

Department of Health and Kinesiology Policy and Procedures on Post-Tenure Review

The university post-tenure review policy is anchored on the front end by the annual review process and at the back end by university-level procedures for professional review that are invoked after a faculty member receives 3 consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. The purposes of this document are: 1) to establish minimum criteria for satisfactory annual review based on the Department of Health and Kinesiology A1 evaluation instrument (adopted 8/98); 2) to establish procedures that are designed to direct and support faculty in their attempt to remedy deficiencies identified in the annual review prior to implementation of University policy; and 3) to summarize and publicize the general procedures (department, college, and university) that pertain to post-tenure review. Faculty are referred to the Texas A&M University Rule on Post Tenure Review (adopted 10/96) for specific questions on University policy.

1. Standards for acceptable performance (Annual Review)

- The standard for acceptable performance is a total of 350 credits, or current A1 credit requirement, without regard to category room the departmental A1 evaluation.
- Failure to attain the required credits will result in an unsatisfactory evaluation and the development of a one-year professional development plan (see #2 below).
- Upon receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation for two consecutive years, or at the request of the faculty member or department head, a departmental post-tenure review will be initiated (see #3 below).
- Receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation for three consecutive years will invoke the University Post-Tenure Review process (see #4 below).

2. One- year Professional Development Plan

- The department head in consultation with the faculty member will develop a one-year professional development plan when a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory annual review. The professional development plan should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, department, and college. This plan should be executed in memorandum format with the signature of the department head, faculty member, and dean affixed.
- It is 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 adopted plan.
- It is the department head's obligation to assist in the development of a plan that thoughtfully considers the strengths and interests of the faculty member and to provide assistance, in good faith, to the faculty member in meeting the goals of the plan.
- Should the faculty member or department head feel that the deficiencies cannot be remedied by establishing a one-year professional development plan, either may request a departmental post-tenure review (see #3 below).

3. Departmental Post-Tenure Review

- The departmental post-tenure review will be conducted by a departmental ad hoc committee, unless the faculty member specifically requests that it be conducted by the department head. The departmental post-tenure review committee will be composed of four tenured faculty members, at or above the rank of the faculty member under review, from within the department (two selected by the faculty member and two chosen by the department head).

- The committee will re-evaluate the faculty member's annual review(s) and recommend to the department head a professional development plan (1 or 2 years) with **reasonable** progress goals.
- This committee may recommend strategies for improvement, e.g., changes in the faculty member's job description to capitalize on the faculty member's strengths and interests, awarding more credits on discretionary items on the A1 evaluation for the faculty member's accomplishments, or exempting the faculty member from review because of substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness).
- The professional development plan should include specific markers (semester or annual) that indicate progression toward satisfactory performance and specify ways in which the departmental administration can support the faculty member in the team effort to meet the objectives of the plan.
- The professional development plan should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, department, and college. This plan should be executed in memorandum format with the signatures of the review committee, department head, faculty member, and dean affixed.
- 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.
- It is the obligation of all members of the departmental post-tenure review committee and the department head to assist in the development of a professional development plan that thoughtfully considers the strengths and interest of the faculty member and to provide assistance, in good faith, to the faculty member in meeting the goals of the plan.

4. Professional Review

- A university-level professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review, and of the nature and procedure of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from the review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the professional review process.
- The purposes of professional review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
- The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
- The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of professional review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum a current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.
- The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing

to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

- The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The professional review will result in one of three possible outcomes: (1) no deficiencies identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report; (2) some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee (or department head) specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean; (3) substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee (or department head) specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a professional development plan acceptable to the dean.
- **The Professional Development Plan.** The professional development plan is an agreement indicating how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria developed under #1 of this policy) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. 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.
- Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will: (1) identify specific deficiencies to be addressed; (2) define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; (3) outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcome; (4) set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes; (5) indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan; and (6) identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.
- **Assessment.** The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.
- **Completion of the Plan.** When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development plan 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.
- If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head, and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility. Failure to complete a post-tenure review professional development plan is deemed to occur when: (1) the professional development plan's goals were not met by the faculty member; (2) the deficiencies in the

completion of the plan are of sufficient magnitude to separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies.

5. Appeal

- If at any time during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4, "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."
- If the faculty member wishes to contest the professional review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a professional development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee.

6. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

- A tenured faculty member desirous of the counsel of a professional review committee in evaluating his or her career may request such counsel by making a request to the department head. Documentation of the results of such a review, patterned after the details outlined in #4 of this Rule, are not to be used in any other University evaluation except by explicit consent of the faculty member.