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Purpose

A faculty member’s performance should continue to be evaluated even after receiving tenure. The results of a tenured faculty member’s performance evaluation may be used to support personnel decisions relating to commendations, suggestions for improvement, and when required, counseling of a faculty member whose evaluation shows the necessity for a professional development plan designed to address deficits in performance.

Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Stephen F. Austin State University (SFA) regards academic freedom as critical to the maintenance of a positive scholastic atmosphere as articulated in Policy 7.3.

Criteria and Evaluation

For the purpose of assessing performance of tenured faculty, each academic unit has developed criteria for categories of performance. Tenured faculty in each academic unit shall be evaluated annually for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Regardless of the criteria used for assessing performance, each evaluation must include the designation of either a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

If a faculty member receives a satisfactory administrative evaluation, the evaluation process is concluded for that year; the faculty member may then be considered for merit and/or promotion.

One unsatisfactory administrative evaluation shall result in a consultation with the academic unit chair/director. If a tenured faculty member receives two unsatisfactory administrative evaluations within any three-year period, a comprehensive professional review will be initiated.

Professional Review and Development Plan

The purpose of the professional review is to identify and place on record the deficiencies in performance and to formulate a specific professional development plan aimed at addressing the deficiencies. The academic unit chair/director shall notify the faculty member that a professional review will be initiated, and will inform the individual of the procedures for the review. The faculty member can request that the review process be conducted by the academic unit chair/director or through peer review.
The reviewer(s) shall consider the two previous unsatisfactory evaluations of the faculty member and recommend a specific development plan to the academic unit chair/director within sixty days. The development plan will specify the deficiencies that are being addressed and what steps the faculty member needs to take to remediate the performance deficiencies according to a timeline.

The final development plan should be the collaborative effort of the faculty member, the academic unit chair/director and dean, and should seek to benefit both the faculty member and the university. It is expected that all parties involved in the process of implementing a specific development plan will work in good faith. The annual evaluation process prescribed in Policy 7.6 is suspended while a faculty member is under professional review.

All professional development plans are formed to address specific situations and may vary from one plan to another. However, each professional development plan should include the following:

- specific deficiencies to be addressed in the plan;
- specific objectives needed to remediate the named deficiencies;
- a list of activities to be carried out to achieve the required outcomes of the professional development plan;
- a schedule of deadlines for completing the activities;
- criteria that will be used to assess progress; and,
- a plan for periodic documented assessment to be conducted at least annually.

Assessment documentation must include a statement of progress prepared by the faculty member and a formal written response by the reviewer(s). The university will provide reasonable support for the professional development plans within available resources. At the completion of the schedule stated in the plan, the academic unit chair/director will make a final report to the faculty member, the review committee, and the dean. If the academic unit chair/director and the dean agree that the faculty member has successfully completed the development plan, then the faculty member will be notified of the outcome. If the academic unit chair/director and dean determine that the faculty member has failed to meet the objectives of the professional development plan, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under Policy 7.29. Failure to adhere to the professional development plan is considered grounds for dismissal.

**Appeal**

At any point in the process a faculty member may enter an appeal under university grievance procedures. A faculty member subject to termination on the basis of evaluations conducted under this policy will receive specific written reasons for the terminations and have the opportunity for referral of the matter to a non-binding alternative dispute resolution process as described in
Chapter 154, Civil Practices and Remedies Code. The opportunity for non-binding alternative dispute resolution will be available only after all internal appeal procedures are exhausted.

**Cross Reference:** Tex. Educ. Code § 51.942; Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ch. 154; Faculty Handbook; Academic Freedom and Responsibility (7.3); Administrative Evaluation of Faculty Performance and Consideration for Merit Pay (7.6); and Tenure (7.29).
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