

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY

A Member of the Texas State University System

SRSU Policy: Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty SRSU

Policy ID: FH 2.21

Policy Reviewed by: Executive Vice President and Provost

Approval Authority: President of the University

Approval Date: August 2025

Next Review Date: August 2030

In accordance with the *Texas Education Code Section 51.942* and the *Texas State University System Rules and Regulations* Chapter V section 4.28, Sul Ross State University is required to adopt rules and procedures providing for a periodic performance evaluation process for all tenured faculty. The evaluation of all tenured faculty shall be part of the university's annual Academic Evaluation System. In addition, tenured faculty at associate and full professor rank will participate in a comprehensive review every five years.

A. Procedure for the Annual Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

All tenured faculty will undergo an annual evaluation of their teaching, research and service. When a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory annual evaluation from the department chairperson and the appropriate college dean, an intensive professional development plan will be implemented to assist the faculty member in addressing and overcoming the identified deficiencies. The professional development plan recognizes that Sul Ross State University has invested considerable time and effort to recruit and retain capable, tenured faculty members.

1. Satisfactory Annual Evaluation.

All tenured faculty shall be evaluated annually as part of the Academic Evaluation System. When this annual evaluation indicates that the tenured faculty member's performance is satisfactory, then no further action is necessary.

2. Unsatisfactory Annual Evaluation, Year One.

When a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory annual evaluation from both the department chairperson and the appropriate college dean, this will be understood as a warning that the tenured faculty member is not performing the responsibilities of a faculty member conscientiously or competently. The department chairperson and the dean may exempt a faculty member from annual review when substantive mitigating circumstances exist.

a) Tenured Faculty Meets with Department Chair

The department chairperson shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the recent annual evaluation and attempt to identify the problem areas revealed by the evaluation.

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY

A Member of the Texas State University System

- b) Department Chairperson.
 - (i) If the faculty member is the department chairperson and receives an unsatisfactory evaluation from the college dean, then the dean shall refer that evaluation and the appropriate materials to the executive vice president and provost. If the executive vice president and provost concurs with the dean's original evaluation, then he shall instruct the dean to initiate the review process for the chairperson.
 - (ii) In this instance, the dean and the department chairperson shall work together to construct a professional development plan acceptable to the vice president and provost.

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY

A Member of the Texas State University System

c) Professional Development Plan.

The professional development plan is an agreement setting objectives to remedy specific deficiencies indicated in the faculty member's evaluation. Based on the collaboration among the faculty member, the department chairperson, and the college dean, the plan should reflect the professional goals of the faculty member, the concerns of the reviewer, and the faculty member's contribution to the department and the university. The faculty member shall sign the professional development plan and make a good-faith effort to work towards its successful completion.

Specifically, the professional development plan shall (1) identify deficiencies, (2) establish remedies for these deficiencies, (3) set a timeline to achieve these objectives, and (4) stipulate the institutional resources which can be used to assist the plan.

d) Progress and Assessment.

The faculty member and the department chairperson shall meet at least twice each semester after the professional development plan has been implemented to assess progress. A progress summary shall be provided to the college dean.

e) Plan Completion.

The professional development plan may extend for no more than one year. When the results of the professional development plan are available, the department chairperson shall compare the objectives of the professional development plan and the results of the recent evaluation. If the plan's objectives have been met; the chairperson shall notify the college dean. If the faculty member has failed to satisfactorily correct the deficiencies noted in the plan, the University may take further action against the faculty member in accordance with University and System policy.

3. Unsatisfactory Annual Evaluation, Year two

a) Unsatisfactory Evaluation.

The university may, but is not required to, permit a second, consecutive professional development plan. If a second consecutive professional development plan is permitted by the University and if the faculty

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY

A Member of the Texas State University System

member receives a second unsatisfactory evaluation, the department chairperson, and the college dean, shall meet to assess the situation. If the department chairperson and the dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the objectives of the professional development plan, then dismissal may result. Failure to meet the goals of the professional development plan is evident when the department chairperson, and the dean agree that the existing deficiencies in the completion of the plan demonstrate that the faculty member under review has not performed conscientiously and with professional competence the responsibilities expected of a faculty member at Sul Ross State University.

B. Procedures for Fifth-Year Comprehensive Performance Evaluation for Tenured Faculty

The fifth-year comprehensive performance evaluation of tenured associate and full professors must be conducted with consideration for both the overall benefit of the University and the continued professional development of the faculty member.

The evaluation of Associate Professors who are applying for promotion to full Professor during their fifth year will constitute the comprehensive performance evaluation process required by this section.

1. For tenured faculty, the comprehensive performance evaluation will be based on the same requirements and criteria used for tenure and promotion, as outlined in Section 2.04 (C) of the *Sul Ross State University Faculty Handbook: General Qualifications and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure*.
2. The process and timeline will be as follows:
 - a. Faculty members must submit the dossier to the department chair by the second Friday in October.
 - b. The department chair shall review each faculty member's five-year performance dossier and determine one of three outcomes: no deficiencies, minor deficiencies, or substantial and chronic deficiencies. The chair shall submit the recommendation, with a written justification, to the dean by the second Friday in November.
 - c. The college dean shall review each faculty member's five-year performance dossier and determine one of three outcomes: no deficiencies, minor deficiencies, or substantial and chronic deficiencies. The dean will forward the recommendation, with a written justification, to the University Promotion and Tenure Council on the second Friday of February.
 - d. The University Promotion and Tenure Council will review and assess the faculty members' five-year performance dossier and determine one of three outcomes: no deficiencies, minor deficiencies, or substantial and chronic deficiencies. The

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY

~~A Member of the Texas State University System~~
University Promotions and Tenure Committee will forward their recommendation, with a written justification, to the executive vice president and provost on the first Friday of March.

- e. The executive vice president and provost shall review all five-year performance dossiers and determine one of the following outcomes: no deficiencies, minor deficiencies, or substantial deficiencies by the first Friday of April. The executive vice presidents and provost's decision is final.
- f. If a faculty member is found to have substantial deficiencies, the subsequent processes will follow the procedures outlined in FH 2.21(A)(2) and (3).