

**Texas Tech University**  
**WHITACRE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**  
**Operating Policy and Procedures**  
[Approved by Executive: 07-29-20]

**WCOE OP 10.31: Comprehensive Performance Evaluation Procedure**

**Date:** August 2020

**Purpose:** The purpose of this Whitacre College of Engineering Operating Procedure (WCOE OP) is to establish uniform guidelines and procedures for comprehensive performance evaluations of tenured engineering faculty members and engineering faculty members who receive an academic promotion.

**Review:** This Operating Policy will be reviewed in the summer of every even-numbered year by the dean's office, with recommendations for revision presented to the Whitacre College of Engineering (WCOE) Executive Committee by August 15.

University Ops related to faculty workload

- OP 32.01 Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures
- OP 32.03 Academic Dean, Associate or Assistant Deans, and Department Chairpersons
- OP 32.05 Faculty Grievance Procedures
- OP 32.31 Comprehensive Performance Evaluations for tenured faculty members and faculty who receive an academic promotion
- OP 32.32 Performance Evaluations of Faculty
- WCOE OP 10.01 Tenure and Promotion
- WCOE OP 10.02 Annual Faculty Review, Evaluation and Expectations
- WCOE OP 10.06 Mediation of Faculty Disputes

**POLICY/PROCEDURE**

**1. Background**

In accord with VTCA, Education Code Section 51.942, and Board of Regents Guidelines for Comprehensive Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty and Faculty Members Receiving Academic Promotions, 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 will 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.

**2. Application**

All tenured faculty members in the Whitacre College of Engineering (WCOE) will have a comprehensive performance evaluation every one to six years. While the legislature specified comprehensive performance evaluations following tenure and also following promotion, the WCOE requires only a single review regardless of whether or not the tenure

and promotion occurred simultaneously. The single review will cover criteria for the academic rank of the person under review. Such criteria are listed in the WCOE OP 10.01 Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures. It should be noted that the comprehensive performance evaluation in no way is a substitute for the annual performance evaluations.

Associate Deans and other WCOE faculty members holding administrative appointments within the University will be subject to comprehensive performance reviews if their academic appointment within a department is 25% or above. These evaluations should carefully evaluate the contributions of the faculty member with respect to the percentage of time allocated to academic work within the department. Comprehensive evaluations of Department Chairpersons will be done by the Dean in accordance with TTU OP 32.03.

### **3. Criteria**

In the evaluation process a Review Committee will determine whether or not the person being reviewed is conscientiously and with professional competence carrying out his/her duties at his/her current academic rank, and is continuing to make a contribution to his/her department and college. The evaluation must take into account changes that occur over the course of an academic career, such as working in an administrative role, developing new academic programs, etc.

### **4. Departmental Guidelines and Procedures**

Each department within the WCOE will prepare a Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures document. At minimum, this document should describe the composition of the Review Committee and any procedures specific to the department in addition to those described in this document and TTU OP 32.31 and be consistent with the criterion described in WCOE OP 10.01. These procedures must be agreed upon by a majority of the voting members of the department and be approved by the Dean.

### **5. Timing**

- All faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure are given a comprehensive evaluation as described in WCOE OP 10.01. These evaluations are considered equivalent to those described in this OP.
- The period between comprehensive evaluations will be no more than six years and no less than one year. This period will normally be six years; however, it may be shortened at the discretion of the faculty member's Department Chairperson in consultation with the Dean.
- For faculty on leave from the University, the comprehensive review will be delayed until the first spring semester following their return.
- Faculty with pending retirements or pending resignations will not be subjected to comprehensive performance reviews.
- A Faculty database for Promotion and Tenure will be maintained in the Dean's Office by the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs.

### **6. Evaluation Package**

The faculty member under review will prepare a dossier as outlined in Section 9 of the WCOE OP 10.01 on Promotion and Tenure; however, the Dean's letter, the department chairperson's letter, the solicited and unsolicited reference letters, and Peer Observation of

Teaching Summary are not necessary. All annual performance reviews since the previous comprehensive performance review or promotion-tenure decision shall be included.

## **7. Candidate's Responsibilities**

The candidate shall

- Review this OP, all applicable OPs as stated in herein and the Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures.
- Prepare an Evaluation Package addressing the criterion outlined in WCOE OP 10.01
- Submit the Evaluation Package no earlier than February 1 to the Department Chairperson.

