

## **Department of Educational Psychology Post-Tenure Review Process and Performance Expectations**

*Adopted 1-11-2017; Revisions Approved 10-8-2018*

The Department of Educational Psychology's (EPSY) post-tenure review guidelines align with the most recent updates to University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 *Post-Tenure Review* (revised October 6, 2016). EPSY's guidelines have also been prepared in accordance with The College of Education and Human Development's (CEHD) *Post Tenure Review Guidelines* (approved December 6, 2016); some of the language was taken verbatim from the University's and/or CEHD's most recently updated documents as well as guidelines from CEHD's Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development.

### **EXPECTATIONS AND PREMISE OF POST-TENURE REVIEW**

1. Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily in (a) teaching; (b) research, scholarship or creative work; (c) service; and (d) any other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration) throughout their career.
2. Modifications to assignments may change as one's career progresses, but tenured faculty appointments should reflect some percentage of effort (i.e., more than 0%) allocated in each of the categories of research, teaching, and service. Changes in level of expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase/decrease in load expectations in another category. Note that volume of work does not equate to quality.
3. Faculty are to be reviewed based on the assigned duties of their position. Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and dean.
4. Faculty with 100% administrative appointments (e.g., associate deans and department heads) will be reviewed by their immediate supervisor (in this case, the dean).

#### **Premise**

The primary purpose of EPSY's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process is to foster the continued development of tenured faculty members' teaching, research, and service productivity. Emphasis is placed on early identification and developmental support for faculty evidencing performance deficiencies in one or more areas. EPSY's PTR policies and procedures highlight the importance of peer input and are similar to departmental procedures associated with initial tenure and promotion decisions. Specifically, they provide multiple opportunities for evaluative administrator and peer input as well as faculty development support for faculty evidencing performance deficiencies prior to the required implementation of a formal *Professional Development Review* (per SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

## **EPSY Post-Tenure Review Committee Process and Timeline**

Post-tenure reviews (PTR) are conducted every spring during the same timeframe as the required annual reviews of faculty performance (University Rule 12.01.99.M2). These two review processes are parallel but may be conducted by separate committees. While the post-tenure reviews yield designations of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory for each of a faculty member's assigned area of service, the annual review may also yield share values (1 – 4) for meritorious productivity in each of those areas.

1. A PTR committee composed of one tenured-faculty member from each EPSY division will meet annually every spring to review the performance of all tenured faculty. This committee serves in an advisory capacity to the department head for post-tenure evaluations. PTR committee members are selected by the faculty, serve 3-year terms, and rotate off of the committee in staggered fashion to ensure continuity and ease of training. The PTR committee selects its chair from among those who have served 2 or more years on the committee. The individual appointed as chair will serve in that role for three years. (For example, if an individual is elected as chair after two years of service, she/he will serve three more years as chair for a total of 5 years of service.)
2. The PTR committee reviews each tenured faculty member's most recently submitted curriculum vitae in conjunction with the three most recent A1 submissions to access the pertinent information to evaluate the areas of teaching, research, and service. Using the department's performance expectations for these areas, the committee will render an evaluation of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of these assigned areas.
3. The committee will submit its review for each tenured faculty member to the department head prior to the annual spring submission date for A2 reports to the college, with sufficient time for the Head to incorporate the findings into the A2 evaluation of each faculty member with respect to post-tenure review status.

## **EPSY Performance Expectations for Post-Tenure Review**

Some of the following performance expectations have been in place for several years and will be applied during the 2018 annual review process. All additional/revised expectations listed in this document will be applied during the 2019 annual review process. For the 2019 evaluation, any rolling averages associated with new expectations will be based on two years. From 2020 and beyond, three year rolling averages will be used.

### **Performance Expectations for Research**

*Based on a 3-year rolling average:*

1. Publishes 2 or more written products\* per year in refereed journals, non-refereed professional outlets, relevant book chapters, or books.
  - At least 1 required product per year must be a peer-reviewed journal article.

- A newly funded external grant/contract (for which the faculty member served as the PI) can replace one required product in a given year.
2. Presents/co-presents 1 or more refereed presentation(s) per year at national / international / regional / state professional conferences.
  3. Writes and submits (as PI, Co-PI, or other major role) one or more proposals for funding from external sources in one of the following areas: research, teaching, program development, and/or service. Minimum expectation is 1 or more proposal within the previous three years. (\*\*Exception allowed if the faculty member is already managing an active extramural project during the time period.)

**Satisfactory:** Meets all 3 performance expectations

**Needs Improvement:** Fails to meet 1 performance expectation

**Unsatisfactory:** Fails to meet 2 or more performance expectations

---

## Performance Expectations for Teaching

1. Completes two courses (i.e., 6 credit hours of teaching or equivalent supervision load) each semester of full employment. *Load reductions require approved course buyouts or approved administrative releases.* Expectations for teaching FTE greater/less than 40% will be adjusted proportionally.)
2. Mentors doctoral students in research and/or teaching activities. Minimum expectation is a 9 variable credit hours per year or alternative evidence of comparable mentorship.
3. Co-authors with graduate students on professional presentations and/or publications. Minimum expectation is 1 or more products with graduate student(s) per year using a 3-year rolling average.
4. Develops course/practicum syllabi that meet TAMU's minimum syllabus requirements and are (a) reflective of current knowledge in the discipline, (b) distributed by the first day of class to students, (c) posted on Howdy (as required), and (d) submitted to the department.
5. Students provide positive feedback for courses/practica and mentorship. Indicators to the contrary include:
  - A pattern of average student ratings lower than 3.5 (for both face-to-face and online courses) for the *Professor treated students with respect* indicator on 3 or more courses within a three-year period.
  - A pattern of average student ratings lower than 3.5 (face-to-face) or 3.3 (online) for the *professor taught the course effectively* indicator on 3 or more courses within a three-year period.
  - A repeated pattern of formal student complaints/grievances documented across time.
6. Advises/chairs equitable share of graduate students based on program needs and enrollments. *Each division/program provides minimum numerical threshold for advising loads based on the program's overall graduate enrollments and competing needs.*

7. Provides doctoral students with annual evaluative feedback and completes online doctoral evaluations by the last day of May for all students chaired/co-chaired.

