP

- 2.3.1 The faculty member, the dean, the department chair, and the ad hoc review committee shall meet at least once per 16-week semester to review the faculty member's progress toward accomplishing the objectives identified in the PDP. The dates of these meetings will be set forth in the PDP. The department chair will maintain notes of this review meeting. At the end of

one year after the implementation of the PDP, the department chair will formally assess the progress made by the faculty member and forward a progress report to the dean with a copy to the faculty member.

- 2.3.2 Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular annual evaluation process may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the PDP following the PTR.
- 2.3.3 If the performance was deemed unsatisfactory, the dean the department chair may extend the PDP. The PDP can be extended for a maximum of two years after which time the faculty member must be rated satisfactory in all TSS areas.
- 2.3.4 When the objectives of the plan have been met within the agreed timeline, the department chair shall make a final report to the faculty member and the dean. The dean will review the report and forward a copy of the report with their comments to the provost. The successful completion of the PDP is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire university community.
- 2.3.5 If, after consulting with the ad hoc review committee, the department chair and the dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the PDP within the stipulated timeframe, including extensions, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the PDP, and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan objectives separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated by the dean, in consultation with the provost, under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

2.4 Timeline

Last Friday in February: Department chair informs the faculty members of the PTR portfolio submission deadline.

First Friday in April: Dean forwards the list of PTR candidates to the provost.

Third Friday in April: Department chair proposes the PTRC in consultation with the dean.

Second Friday in May: (1) PTRC is endorsed by the college's tenured faculty members and (2) Faculty member, if they choose external review of scholarship, sends the department chair the list of arms-length external experts for review of SRCA.

Third Friday in May: If needed, department chair sends the dean the list of external experts for review of SRCA.

First Friday in June: Dean sends requests to external experts requesting SRCA review.

First Friday in September: (1) Faculty portfolio submission is due, (2) External reviewers' letters are due, and (3) The dean's office provides portfolio access to the PTRC very soon after.

Third Friday in September: PTRC recommendation is due.

First Friday in October: Department Chair's recommendation is due.

Last Friday in November: Dean's recommendation is due.

Second Friday in January: Provost's decision is due.

Fourth Friday in January: Ad hoc Professional Review Committee is formed if PDP is needed.

Fourth Friday in February: Finalization of PDP for faculty rated 'unsatisfactory.'

First Class Day in Fall following finalization of PDP: PDP, if needed, begins.

3. APPEAL

If at any point during the process, the faculty member believes the provisions of this procedure are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of System Regulation 32.01.01 *Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members*.

RELATED AUTHORITIES

System Policy 12.01 *Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure*

System Policy 12.06 *Post Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*

System Regulation 32.01.01 *Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members*

CONTACT OFFICE

Academic Affairs, Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs: Phone - (210) 784-1200.

APPENDIX A Post-Tenure Review Committee Report

Please use this form, type or print. Form can extend beyond one page if necessary.

TEACHING	Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory		Exemplary	
-----------------	--------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	--

Comments:
Committee Vote:

SRCA	Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory		Exemplary	
Comments:						
Committee Vote:						

SERVICE	Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory		Exemplary	
Comments:						
Committee Vote:						

PTRC Chair Signature: _____ Date: _____

Submit a copy of this recommendation to the department chair, with a copy to the faculty applicant, and the members of the Post Tenure Review Committee.