



Angelo State University
Operating Policy and Procedure

OP 06.19: Regulations for Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

DATE: August 15, 2018

PURPOSE: The purpose of this Operating Policy/Procedure (OP) is to establish uniform guidelines and procedures for comprehensive performance evaluations of tenured faculty members.

REVIEW: This OP will be reviewed by February every three years, or as needed by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate with recommended revisions forwarded through the provost and vice president for academic affairs (PVPAA) to the president by March 1. This policy may be amended only by action of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. Background

In accord with VTCA, Education Code, Section 51.942 and the Board of Regents Guidelines for comprehensive performance evaluation of tenured faculty, each faculty member who is tenured at Angelo State University, excluding full-time academic administrators having tenure, is subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation. Each tenured faculty member must undergo a comprehensive performance evaluation once every six years following granting of tenure. The dean of the college initiates the evaluation process by notifying the faculty member of the comprehensive performance evaluation no later than September 1, the evaluation to begin no earlier than February 1 and end no later than May 1, all of the same academic year. The dean of the college simultaneously notifies the PVPAA and the faculty member's department chair.

2. Procedures

Standardized procedures, including required peer review, directed toward the professional development of the faculty member will be followed by each department and college. These procedures include:

- a. The comprehensive performance evaluation is to be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research and creative works, professional service, administration (when applicable), and clinical service for faculty with clinical responsibilities. The evaluation must include peer review of the faculty member.
- b. Annual performance evaluation materials, including the Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation Form as well as the Department Peer Evaluation Form, conducted under the terms of OP 06.28 Annual Performance Evaluation for Tenured and Tenure Eligible

Faculty for the period since the previous comprehensive performance evaluation will comprise the primary elements in the comprehensive review process. For a tenured faculty member's initial comprehensive evaluation under this policy, annual performance evaluation materials for the past six years will be used, including the Faculty Activity Report and Evaluation Form, the Department Peer Evaluation Form, and any departmental documents that outline faculty progress towards departmental-level performance criteria as specified in OP 06.23 Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures. The faculty member may submit additional supporting documentation as he or she deems relevant for the comprehensive performance evaluation, such as:

- (1) complete vita, including a summary statement of professional accomplishments;
 - (2) statement of professional goals; and
 - (3) professional development plan.
- c. The evaluation process will consist of the following steps:

- (1) Evaluation by faculty peers at the department level

The department chair initiates the department peer review process after receiving notification of the required review from the dean. The chair convenes a meeting of the tenured faculty, charges them with evaluating the faculty member, and specifies the date by which deliberations must be completed. The department chair will not participate in the discussion or vote. The tenured faculty will elect one of their number to serve as chair of the committee. The tenured faculty members, excluding the department chair, vote by secret ballot. In cases where the department does not have at least three tenured faculty members, the department chair will request evaluation from tenured members from other departments to provide a review committee of at least three people. The peer review committee is responsible for providing a summary rating (Performing Competently; Not Performing Competently) and providing constructive comments in narrative form when a rating of Not Performing Competently is identified. The elected chair will supervise the counting of ballots and fill out two copies of the evaluation form (Attachment A). The chair will destroy the ballots and forward one copy of the evaluation to the department chair and simultaneously forward the second copy to the faculty member.

A faculty member may meet with the peer review committee prior to its deliberations or upon receiving the committee's evaluation.

- (2) Evaluation by the department chair

The department chair adds his/her evaluation of the tenured faculty member's comprehensive performance (Performing Competently; Not Performing Competently) and provides constructive comments in narrative form when identifying a rating of Not Performing Competently. A copy of this evaluation will be provided simultaneously to the dean and the faculty member. Both the department chair and faculty member will sign the evaluation.

(3) Evaluation by the direct supervisor of administrative duties (when appropriate)

The direct supervisor of a faculty member with administrative duties is responsible for providing a summary rating (Performing Competently; Not Performing Competently) and providing constructive comments in narrative form when identifying a rating of Not Performing Competently (Attachment B). The supervisor will forward simultaneously a copy of the form to the department chair, appropriate dean, and faculty member. Both the supervisor and faculty member will sign the evaluation.

(4) Evaluation by dean of the college

The dean will review each comprehensive evaluation, including that of the peer review committee, department chair, and direct supervisor (when appropriate). The dean adds his/her evaluation (Performing Competently; Not Performing Competently) to the evaluation form (Attachment A), including constructive comments when identifying a rating of Not Performing Competently, and simultaneously forwards a copy to the faculty member and all appropriate materials, including Attachment B if appropriate, to the PVPAA for review.

(5) Evaluation by the PVPAA

The PVPAA reviews all materials, adds his/her evaluation (Performing Competently; Not Performing Competently) to the evaluation form(s), including constructive comments when identifying a rating of Not Performing Competently and simultaneously forwards a copy to the faculty member. The PVPAA forwards written results of all evaluations as well as his/her recommendation to the president.

- d. At each level of review, an opportunity is provided for reconciliation of disagreement. In cases when the Department Peer Review Committee disagrees with the faculty member, reconciliation is left to the department chair. When the findings of the Department Peer Review Committee differ from those of the department chair, the dean of the college resolves the conflict. When the dean's report is in conflict with that of the department chair, the PVPAA is responsible for resolving the disagreement. When the direct supervisor for a faculty member's administrative assignment disagrees with the faculty member, reconciliation is left to the dean or PVPAA as appropriate.

3. Due Process and Rights to Appeal

The comprehensive performance evaluation process incorporates commonly recognized academic due-process rights, as specified in the Angelo State University Tenure and Promotion Policy. Due-process rights include notice of the 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 right to a hear 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 external specialists in the faculty member's area of teaching and/or scholarly activity/creative endeavor. These outside reviewers will be selected by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department chair. The external specialist reviews shall be included with the evaluation materials forwarded to the responsible academic dean, the PVPAA, and the president and

[Minor revision: Approved by the Board of Regents, August 10, 2018]

shall be considered in any administrative action that results from the comprehensive performance evaluation process.

4. Actions

A faculty member may undergo developmental planning as specified in OP 06.28 Annual Performance Evaluation for Tenured and Tenure Eligible Faculty or appropriate actions as specified in OP 06.29 Faculty Non-Reappointment and Tenure Revocation.

5. Application

The annual comprehensive evaluation is not waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred for one year in the event that the review coincides with the comprehensive review for promotion or appointment to an endowed position. The PVPAA must approve any request for deferment.

6. Notification

A copy of this policy and any amendments will be filed with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on or before September 1 of each year.

Attachment A: [Comprehensive Tenured Faculty Performance Evaluation](#)

Attachment B: [Comprehensive Administrative Performance Evaluation](#)