TEXAS A&M **INTERNATIONAL** UNIVERSITY

Rule

12.06.99.L1 Post Tenure Review and Periodic Peer Review

First Approved: October 26 , 2026
Next Scheduled Review: October 26, 2031

Rule Statement and Reason for Rule

The purpose of this rule is to establish guidelines for continued evaluation of faculty and provide faculty with feedback to improve performance in teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service, especially if they score below a satisfactory level.

In accordance with *Texas Education Code Section 51.942* and The Texas A&M System (System) Policy *12.06, Post-Tenure Review for Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness,* each institution of higher education in the state of Texas is required to establish a comprehensive performance evaluation process for tenured faculty to be conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure. The evaluation must be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service, and must include a peer review of the faculty member.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. GENERAL

1.1. All faculty, regardless of tenure, undergo an annual evaluation, and it is based on performance in teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service, for the preceding calendar year. For tenured faculty members, annual evaluations also serve to assess whether the individual is making continued contributions consistent with that of a tenured faculty member. If such an individual is not making continued progress in teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service, guidance will be provided to assist the individual in meeting their faculty responsibilities. Guidance can be in the form of a professional development plan or a post-tenure review, as explained below.

1.2. In accordance with *Texas Education Code Section 51.942* and System Policy *12.06, Post-Tenure Review for Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*, tenured faculty members are also subject to a periodic peer review (PPR, see section 4), which supplements the annual evaluation process

and is more comprehensive as it evaluates faculty productivity in teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service over a five year period. The PPR is different from a post-tenure review (PTR).

2. ANNUAL EVALUATION

2.1. Tenured faculty are annually evaluated in three core areas: teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service. Each academic college/school and the library have established criteria, in the form of rubrics, to assess each core area and has created ranges or scores to denote exceptional productivity to unacceptable productivity. When faculty are evaluated, they receive scores for each area ranging from zero to five, the latter indicating exceptional work while zero denotes no work.

2.2. If a faculty member scores a two in any area, productivity is unsatisfactory and deemed seriously deficient. The respective Department/Division Chair, must meet with the faculty member within two weeks of the written evaluation to develop plans for improvement in the form of a Professional Development Plan (PDP). The PDP will specify areas of deficiencies, steps to remedy them, and the period of time that such deficiencies must be remedied. Both the evaluation and the written PDP will be submitted to the respective Dean. The intent of the PDP is to provide tenured faculty with immediate identification and means of remedying any professional shortcoming.

2.3. If a faculty member receives a score of two in one area for two consecutive annual evaluations, they will undergo a professional review known as a post-tenure review (PTR; see section 3).

2.4. If a faculty member scores a one or zero in an area or multiple areas, during one annual evaluation, performance is deemed egregious. Egregious deficiencies are defined as behavior that compromises the learning environment for students and/or compromises continued employment for faculty (see SAP 12.01.99.L0.01, *Dismissal for Cause and Summary Dismissal of Tenured Faculty*). In cases where performance is egregious, the faculty member must undergo an immediate professional review or what is known as a post-tenure review (PTR; see section 3).

3. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

3.1. PTR includes the creation of an ad hoc professional review committee of tenured faculty from the respective faculty's college/school. The ad hoc committee consists of three tenured faculty that will be created by the Dean, Chair, and the faculty member. If the Dean, Chair, and faculty member cannot come to an agreement on the composition of the committee, then the following guidelines must be followed by the Dean in appointing a committee: two of the members must be selected from the college's promotion and tenure committee, one selected by the Dean and one selected by the faculty member; and the final member of the committee will be selected by

the Faculty Advisory Council's presiding officer (or by the Faculty Advisory Council's associate presiding officer if the presiding officer has a conflict of interest).

3.2. PTR requires the submission of a dossier (with the inclusion of documented productivity for the area(s) found deficient) and a report from the committee on whether or not the committee found no deficiencies, some deficiencies, or serious deficiencies in the faculty's productivity. Within two weeks of receiving the committee's recommendation, the Provost must accept, reject, or modify the findings of the committee and submit back to the committee, the Department/Division Chair, and the faculty member, a written report that announces and justifies his or her ruling.

3.3. Within two weeks of the Provost's issuing of a ruling that "serious deficiencies" exist, the ad hoc professional review committee must meet with the faculty member and the Department/Division Chair to create a PDP to submit to the Dean and the Provost for approval.

3.4. The PDP describes in detail how the faculty member will remedy the specific deficiencies identified by the ad hoc professional review committee. The written plan must be created with the collaboration of the ad hoc professional review committee, the faculty member, the Department/Division Chair, and the respective college/school/library Dean, and it should meet the needs of the faculty member, the department, and the respective college/school. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to cooperate fully in the development of this plan and to make a good faith effort to implement it. It is the responsibility of the committee, the Chair, and the Dean to ensure that the plan is designed to be a meaningful and effective means of returning the tenured faculty member to full professional productivity.

