

**Institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures**  
**Policy 05.05.02**

Section: Faculty Policies	Responsible Vice President: Executive VP and Provost
Subject: Evaluations	Responsible Entity: Council of Deans and Faculty Senate

**I. Title**  
*Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*

**II. Policy**  
In accordance with the *Texas Education Code* [Section 51.942](#), all tenured faculty must undergo a comprehensive periodic performance evaluation. With oversight by the Deans of the respective Schools, these evaluations will be conducted by peer review in each of the Schools of Health Professions (SHP), Nursing (SON), Public and Population Health (SPPH), and John Sealy School of Medicine (JSSOM), and as appropriate the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences.

**III. Procedure**  
In accordance with the principles enunciated by the Regents’ *Rules and Regulations*, [Rule 31102](#), *Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*, recognizing the importance of tenure as outlined in Section 2.2 of the Regents’ Rule, and using traditional governance structures, the faculty of each of the Schools has developed an implementation plan appropriate for the School.

Performance evaluations are a key component of employee growth and development. A thorough review allows managers and faculty members to:

1. Document individual performance;
2. Establish goals and expectations that align with and support the institution's objectives;
3. Recognize achievements and accomplishments; and
4. Discuss areas for improvement and identify opportunities for professional training and development.

Evaluation of tenured faculty will continue to be performed annually in compliance with [Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations](#). A comprehensive periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty will be performed every six (6) years. Scheduled reviews may not be waived for any tenured faculty member but may be deferred in rare circumstances when the review period will coincide with approved leave, comprehensive review for promotion, or appointment to an endowed position. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one (1) year from the scheduled review. Periods when a faculty member is on leave will not be counted in calculating when the comprehensive evaluation is required. The requirement of periodic review does not imply that individuals with unsatisfactory annual evaluations may not be subject to further review and/or appropriate administrative action.

The evaluation shall include a review of the faculty member’s professional responsibilities and accomplishments during the last six (6) years in teaching, research, service, patient care, and administration, as appropriate and commensurate with academic rank. Reasonable individual notice of at least six (6) months of intent to conduct a comprehensive post-tenure review will be provided to a faculty member.

**Departmental (JSSOM) or School Review (SHP, SON, and SPPH)**

The faculty member being evaluated shall provide the same material used for annual evaluations but cover the review period. The Regents' Rule requires that the faculty member submit a curriculum vitae, including a summary statement of professional accomplishments, and shall submit or arrange for the submission of annual reports and teaching evaluations.

The faculty member may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other additional materials the faculty member deems appropriate.

Evaluation of the faculty member's performance will be carried out per each school's policy by a peer review committee, but in any event, must be reported to the chair (or equivalent) and Dean for review.

Peer committee members shall include representatives of the department/school and will be appointed, on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength, by the Dean pursuant to processes as defined in school's policies. The faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to meet with the peer review committee or committees.

For a post-tenure review of the department chairs, deans, provost, and other University leaders with tenured faculty appointments, the Office of Faculty Affairs will appoint an *Ad Hoc Committee* in lieu of the departmental Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee ("APT Committee") to avoid any potential or perceived Conflict of Interests. The *Ad Hoc Committee* will consist of a Faculty Senate leader representing the school of the faculty, a former school department chair, and the Chair or Vice Chair of the school's APT Committee. The members of the *Ad Hoc Committee* shall not be from the department of the candidate.

Periodic reviews will use the same evaluation categories as designated in the annual reviews of "**exceeds expectations**," "**meets expectations**," "**does not meet expectations**," and "**unsatisfactory**." Specification of the criteria for each level of performance will be determined by the criteria and judgments that are applied to the annual review by each department/school and commensurate with academic rank. The faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to meet with the peer review committee or committees in instances where an unsatisfactory evaluation is issued. Faculty with an unsatisfactory evaluation also have the right to appeal through IHOP 05.03.08, *Faculty Grievance Policy*.

The results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member, the department chair (or equivalent), the Dean of the appropriate school, the Provost, and the President for review and appropriate action. In cases of an unsatisfactory evaluation, documentation of area(s) deemed unsatisfactory, and a copy of the written report shall be provided to the faculty member.

The formal post-tenure review process concludes at the department (JSSOM)/school (SHP/SON/SPPH) level with a written report unless there is a school level peer review of an unsatisfactory evaluation (JSSOM only).

