

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & KINESIOLOGY POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Approved by HLKN'S Executive Committee  
December 19, 2016

These guidelines are in accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01, *Post-Tenure Review* and govern tenured faculty members in the College of Education and Human Development. Much of the language in this document was taken almost verbatim from the University's and College of Education and Human Development documents with some modifications to fit the context of the Department of Health & Kinesiology (HLKN).

Post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity. Post-tenure review is comprised of review by tenured faculty peers serving on division annual A1 evaluation committees as well as annual performance reviews by the department head (i.e., A2 evaluations).

## A. DEPARTMENT EXPECTATIONS

- 1 In accordance with University Rule, The College of Education and Human Development expects tenured faculty to perform satisfactorily at teaching; research, scholarship or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e. g administration, program coordinator, division chair, etc.) throughout their career.
- 2 Load requirement on these assignments may be modified but should not go to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.
- 3 Alternate work assignments (such as administration, program coordinator, division chair) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and dean. Faculty are to be reviewed based on the assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.
- 4 Faculty with 100% administrative appointments (for example, associate deans and department heads) will be reviewed by their immediate supervisor (in this case, the dean)

## B. FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2: "*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.*"

- 1 In the Department of HLKN, tenured faculty are housed in three divisions (i.e., Health Education, Kinesiology, and Sport Management). Therefore, each division has developed Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations, division and rank specific annual evaluation processes (A1), and Post-Tenure Review (PTR) criteria that establish guidelines with clear criteria for rating faculty performance in the annual review. These A1 guidelines were developed with faculty input and approved by Division Faculty, the Department Executive Committee, the Department Head, the Dean, and the Dean of Faculties. Recommendations for changes in the approved guidelines are made annually by the division A1 Review

Committee's and disseminated prior to the academic year in which they are to be used.

- 2 HLKN Divisions have established rating categories for annual reviews of "Satisfactory," "Needs Improvement," and "Unsatisfactory" for teaching, scholarship, service with criteria for each category clearly defined (see Appendix A). Meritorious performance is defined as performance in the top 10% of respective division faculty on the three year average of research credits earned on A1 annual review unless otherwise specified in the division specific criteria.
- 3 An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single category: teaching; research, scholarship or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e. g. administration, program coordinator, division chair, etc.) A rating of needs improvement in any two categories will equate to an "Unsatisfactory" rating on the annual evaluation.
- 4 An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria established in the A1 guidelines. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. A written improvement plan, developed by the faculty in collaboration with the department head, must be included with the report to the dean. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (Post-Tenure Review) of the faculty member.
- 5 Immediately upon receiving an "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" rating, the faculty must work with the department head to develop the improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take 1 year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. However, milestones must be established for each year of the plan. The ranking of "Needs Improvement" can stay as "Needs Improvement" as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the ranking will be changed to "Unsatisfactory".
- 6 A faculty with an unsatisfactory rating will be ineligible for merit. A "Needs Improvement" rating in one area **does not** disqualify one from merit.

### C. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (Post-Tenure Review)

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process 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 at the institution.** The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member. The expectations of faculty at the periodic peer review must be aligned with the expectations established by the faculty and department head in the A1 guidelines.

While the annual review is a snapshot of faculty performance over a year (or three years in the area of scholarship for most departments), the periodic peer review is a more comprehensive review and assesses faculty performance over a period of time (no more than six years) established by the department and written in the post-tenure review guidelines.

Note: The Periodic Peer Review is the Post-Tenure Review.

1. The purpose of the Periodic Peer Review is to:

- a. Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;
  - b. Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;
  - c. Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and
  - d. Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.
2. Each department will establish clear guidelines for Post-Tenure Review and will address:
    - a. In the Department of HLKN, peer-review will be conducted annually as part of the annual A1 evaluation by the tenured members on the A1 review committee. Committee membership is determined annually by vote of the division and/or assignment by the Division Chair. Division specific criteria have been developed and include assessment of annual performance from submitted A1 materials as well as assessment of productivity over a three year basis in the areas of teaching, research, and service, if applicable based on division criteria.
    - b. Criteria for rating of faculty performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility. These criteria have been alignment with those established for the annual review (A1) and faculty Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations.
  3. A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review
  4. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review
  5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically state the deficiencies, in writing. The faculty in collaboration with the department head will immediately develop an improvement plan to address the deficiency.
  6. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted by the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department the department head will share the report with the department head of the secondary department.
  7. No later than May 31, each department will provide to the dean a listing of faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. This report will be submitted to the Dean of Faculties.

#### D. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional

- 1 A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives (a) three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (b) an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (Posy-tenure Review) or (c) upon request of the faculty member. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.
- 2 The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
- 3 Within one month of notification of a Professional Review, the faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.
- 4 The department head will add to the dossier any additional materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 5 The Professional Development Review must be completed within three months of the submission of the dossier and will result in one of three outcomes:
  - a. **No deficiencies** are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
  - b. **Some deficiencies** are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee states the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. As mentioned in Item 2.4, the faculty member in collaboration with the department head develops an improvement plan to remedy the deficiencies.
  - c. **Substantial or chronic deficiencies** are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” acceptable to the dean.