3.5. Plans must be tailored to the specific circumstances of the faculty members for whom they are developed, but all plans must: (1) describe specifically the deficiencies to be addressed by the plan; (2) identify specific goals that must be met to remedy the deficiencies; (3) describe what the faculty member will do to meet these goals; (4) establish intermediate and final timelines for the completion of the activities necessary to meet the goals of the plan; (5) identify the specific criteria to be used in assessing the faculty member's annual progress toward meeting the goals of the plan; and (6) identify the resources that the University will devote to the support of the faculty member's efforts to complete the plan.

3.6. PDPs may allow up to three years for the faculty member to return to full productivity. However, in those cases in which the faculty member's deficiencies are deemed "egregious," the PDP may require reasonable improvement within a time frame of a regular semester. The faculty member and the Chair will meet at the end of each semester to discuss the faculty member's progress toward fulfilling the PDP. At the end of the academic year, the Chair will submit a written progress report to the ad hoc professional review committee, to the Dean, and to the Provost. A copy of the Chair's written report must be sent to the faculty member. The Chair's regular annual

evaluation of the faculty member in question should draw upon the findings of the progress report.

3.7. As soon as the faculty member has completed the PDP, or by the deadline established by the plan, whichever comes first, the Chair must write a final report to the faculty member, the ad hoc professional review committee, the Dean, and the Provost. Because it is the commitment of the faculty and administrators involved in the process to support faculty members fully in their efforts to return to full productivity and thus benefit not only the faculty member but the entire university, it is expected that in all but a very small minority of cases the final report will be positive. These findings become final upon certification by the Provost.

3.8. If a faculty member disagrees with the finding of "serious deficiencies" by the ad hoc professional review committee, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the Dean first and then the Provost. When a faculty member, Chair, and the Dean cannot agree on a PDP, then the University Promotion and Tenure Committee will intercede, mediate the dispute, and issue a draft of the plan for the review and approval of the Provost. If at any stage in the PTR process a faculty member believes that the provisions of the process are being applied unfairly, the faculty member may file a grievance.

3.9. Faculty members have the right to voluntarily request a PTR and have an ad hoc professional review committee review their work and counsel them on their career. To initiate this process, faculty members must make a request in writing to their Department/Division Chair that they wish to undergo a voluntary PTR.

4. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW (PPR) PROCEDURES

4.1. Tenured faculty will undergo an additional performance review, known as the periodic peer review (PPR), every six years after receiving tenure unless extraordinary circumstances exist similar to those outlined in TAMIU Rule 12.01.99.L1 *Extension of the Tenure Probationary Period* to delay or extend the review.

4.2. All requests to delay the PPR and extend the review process must be based on extraordinary circumstances. For purposes of this rule, extraordinary circumstances will include any catastrophic or life-threatening illness, an unforeseeable emergency or circumstance of a similar severity that substantially inhibits for a significant period of time the faculty member's ability to meet the timeframe for a PPR. Extraordinary circumstances may also include accepting, at the request of TAMIU, a major administrative task that impinges on the faculty member's time to meet the deadline for PPR. TAMIU will have the sole discretion to determine what circumstances rise to the level of extraordinary.

4.3. It is the responsibility of the faculty to provide appropriate documentation to adequately demonstrate why the delay should be granted. Faculty members seeking an extension must

make a written request to the Department/Division Chair no later than six months before the scheduled PPR. The request must detail the extraordinary circumstances. TAMIU may request additional documentation from the faculty member. After review by the faculty member Department/Division Chair, the request must be forwarded to the Dean and the Provost. The Provost will have the final approval of the request.

4.4. PPR applies to all tenured faculty regardless of rank. Administrators with faculty status (e.g., Chairs, Directors, Deans, Associate Deans, Associate Provost, and Provost) are exempt from full PPR if administrative duties constitute more than 75% of their workload. If and when such administrators return to faculty, they will undergo a PPR six years after returning to faculty on a full-time basis.

4.5. Faculty are to submit a comprehensive dossier on September 1st of their review year demonstrating accomplishments/achievements in teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service since receiving tenure. Thus, evidence submitted for PPR should span five years.

4.6. The PPR will consist of evaluations at different levels ranging from a college committee, the Department/Division Chair, the College Dean, and the Provost. The Provost will make a final decision on whether the faculty member has no deficiencies in relation to teaching research (scholarship or creative work), and service; some deficiencies; or serious deficiencies.

4.7. The college committee will be the first body of peers to review a fellow faculty member's electronic portfolio or dossier. The committee is comprised of all members of the respective college's promotion and tenure committee. Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies will allow the review to be prejudiced by factors such as race, color, religion, age, genetic information, veteran status, disability, or any other classification protected by federal, state, or local law.

4.8. All members of the committee must be present to evaluate the faculty member. No member of the committee can abstain from making a recommendation unless there is a conflict of interest such as a familial relationship with the faculty member being reviewed.