Possible uses of the information contained in the report include the following:

1. For individuals found to be performing well, the evaluation may be used to determine salary recommendations, nomination for awards, or other forms of performance recognition.
2. For individuals whose performance indicates they would benefit from additional institutional support or a remediation plan, the evaluation may be used to provide such support (e.g., teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues/services expectations).
3. For individuals found to be performing unsatisfactory, a review to determine if good cause exists

for termination under the current Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, [Rule 31008](#), *Termination of a Faculty Member* may be conducted.

#### School-level review of unsatisfactory departmental evaluation (SOM only)

1. A school-level review of an unsatisfactory evaluation is not mandatory but may be initiated by the Dean or the faculty member under review.
2. The school level peer –review committee members shall be representative of the department/school and will be appointed, on the basis of their objectivity and academic strength, by the Dean pursuant to processes as defined in school policies. The faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to meet with the peer review committee or committees.
3. Additional information may be requested on the faculty member as deemed appropriate by the committee.
4. A final written report will be provided to the faculty member, department chair, and Dean.

#### Faculty Support Plans

1. A faculty development plan shall be established by the respective school Dean or department chair for all faculty receiving unsatisfactory evaluations or those receiving unsatisfactory reviews. The support plan will include a schedule for follow-up, defined goals and benchmarks for measuring improved performance. The plan should also outline resources available to the faculty member for meeting the plan objectives. A mentor will be assigned by the Dean of the school or department chair (or equivalent) to the faculty member to support the plan and faculty development. The mentor should be the person who has been involved in the annual evaluation, understands and has been involved with the plan in directing the individual.

#### Other considerations for periodic review

1. The six (6) year review period restarts with the date of promotion to associate or full professor.
2. Periodic evaluation of endowed positions can be deferred for one (1) year.

#### Procedural Review

1. The Council of Deans and the UTMB Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Chair, Chair-Elect, and Past Chair), herein referred to as the “Review Committee”, will monitor the Post-tenure Review Process. At any point in the Post-Tenure Review process, a faculty member may request a review of the process. The Review Committee will advise the Provost as to whether, in its judgment, the procedures followed in the faculty member’s case accords with both the University’s and commonly accepted professional standards for reviewing and evaluating faculty.
2. The faculty member initiates a review by making a written request to the Provost, describing the procedural irregularity being asserted. The Review Committee will make every effort to review the situation and make a written report to the Provost and faculty member within one (1) month of the written request. Informal questions may be directed to the Review Committee at any point, but activation of a formal review requires a written notification. The Post-Tenure Review process may continue while the committee review is in progress, but no final report or initiation (or continuation) of a Faculty Development Plan may occur until the review is complete.
3. The faculty member can appeal the Review Committee’s decision by following the procedures in IHOP 05.03.08, *Faculty Grievance Policy*.

#### Scheduling

1. Faculty members shall be given six (6) months advance notice of upcoming evaluation.
2. School-level reviews should be completed by July 1.

3. If appropriate, Faculty development plans should be established within sixty (60) days of the evaluation report with a scheduled appointment for follow-up.

Termination or Other Appropriate Disciplinary Action.

For tenured faculty members for whom incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is found, review to determine if good cause exists for termination under the current Regents' *Rules and Regulations* shall be considered, in accordance with the due process procedures of the Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 31008 and outlined in IHOP 05.03.10, *Termination*.

If disciplinary action other than termination is considered appropriate, such faculty members shall be notified of the specific charges and shall have access to a grievance hearing prior to the imposition of the disciplinary action pursuant to IHOP 05.03.08, *Faculty Grievance Policy*.

**IV. Relevant Federal and State Statutes**

*Texas Education Code* [Section 51.942](#)

**V. Relevant System Policies and Procedures**

Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, [Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)  
 Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, [Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member](#)  
 Regents' *Rules and Regulation*, [Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations](#)

**VI. Related UTMB Policies and Procedures**

[IHOP – 03.01.04 - Performance Management Program](#)  
[IHOP - 05.05.01 - Faculty Evaluations](#)  
[IHOP - 05.03.03 - Named Professorships and Endowed Chairs](#)  
[IHOP - 05.03.10 - Termination](#)  
[IHOP - 05.03.08 - Faculty Grievance Policy](#)

**VII. Dates Approved or Amended**

<i>Originated: 03/20/1998</i>	
<i>Reviewed with Changes</i>	<i>Reviewed without Changes</i>
03/13/2014	
01/28/25	

**VIII. Contact Information**

Council of Deans  
 (409) 747- 9083