## **8. Chair's Responsibilities**

The department chair shall

- Notify the candidate who has been identified for comprehensive performance evaluation no later than September 1 and provide the candidate with a copy of this OP and the Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures.
- Assemble a peer review committee that reviews the material, meets and votes on the candidate prior to April 1 of the year following notification of the comprehensive performance evaluation; members shall not have an identified bias.
- Will send the Evaluation Package to the Review Committee 2 weeks prior to their meeting.
- Chair these meetings but will not vote.
- (With one other committee member) count the ballots and record the votes in the presence of the committee.
- Announce only the wishes of the majority of the Review Committee. When there is no simple majority among the possible selections (1) Satisfactory Progress, (2) Remedial Action Required, and (3) Unsatisfactory Progress. Selections (2) and (3) together form a simple majority, the Chairperson will inform the Review Committee that the vote reflects an unsatisfactory evaluation. The Chairperson should make every effort to ensure the confidentiality of the vote.
- In case of a positive evaluation from the Committee, the results of the ballot and written comments will not be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering, provided that the Department Chairperson is in agreement with the finding. In this case, the Dean of Engineering will simply be informed of the positive outcome by way of a letter from the Department Chairperson. If the Department Chairperson disagrees with the findings, the ballot forms and any written comments, together with Attachment B, which includes the Chairperson's evaluation and recommendations for improvement and institutional support to sustain that improvement, will be forwarded to the Dean of Engineering.
- In case of an unsatisfactory evaluation from the Committee, the Committee will develop specific recommendations for improvement. The Department Chairperson will complete Attachment A and forward it together with the ballot forms, any written comments, and the Committee recommendations to the Dean of Engineering who will determine the appropriate course of action and so inform the faculty member and his/her Chairperson.

- Inform the Dean of Engineering in writing of the outcome of the review by April 15.

## **9. Review Committee**

The Review Committee members shall

- Constitute as described in the Departmental Comprehensive Evaluation Procedures document.
- Be the only ones allowed to attend the committee meeting(s).
- Attend meetings scheduled between February 1 and March 1 of the year following notification to the faculty member of the comprehensive performance evaluation.
- First discuss any questions of clarification pertaining to the Evaluation Package, and then discuss the performance of the faculty member over the last annual evaluation period.
- Select one of the following recommendations during the secret ballot (see Attachment B):
  - Satisfactory Performance.
  - Development Program Required.
  - Unsatisfactory Performance.
- Ballots are not to be signed but may contain handwritten comments. It should be noted that the ballots are discoverable in case of litigation.
- Be able to submit an absentee ballot to the department Chairperson prior to the committee meeting which they are unable to attend.

## **10. Dean's Responsibilities**

The dean will notify the faculty member in writing of the outcome of the evaluation by May 1.

## **11. Special Cases**

- In the case of a Department Chairperson undergoing a comprehensive performance evaluation, an Associate Dean will perform the duties normally performed by the Department Chairperson. In these cases, there will obviously be no recommendation from the Department Chairperson.
- In the case where a faculty member is on a development leave, the evaluation will take place at the first regularly scheduled evaluation following his/her return.

## **12. Outcomes**

As a result of the review process described above, a faculty member may be terminated, placed in a development program as specified in OP 32.32, Section 5, or other appropriate disciplinary action, or subject to revocation of tenure if incompetency, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present.

## **13. Grievances**

Any grievances over this process, recommendations and Chair's discussion will be resolved using WCOE OP 10.06 and University OP 32.05 for dispute mediation.

Attachment A

Comprehensive Performance Evaluation Form  
**Whitacre College of Engineering Texas Tech University**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Department/Unit:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Employment:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rank/Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Rank Obtained:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Tenure Granted:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Submitted:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Review Committee Members:**

---

---

---

---

**Review Committee Vote:** (record vote)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory Performance
- \_\_\_\_\_ Development Program Required
- \_\_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory Performance

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Chairperson Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness Signature

**ATTACH SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION & ANY  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Attachment B

POST-TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE  
BALLOT

Name of Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Satisfactory Progress

☐

Remedial Action Required

☐

Unsatisfactory Progress

☐

Reasons for vote:

(Comments shall be handwritten. Comments will be shared with the candidate, College Committees, dean, & provost. The ballots are discoverable in case of litigation. **Please do not sign.**)