4.9. The committee must reach one of three possible conclusions:

4.9.1. No Deficiencies. The committee has identified that the faculty member is performing at a level consistent with that of a tenured faculty member in the respective College for all three areas— teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service.

4.9.2. Some deficiencies. The committee has identified an area of concern or several areas of concern with respect to teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service but such deficiencies are minor and can be addressed by the faculty member over the course

of one academic year. The committee, however, must describe the deficiencies and the Department Chair will work with the faculty to address deficiencies.

4.9.3. Serious deficiencies. The committee has identified a serious deficiency in one or more areas (teaching, research (scholarship or creative work), and service) that are chronic (i.e., evidence of deficiency for more than two years) and not consistent with the level of performance required of tenured faculty in the respective College. The committee must elaborate on the nature of these deficiencies.

4.10. The committee will submit their report and recommendation to the Department/Division Chair. The Department/Division Chair, College Dean and the Provost will conduct an independent and separate evaluation of the faculty member undergoing PPR and each will reach one of three possible conclusions regarding the evaluation: No Deficiencies, Some Deficiencies, and Serious Deficiencies. The Department/Division Chair will submit a report with a recommendation to the College Dean, who will then independently evaluate the faculty member. They will then send a report and recommendation to the Provost and include all other previous evaluations. The Provost will review all recommendations, the faculty member's dossier, and make the final decision.

4.11. If the Provost finds some deficiencies, a Professional Development Plan (PDP), as described in section 3.5, will be implemented although for PPR, the ad hoc committee will be the college promotion and tenure committee. If the Provost finds serious deficiencies, the faculty must undergo PTR, as described in section 3.

5. APPEALS

5.1. If a faculty member disagrees with the findings of the PTR or the PPR, the faculty member may appeal the decision to an appeals committee that consists of a total of seven faculty members: four members of the University Grievance Pool (two selected by the faculty member and two by the Provost) and three tenured Faculty Advisory Council members appointed by the Faculty Advisory Council's presiding officer.

5.2. The intention to appeal must be stated in writing and provided to Office of the Provost within 20 calendar days of receiving the written notice of the decision. At this time, the Provost's only role is to notify the University Grievance Pool and the Faculty Advisory Council that an appeal has been filed.

5.3. The appeals committee may not include members who may have a relevant conflict of interest or who have participated at any level in making the decision being appealed. The committee will meet within 15 calendar days of the faculty member's written notice of appeal and determine if the faculty member has established a prima facie case that the decision was made in violation of the faculty member's (1) academic freedom, (2) without adequate consideration of the faculty

member's record of professional achievement and (3) an appeal alleging the decision was based on discrimination will be exclusively adjudicated in accordance with the procedures outlined in System Regulation 08.01.01. If the committee determines that the faculty member has not alleged a prima facie case, the allegations will be dismissed and the PTR or the PPR must stand. If the committee determines that the allegations do establish a prima facie case, the matter will be referred for an evidentiary hearing by the same appeals committee. A prima facie case for purposes of this subsection means that the faculty member's evidence, alone and unrebutted, would establish that a violation as defined above may have occurred.

5.4 In any evidentiary hearing, the burden of proving that the decision was made in violation of academic freedom or without adequate consideration of the faculty member's record of professional achievement must rest with the faculty member. The burden of proof must be met by a preponderance of the evidence, i.e., that which is more convincing, more credible, and of greater weight than contrary evidence. Both the faculty member and the administration have the right to representation at this hearing. The committee will complete its report to the Provost within 15 calendar days of the completion of the hearing. If the faculty member appealing the decision names the Provost as a party to the appeal, namely, charging the Provost with having violated his or her academic freedom, or with not having adequately considered his or her professional achievements in making the decision, then the committee's report would go to the President. The President's decision is final.

Related Statutes, Policies, Regulations, or SAP's

Texas Education Code Section 51.942 – Faculty Tenure
University SAP 12.01.99.L0.03, Performance Evaluations for Faculty
System Policy *12.06 - Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness*

Definitions

Annual Evaluations – See PPE.

Deficient Performance – Tenured faculty performance that is deemed unsatisfactory and can be Characterized as a score of 1 or 2 in either the PPE or the PPR.

Egregious deficiencies — Behavior that compromises the learning environment for our students and/or faculty.

Rule

Periodic Peer Review (PPR) – State and system mandated review of tenured faculty to ensure continued professional development and growth. The PPR occurs every five (5) years after the conferral of tenure.

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) – Process by which tenured faculty deemed to be unsatisfactory in some aspect of their position are given the opportunity to correct any deficiency and gain necessary professional development.

PPE (Professional Portfolio Evaluation) – Process by which all faculty at TAMIU are evaluated every year. Evaluations are based on calendar year.

Professional Development Plan (PDP) – Individual strategy for tenured faculty created during the Post-Tenure Review process to aid the faculty member in correcting any deficiencies identified and gain any needed professional development. The plan is used as a roadmap by a faculty review committee and the administration to gauge a faculty member's progress.

Contact Office

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, 956-326-2240.