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The post tenure review process encourages a high level of sustained performance throughout a faculty member’s academic career. The review process is intended to convey the constructive spirit of faculty development without intruding on the academic freedom of the faculty.

Post tenure review at Texas A&M University-Commerce applies to tenured faculty members and relies on the annual review of performance and the sixth-year Professional Review. Both are based on a high standard of excellence in teaching, research or other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service.

Annual Review
Annual reviews of performance are conducted for all faculty members (tenured and untenured); reviews provide written evaluations of performance in teaching, RSCA, and service; and they result in a written statement of goals commensurate with faculty rank, tenure status, and seniority. Individual faculty plans for achievement are developed annually from department criteria for teaching, RSCA, and service. Annual evaluation of tenured faculty should be treated as an ongoing “post tenure review” of the tenured faculty.

Sixth-Year Professional Review
Every tenured faculty member is reviewed every sixth year after receiving tenure or an academic promotion. The department head or equivalent will inform the faculty member of the required review and the procedures to be followed. Faculty members who are reassigned to administrative assignments, such as department head, assistant dean, or director of a program, are evaluated for PTR on the basis of the faculty role portion only.

The professional review is conducted by an Ad Hoc Review Committee (AHRC) composed of three tenured faculty members, one of whom is appointed by the academic dean/director of school, one by the department head or equivalent, and one by the faculty member to be reviewed. The committee may include faculty from one’s own department or from other departments, colleges, or universities.

Within one month of being notified of the professional review, the faculty member should submit a portfolio, based on the Service Report Form (see Appendix). The portfolio must include a current curriculum vitae; evidence of performance in teaching, RSCA, and service; and all documents, materials, and statements the faculty member deems relevant and necessary to support all work and accomplishments during the past five years. The department head or equivalent adds copies of the department faculty annual evaluations
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during the past five years and any other pertinent information to the portfolio. Materials may be added at any time during the review process.

The AHRC conducts the professional review within one month after the faculty member submits the initial portfolio. The review is based on the faculty member’s specific role and responsibilities, as outlined in the faculty member’s annual plan for achievement (goals) during the immediate past five years. As a matter of due process, the faculty member has the right to meet with the review committee (AHRC) prior to its final recommendation. The AHRC will provide copies of its findings to the faculty member and department head or equivalent. The department head or equivalent will forward them to the academic dean/director of school, along with his or her own recommendation. The dean/director of school will add his or her recommendation and forward the report and recommendations to the provost. If there is consensus among the AHRC, department head or equivalent, and the academic dean/director of school that the faculty member’s performance is satisfactory, the provost may rule that the post tenure review process cease and so notify the faculty member and the department head or equivalent.

Timeline for the PTR
October 1. The department head or equivalent notifies the faculty member that the PTR is to be conducted.

October 15. The appointment of the AHRC should be completed.

November 1. The review portfolio should be submitted no later than this date in the review year.

February 1. The review of performance is completed by the AHRC, department head or equivalent, and academic dean/director of school and is forwarded to the provost by this date.

March 1. The results of the PTR are provided to the faculty member.

If any of these dates fall on a day in which the university is closed, the date will be moved to the following business day in which the university is open.

The Professional Development Plan (PDP) and Its Completion
If the provost decides there are elements of unsatisfactory performance in a faculty member’s review, he or she will recommend to the president that the faculty member in question develop a PDP to overcome deficiencies within a period of two years. The PDP is an agreement indicating how specific deficiencies in a faculty member’s performance will be remedied.

The department head or equivalent, in consultation with AHRC, will help the faculty member finalize the PDP, which must be prepared by April 1. The academic dean/director of school must approve the PDP prior to its initiation. The plan will be initiated within 30
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days after receiving the academic dean/director of school’s approval. The faculty member’s progress will be monitored and will be reviewed a minimum of one time each semester.

When the objectives of the PDP have been met, or no later than two years after initiating the plan, the department head or equivalent will make a final report (including an overall rating for the period of the plan) to the faculty member, review committee, and academic dean/director of school. The overall rating will be inclusive of teaching, RSCA, and service.

If after two years of the plan’s implementation, the faculty member has not shown improvement in the identified deficiency areas and has not achieved an overall satisfactory rating, dismissal procedures may be initiated. An extension of no more than one year may be granted by the academic dean/director of school upon the recommendation of the department head or equivalent under unusual circumstances.

APPEAL: If a faculty member believes that the provisions of this procedure are unfairly applied, he or she may file a grievance.