Post-Tenure Review

**SUBJECT**
Comprehensive Performance Evaluations of Tenured Faculty Members and Faculty Members Who Receive an Academic Promotion (Post-Tenure Review)

**PURPOSE**
Establish uniform guidelines and procedures in the Department of Design for comprehensive performance evaluations of tenured faculty members and faculty members who receive an academic promotion. The policy is consistent with Texas Tech University Operating Policy 32.31.

**REVIEW**
This policy will be reviewed in the spring of even numbered years by the DOD faculty with recommendations to the DOD Chair.

**POLICY**
Each faculty member who is tenured or who receives an academic promotion at Texas Tech University is subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation. The evaluation shall 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 or received an academic promotion. In the College of Human Sciences, the review is conducted every six years. Inasmuch as all faculty members covered by this policy are subject to rigorous evaluation prior to receiving tenure and/or promotion, there is an assumption that they continue to be competent in their professional responsibilities. Therefore, the burden of proof in establishing a pattern of incompetent performance requiring revocation of tenure lies with the DOD, the College, and the University.

OP 32.31 states that these procedures shall be agreed upon by a majority of the voting member of the academic unit (2.b.). “Voting faculty,” as defined in the Faculty Senate Constitution, includes all persons under full-time contract who have completed a residence of one year at Texas Tech University and who are tenured or hold appointment that make them eligible for tenure.

**PROCEDURES**
Notice of the comprehensive performance evaluation shall be given to the faculty member involved no later than September 1. The evaluation shall begin no later earlier than February 1 and be completed no later than May 1, all in the same academic year. The
evaluations shall be directed toward the professional development of faculty members, using the following procedures. A summary timeline is available.

1. The comprehensive performance evaluations shall be based on the professional responsibilities of the individual faculty member in teaching, research, service, and administration (when applicable) and shall include the DOD Teaching, Service, and Research/Creative Activity Rubrics. The Rubrics provide guidelines for tenured faculty for assessing the areas of teaching, service, and research/creative activity. Faculty receive ratings/points ranging from 1—4 (4 being highest); Exceeds Expectations (4 pts), Meets Expectations (3 pts), Minimally Meets Expectations (2 pts) and Does Not Meet Expectations (1 pt).

2. The DOD Post-Tenure Review Committee is comprised of three tenured faculty members in the DOD and one tenured faculty member from another department in the College. Departmental members of the DOD Post-Tenure Review Committee are elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the DOD department. To the degree possible, department and faculty members serving on the Committee will represent ADM and ID in the department. Non-departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee members and two alternates for each department are drawn by lot from a pool of all tenured faculty members in the other departments in the College. The drawing will take place at a meeting of the College of Human Sciences Administrative Team. If a faculty member being evaluated objects to the non-departmental representative selected, an alternate will serve (the candidate is limited to deleting one non-departmental member). The DOD chairperson may also delete one of the outside members if desired.

Department chairs are not eligible to serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A faculty member who currently is on a development program, as specified in OP 32.32, Section 5, may not serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Faculty members may not serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the DOD department during the year they are being evaluated. Committee members serve one-year terms but may be re-elected.

3. Materials to be provided by the faculty member for consideration by the DOD Tenure Review Committee include

- A vita covering only the previous six years

- Annual performance reviews including DOD Teaching, Service, Research/Creative Activity Rubrics, annual faculty report, chairperson’s evaluation, and faculty member’s response (if any) conducted under the terms of OP 32.32 for the period since the previous comprehensive performance review or promotion-tenure decision
• A one-page statement of the faculty member’s goals for future performance, and

• Additional documentation that the faculty member deems relevant to the comprehensive performance evaluation. University policies allow the faculty member being evaluated to include as much additional documentation as he or she wishes, although these additional materials usually consist of two pages or less.

4. DOD Department Chair convenes the Committee and gives them their charge. The Committee members then review the materials and meets to discuss the materials and formulate its evaluation. The Department Chair does not participate in the activities of the committee. When the Chair is being reviewed, the Dean or designee acts in the role of the department chair for the purposes of convening the committee and next-level evaluation. Tenured faculty who are up for review may not serve on the committee. Members of a peer evaluation committee who have a conflict of interest with an individual under evaluation should refuse themselves from evaluating that person.

5. Committee activities and the resulting decision of competent or incompetent are described below:

(a) The Review Committee will vote on ballots provided. These ballots will be attached to the completed Committee report and forwarded to the Chair. The report of the Review Committee shall consist of a finding of competent or incompetent for each evaluated faculty member. A finding of incompetence should reflect a long-term pattern of incompetent performance during the six-year period, rather than a short-term lapse in publication, weak teaching evaluations in a few instances, or other short-term variations in performance. The basic standard for evaluation is whether the faculty member under review conscientiously discharges with professional competence the appropriate duties associated with his or her position, not whether the faculty member meets the current standards for tenure, as those standards might have changed since the initial granting of tenure. A finding of incompetence must be based on evidence and be well-documented.

(b) The Report of the DOD Post-Tenure Review Committee is presented to the members of the DOD tenured faculty in the department, who vote by ballot to accept or reject the committee report. If the candidate has been deemed incompetent by the Post-Tenure Review Committee, the full set of materials from the review automatically go to the entire tenured faculty for their consideration before voting. If the candidate has been deemed competent, a voting tenured faculty member can view the materials upon request. After the vote by the tenured faculty, the results are given to the faculty member for comment. At this point the faculty member may make a written response.

(c) The DOD Department Chair indicates on the committee review form his/her assessment of competent or incompetent; he/she is required to add comments if the evaluation is of incompetence.
(d) The Report of the Post-Tenure Committee, the vote of the department tenured faculty, the faculty member’s rejoinder, if any, the Department Chair’s comments, and faculty materials are forwarded to the Dean.

(e) The Dean indicates competent or incompetent; he or she is required to add comments if the evaluation is of incompetence. The Dean reports the results to the Provost.

6. Due Process and Rights to Appeal

The comprehensive performance evaluation process incorporates commonly recognized academic due-process rights, as specified in the Texas Tech University Tenure Policy. Due-process rights include notice of timing, manner, and scope of the evaluation and, before a faculty member may be subject to disciplinary action on the basis of a comprehensive performance evaluation conducted under this policy, notice of specific charges and the rights to a hearing on those charges. In all such cases the burden of proof shall be on the University. In the case of a disputed peer review, the faculty member may request that additional reviews in writing be solicited from no more than three specialists in the faculty member’s area of teaching and/or research who are not members of the academic units. The outside reviewers will be selected by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the administrator of the academic unit responsible for the evaluation. The specialist reviews shall be included with the evaluation materials that are forwarded to the responsible academic dean, the University Provost, and the President and shall be considered in any administrative action that results from the comprehensive performance evaluation process.

7. Actions

A faculty member deemed incompetent may be placed in a development program as specified in OP 32.32, Section 5, receive other appropriate disciplinary action, or be subject to revocation of tenure if incompetency, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present. If termination is recommended as a result of the comprehensive performance evaluation, the faculty member shall be given the opportunity of referral of the matter to a non-binding alternative dispute resolution process as in Chapter 154 of the Civil Practices Code or another agreed upon dispute resolution method. Termination will be pursuant only to conditions of the termination procedure specified in the Texas Tech University Tenure Policy, Section

8. Application

The comprehensive post-tenure review process may not be waived for any tenured faculty member of Texas Tech University unless the faculty member is retiring or resigning at the end of the academic year in which the review is to take place.
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