August 15, 1997

TO: Dr. G. P. (Bud) Peterson

FROM: Rayford G. Anthony, C. D. Holland Professor and Department Head

SUBJECT: Post Tenure Review

Attached is a draft of the proposed post tenure review policy for the Department of Chemical Engineering. A faculty committee drafted the first 3 drafts. The fourth draft was revised to reflect many of the comments from the faculty at the first faculty meeting. Because of summer vacations and travel to meetings and conferences, the committee composition changed over the summer. Two faculty meetings were held to discuss the document. At each meeting there were approximately half of the faculty in attendance. As you might surmise, the exact same half was not at either of the two meetings.

The draft enclosed is a revision of the fourth draft submitted to me by the committee. This revision was completed in order to make the document acceptable to me. At the faculty meeting today, the members in attendance approved this draft. However, I would like for this to be considered a draft, and give all the faculty time to review it, and vote on it by secret ballot. This vote will be conducted next week and will be completed by that time. I anticipate that a majority of the faculty will approve this draft. This draft can also be used by you to determine if we are in compliance with the University Policy on Post Tenure Review.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss it please call me or schedule a meeting.
‘DRAFT’, August 14, 1997
Implementation of post-tenure review procedure for the Department of Chemical Engineering

The principal goal of Texas A&M University’s rule on post-tenure review in the College of Engineering is to identify those faculty members whose performance chronically and substantially fails to meet the minimum expectations of the department for satisfactory performance and to provide opportunities for the correction of their performance. What follows is the implementation of that rule for the Department of Chemical Engineering.

Occasions when faculty fail to meet professional responsibilities in ways that are grossly unprofessional, negligent, or illegal are covered by specific TAMU policies and may result in immediate action by the Department Head. The TAMU Rule on Post-Tenure Review is not intended to address those situations.

I. Annual Review Process

This document describes the procedures and performance criteria used by the Head and his or her Advisory Committee for Post-Tenure Reviews.

* One of the responsibilities of the Department Head is to assess the overall performance of the faculty member in accordance with PPM2.3.2.5, which has been replaced by University Rule No. 12.99.99.M2. The result is a written evaluation of each faculty member, which must be signed by the faculty member and the Department Head and be submitted to the Dean’s office no later than April 15th of each year.

* A responsibility of a faculty member is to furnish adequate documentation of teaching, research, and service.

Collegiality and openness should be the hallmarks of the review process, along with emphasis on constructive faculty development, orientation, and mentoring.

In what follows, performance indicators for research, teaching, and service are meant to be used only as guidelines: the quality of the faculty member’s work is always the overriding consideration. Performance indicators are listed in Appendix I, University Rule 12.99.9M

If the Department Head determines in the annual review that a tenured faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory, the Department Head, prior to reporting this assessment to the Dean, will advise the faculty member of his intent to report his performance as unsatisfactory. The Department Head will then activate the faculty advisory committee composed of a minimum of 5 tenured faculty. The criteria for service on this committee will be the same as required to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the exception that the members of the committee must be tenured. This will be a standing committee with four members elected by the tenured and tenure track faculty with each member serving for a period of four years. To maintain continuity one
member per year will be elected by the faculty. After the first committee is elected, the members of the committee will draw numbers to determine the terms of office, with each member serving one, two, three or four years. A member of this committee may be re-elected. The fifth member of the committee may be appointed by the faculty under review. The purpose of this committee is to ensure that the faculty member in question has received a fair and unbiased evaluation. The committee will then submit a written report of their conclusions, and this report with the Department Head’s evaluation will be forwarded to the Dean.

Performance Indicators

The Head will look for indicators of excellence, effectiveness, or deficiency in scholarly activities over three-year periods. The performance assessment of faculty will be based upon the extent to which a positive contribution has been made to the University, the Department, and/or the Profession through quality performance in research, teaching, and/or service activities. All activities of each faculty member will be considered to the extent to which they bear upon the stated indicators, and the quality of performance will be judged on the basis of a comprehensive consideration of all activities. There is no pre-determined priority list or order of ranking of importance of specific activities, nor is there a finite “checklist” of activities to be used for evaluation or ranking of individuals. It is recognized that the strengths and weaknesses will vary with the individual, and the objective of the evaluation process is to maximize the contribution of each individual’s strengths, talents, and interests. The use of ratings and evaluations only for the purpose of rewards and punishments is considered to be divisive and counter-productive.

II. Post-tenure review Process

Based on the approved departmental criteria, should the Department Head conclude with a preponderance of evidence that the faculty member’s performance has been “unsatisfactory” for the purpose of post tenure review, the Advisory Committee shall review the annual report, the resume of the affected faculty member, and any other relevant factors. Based on a majority vote, the Advisory Committee shall prepare a brief written report summarizing the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses and shall report, for the purpose of post-tenure review, either that the faculty member’s record has or has not been evaluated by the Department Head in a fair and consistent manner.

In the case that a faculty member’s performance is judged to be “unsatisfactory” by the Department Head, and the Advisory Committee indicates that the evaluation process and outcome has been fair, consistent and without bias, the Department Head shall provide the faculty member as well as the Dean’s office with the following:

i. A written evaluation of performance

ii. The written report of the Advisory Committee, and

iii. Written notification that the faculty member’s performance has been found to be
“unsatisfactory” for the purpose of post-tenure review.

Any faculty member, who does not agree with the determination of the Department Head and/or with the Advisory Committee’s assessment of fairness and unbiased evaluation by the Department Head, shall be afforded the opportunity to discuss this determination in person with the Advisory Committee and/or Department Head.

Professional review will be initiated, when a faculty member receives an assessment of “unsatisfactory” performance for three consecutive years. Professional review, when initiated, will be conducted by the Department Head in consultation with Advisory Committee or by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Dean in consultation with both the Head and the faculty member undergoing review.

A faculty member may request “Voluntary Post-Tenure Review” as provided in the University’s post-tenure review policies (see Rule, IV) at any stage of this process. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review would mean that a professional review would be conducted by an ad hoc faculty review committee appointed by the Dean (see PPM 2.3.2.5). Such a request will halt any further proceedings of the Departmental Advisory Committee.

If, after review, the Advisory Committee deems the affected faculty member’s performance to be “satisfactory,” the Committee’s report justifying this decision will be placed in the Faculty Member’s Personnel file, and he or she will be considered to have performed in a satisfactory manner.

III. Changes in either the annual or post-tenure review process

Any changes to the above processes must be approved by a majority vote of faculty, by the Head, and by the Dean.