**Satisfactory:** Meets all teaching performance expectations

**Needs Improvement:** Fails to meet 1 or 2 performance expectations

**Unsatisfactory:** Fails to meet 3 or more performance expectations **or** a pattern of formal student complaints/grievances regarding egregious conduct.

## Performance Expectations for Service

*Based on a 3-year rolling average:*

### *Internal*

- Participates in some aspect of division/program- or department- level service activity during each academic year. (*Some examples: coordinating a degree program, chairing a division, serving on a search committee, serving as member of special task force, participating in accreditation/review preparation, coordinating WEAVE online entry, engaging in special recruitment activities etc.*)
- Serves on 2 or more ad-hoc or standing department, college, or university-level service activities within a 3-year period (*Some examples: climate committee, Council of Principal Investigators, Institutional Review Board, Graduate Instructional Council, Faculty Advisory Council, post-tenure review committee, A-1 reviews, Faculty Senate, search committees for other programs, technology council, etc.*)

### *External*

- Active, visible external service as (a) reviewer/editor for refereed publications, books/book chapters, (b) elected office/board/task force/advisory council for professional organization, or (c) panel member/reviewer for national grant agency  
Minimum expectation: Evidence of 1 or more external service activities per year.

**Satisfactory:** Meets all 3 performance expectations

**Needs Improvement:** Fails to meet 1 performance expectation

**Unsatisfactory:** Fails to meet 2 or more performance expectations

## EPSY POST-TENURE REVIEW EVALUATION OUTCOMES

1. Annual post-tenure reviews yield a designation of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of the core areas of research, teaching, and service. Criteria for these designations directly align with the department's annual evaluation process for awarding merit. (Regarding merit, eligible faculty may be awarded between 1 and 4 merit shares for meritorious performance in each of their assigned areas of research, teaching, and service. Final merit shares are determined by the

DH in consultation with the A-1 Review Committee recommendations and in accordance with EPSY's approved *Faculty Role Expectations*.)

- **Rating of Needs Improvement in One Area:** When a tenured faculty member's annual performance in a core area is deemed "*needs improvement*," that individual will be invited to collaborate with the department head to develop professional development plan. For teaching, this plan should typically take 1 year or less to successfully complete. In other areas (e.g. research), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. The rating of "*Needs Improvement*" can remain a following year as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to "*Unsatisfactory*."

Note: Atypical work load assignments may influence final evaluations and subsequent decisions of whether a faculty member warrants a professional development plan. For instance, a faculty member with a 40% teaching load would be expected to meet all departmental benchmarks for teaching. However, if a faculty has a 10% distribution of work load in teaching, some performance expectation levels (e.g., numbers of courses taught, number of advisees) may need to be adjusted accordingly. Given the numerous potential combinations of work load distributions and benchmarks, the final determination of whether a faculty member with an atypical workload distribution meets the annual performance expectations will be made by the Department Head.

- **Ratings of *Unsatisfactory* in one or more area or *Needs Improvement* in two areas:** Once the PTR committee's submits their annual review, the department head will review and determine whether there are any faculty who require further consideration for a department-level professional development plan due to ratings of *unsatisfactory*, or two or more *needs improvement* ratings.
2. If a faculty member does not agree with the designations of *Unsatisfactory* or *Needs Improvement*, or if the faculty member and the Department Head cannot come to agreement on a department-level professional development plan, the matter will be referred to a subcommittee of the department's Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee that is constituted by the T&P Chair and consists of four individuals from three or more divisions
  3. The faculty member will be invited to meet with the T&P Subcommittee to present her or his case. After hearing the faculty member the committee will, in collaboration with the Head, make the final decision on the issue at hand. The Head will communicate that decision to the faculty member and append a written summary of the decision to the faculty member's A-2 evaluation that will be submitted to the Dean of the College.
  4. The department will follow the CEHD Post-Tenure Review guidelines and University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 in implementing academic professional development for any

faculty member who has fallen below the performance benchmarks for the department.

5. In keeping with TAMU rules on post-tenure, a tenured faculty member also may voluntarily request a departmental promotion and tenure review by either the Department Head or the Tenure and Promotion Committee or both to evaluate his or her performance. Documentation of the results of such a review is not to be used in any other university evaluation except by explicit consent of the faculty member. This review may result in a development plan agreed to by the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

If a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive years of unsatisfactory performance reviews in any given area, the Department Head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review per TAMU's policies regarding post-tenure review. Note: University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 section 4.1 states that a professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “*Unsatisfactory*” annual reviews (section 2) or an “*Unsatisfactory*” Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7). The department head will inform the faculty member 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. All tenured faculty are advised to familiarize themselves with TAMU Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01 *Post Tenure Review* and the CEHD Post-Tenure Review Guidelines approved by Dean’s Council on December 6, 2016.