## **E. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

1. Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will include the following:
  - a. specific deficiencies to be addressed;
  - b. specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
  - c. an outline of the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
  - d. time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
  - e. specific criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
  - f. resources to be committed by the department in support of the plan.
2. Annual Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies, and a progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.
3. Completion of the Plan.
  - a. When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the College community.
  - b. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

## F. APPEAL

1. If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4 *Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights*.
2. If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final.
3. If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final.
4. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

## G. VOLUNTARY POST-TENURE REVIEW

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review by making a request to the department head.

## H. DIVISION SPECIFIC CRITERIA

### *Division of Health Education*

The Health Education Division (HED) tenure-track faculty have developed the following annual review guidelines. Research productivity and scholarship will be based on (a) dissemination of scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited and non-edited books, 1<sup>st</sup> edition book chapters) and scholarly presentations at national/international conferences; and (b) grant activities. Teaching performance will be based on student course evaluations. Service performance shall be based on accumulation of service points on the HED A1 form.

Note: This PTR document is intended to provide general guidance regarding *expected minimal faculty engagement and productivity levels required for merit consideration* – should merit monies be available. Moreover, the criteria outlined herein are intended to identify faculty who need improvement in one aspect of their job (researching, teaching or service) and would benefit from a formal development/improvement plan and team.

**Exemplary faculty** are deemed to be those whose annual A1 adjusted point total places them in the top quartile of all HED tenure track faculty.

## RESEARCH

Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
<i>- Assistant Professors -</i>		
<i>At least 2 of the following criteria must be met:</i>	<i>Only meets 1 of the following criteria:</i>	<i>None of the following criteria are met:</i>
Published multiple peer-reviewed journal articles	Published only one peer-reviewed journal	Published no peer-reviewed journal articles
AND/OR	OR	AND
Submitted grant activities as PI or Co-PI	Submitted or led (PI, Co-PI, Co-I) grant activities	Did not submit (PI, Co-PI, Co-I) grant activities
AND/OR	OR	AND
Currently receiving funds via active grants as PI, Co-PI, or Co-I	Currently engaged in active grants as PI, Co-PI or Co-I	Does not have active grants as PI, Co-PI or Co-I
AND/OR	OR	AND
Disseminates research via national/international presentations	Disseminates research via national/international presentations	Does not disseminate research via national/international presentations
<i>- Associate &amp; Full Professors -</i>		
AND/OR	OR	AND
Disseminates scholarship in the form of books (first edition) or book chapters	Disseminates scholarship in the form of books (first edition) or book chapters	Does not disseminate scholarship in the form of books (first edition) or book chapters

## TEACHING

Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
<i>- Assistant, Associate, &amp; Full Professors -</i>		
<i>At least 1 of the following criteria must be met:</i>	<i>Meets the following criteria:</i>	<i>Meets the following criteria:</i>
Average annual teaching evaluation of $\geq 4.0$ on the following item:  - “The Instructor taught the class effectively”	Average annual teaching evaluation of 3.5 – 3.99 on the following item:  - “The Instructor taught the class effectively”	Average annual teaching evaluation $\leq 3.49$ on the following item:  - “The Instructor taught the class effectively”
OR		
Average annual teaching evaluation of $\geq 4.0$ on any 2 of the following items:  - “At the beginning of the semester, the instructor explained the evaluation process for this course” - “Class lectures, discussion, and/or activities were related to the stated objectives”		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Procedures for determining course grades were appropriate”</li> <li>- “The instructor was knowledgeable concerning the course content”</li> <li>- “The instructor was well prepared for class meetings”</li> <li>- “The instructor provided prompt feedback regarding my performance”</li> <li>- “The instructor responded constructively to questions asked in class”</li> <li>- “The instructor required a level of knowledge that included, but went beyond, memorization of facts”</li> <li>- “The instructor provided an opportunity for instructional assistance outside of class”</li> </ul>		
OR		
Satisfactory teaching evaluation by a representative from the Center for Teaching Excellence		

## SERVICE

Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
<i>- Associate &amp; Full Professors [n/a to Assistant Professors] -</i>		
<i>Meets the following criteria:</i>	<i>Meets the following criteria:</i>	<i>Meets the following criteria:</i>
100% of A1 service credits obtained	50-99% of A1 service credits obtained	<50% of A1 service credits obtained

### *Division of Kinesiology*

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
<b>Research</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">&lt;80% of minimum A1 or <u>none of the following:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First/senior author of a peer-reviewed publication</li> <li>2. external grant submission</li> <li>3. active external grant</li> <li>4. national/international conference presentation</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">80-99% of minimum A1 and <u>only one of the following:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First/senior author of a peer-reviewed publication</li> <li>2. external grant submission</li> <li>3. active external grant</li> <li>4. national/international conference presentation</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">≥100% of minimum A1 or <u>at least two of the following:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First/senior author of a peer-reviewed publication</li> <li>2. external grant submission</li> <li>3. active external grant</li> <li>4. national/international conference presentation</li> </ol>



<b>Teaching</b>	<80% of minimum A1 or (<3.5 average of student evaluations unless there is a satisfactory peer evaluation)	80-99% of minimum A1 or (3.5-4.0 average of student evaluations unless there is a satisfactory peer evaluation)	≥100% of minimum A1 and >4.0 average of student evaluations and satisfactory peer evaluation*
<b>Service</b>	<80% of minimum A1	80-99% of minimum A1	≥100% of minimum A1

\* Assistant Professors only

### ***Division of Sport Management***

The Division of Sport Management (SPMT) has adopted PTR criteria for research, teaching, and service. Annual reviews of the following criteria will be based on a three-year rolling total, unless otherwise noted. Review of research productivity shall be based on the volume of original scholarship in the following areas: (1) scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition book chapters, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited books, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition authored books), and (2) external funding (i.e., grant/contract submissions and procurements external of CEHD). Review of teaching performance shall be based on student course evaluation scores for those courses counting toward a faculty member’s annual teaching load. Faculty members also have the option for the Center for Teaching Excellence to review their teaching, if student evaluations fall below the suggested cut-points. Review of service performance shall be based on the accumulation of service points on the SPMT A1 form.

This PTR document is intended to provide general guidance regarding the expected minimal level of faculty engagement and productivity required for merit consideration (if a merit pool is available); and will serve as the criteria for identifying faculty members who: (a) need improvement in one or more of the areas noted, or (b) require a formal PTR hearing due to an extended period of “unsatisfactory” performance in one or more of the areas noted.

Faculty members are eligible for merit in the year of evaluation if they: (a) earn “Satisfactory” ratings in two areas and “Needs Improvement” in a third area, or (b) earn Satisfactory ratings in all three areas. One rating of “Unsatisfactory” in any category for the year of evaluation, or two “Needs Improvement” ratings for the year of evaluation automatically disqualify a faculty member from merit consideration, and will trigger a professional development plan.

The criteria offered below should not be interpreted as the minimum criteria needed for achieving tenure and promotion in the CEHD or replace the Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations of faculty in SPMT.

### **Unsatisfactory**

*Note: All criteria are based on a three year rolling total, unless otherwise noted.*

#### ***Research:***

- Publications: Two (2) or fewer scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition book chapters, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited books, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition authored books).
- Funding: Zero (0) external grant/contract submissions.

*Teaching:*

- <4.00 average student evaluation score for all courses taught.

*Service:*

- Assistant Professors: *n/a*
- Associate and Full Professors: average of < 50% of minimum A1 service credits.

**Needs Improvement**

*Note: All criteria are based on a three year rolling total, unless otherwise noted.*

*Research:*

- Publications: Three (3) scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition book chapters, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited books, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition authored books).
- Funding: One to Two (1-2) external grant/contract submissions.

*Teaching:*

- Between a 4.00 and 4.15 average student evaluation score for all courses taught. A faculty member who has an average score between 4.00 and 4.15 can have a rating above Satisfactory with a positive review from the Center for Teaching Excellence.

*Service:*

- Assistant Professors: *n/a*
- Associate and Full Professors: 50-99% of minimum A1 service credits.

**Satisfactory**

*Note: All criteria are based on a three year rolling total, unless otherwise noted.*

*Research:*

- Publications: Four (4) scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition book chapters, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited books, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition authored books).
- Funding: Three or more (3+) external grant/contract submissions.

*Teaching:*

- At least a 4.25 average student evaluation score; or (if below 4.25) a satisfactory review by the Center for Teaching Excellence.

*Service:*

- Assistant Professors: *n/a*
- Associate and Full Professors: 100% of A1 service credits obtained.

**Exemplary**

*Note: All criteria are based on a three year rolling total, unless otherwise noted. To be considered "Exemplary," faculty members must meet the minimum criteria outlined below. SPMT faculty will vote on those deemed "exemplary".*

*Research:*

- Publications: Nine or more (9+) scholarly publications (i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, 1<sup>st</sup> edition book chapters, 1<sup>st</sup> edition edited books, and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition authored books).
- Funding: Five or more (5+) external grant/contract submissions and at least one (1) funded project.

*\*Scholarly book notes: One non-edited book (i.e., in the year of publication) is equivalent to 3 journal publications. One non-edited book contract (i.e., in the evaluation year) is equivalent to one grant submission. One edited book (i.e., in the year of publication) is equivalent to 1 journal publication.*

*\*\*Grant/contract notes: Significant grant and contract procurement, depending on the level, size, and duration of the award, can be equivalent to 2-3 journal publications per year for the duration of the funding period. Multi-year grants can count towards a grant submission in a given year.*