

Faculty Documents

GUIDELINES FOR SIX-YEAR FACULTY REVIEW The University of Texas Dental Branch at Houston Adopted January 14, 1998 Revision October - 2005

General Considerations

The University of Texas Dental Branch at Houston (Dental Branch) desires that all faculty members be given an opportunity to advance their academic career and achieve their professional goals. As part of this process, the Dental Branch considers periodic reviews of each faculty member an essential part of career planning, assessment, and development. The periodic reviews should serve as a basis for the evaluation process with respect to individual career goals in relation to the mission(s) of the department, the Dental Branch, and the UTHSC-H.

All faculty (tenured and non-tenured, full-time, and part-time) including department chairs and administrators with faculty appointments are evaluated annually by their respective chair or by the Dean (as appropriate). A more comprehensive evaluation will occur every six years (Six-Year Reviews). Exceptions may be made by the Dean in case of overlap with an approved leave or other comprehensive review, such as used for promotion and tenure. The purpose of the six-year evaluation is to encompass a broader view of accomplishments in the preceding six-year period and encourage long-range planning. This review also fulfills the UTHSC-H review requirements and the UT Board of Regents' mandated post-tenure review.

The proposed guidelines for Six-Year Reviews have been developed within the policies and are regulations of the UTHSC-H, The University of Texas Board of Regents' Rules and the Texas legislature's bill, SB149 on faculty review. The present guidelines include specific recommendations for the implementation of the review process at the Dental Branch. The general intent is for the review process to be objective and meaningful and at the same time not overly burdensome for all concerned.

Six Year Comprehensive Review

1. Process of Instituting the Reviews at the Dental Branch: The Six-Year Review process was phased in over a six-year period beginning with the 1997-98 academic year. Now that the first cycle of reviews (six years) have been completed, the process to be followed is the following:

Tenured faculty members are evaluated on a six-year cycle determined by the academic year of their award of tenure or most recent promotion. Non-tenured

faculty are evaluated on a six-year cycle determined by the academic year of their most recent date of appointment or promotion.

2. Role of the Office of Educational Research and Professional Development: The Office of Professional Development (OPD) will notify in writing all faculty members and the departmental chair of the intent to conduct the Six-Year Review, six months prior to the deadline for submission of review materials. The dean will be notified by the OPD about department chairs and associate deans undergoing the review. The Review of the faculty will be coordinated at the departmental level through the OPD.

3. Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Each faculty member will be expected to be their own advocate and will submit to their departmental chair a Six-Year Review packet within the specified six-year timeline. This packet will include their Faculty Development Plans and annual reviews (Activity Reports and Merit Review Scores) from the preceding six-year period. They must also submit within their packet a current curriculum vitae, student and peer evaluations, and any other supporting material they deem important to the review process.

4. Role of the Dean and Department Chair in the Submission Process:

A. **The Department Chair** will review the packet for completeness; provide a letter assessing the faculty member's overall (performance) record over the preceding six years; and deliver all materials to the office of the Dean by the submission deadline.

B. **Role of the Dean in the Submission Process for Faculty:** Once all faculty packets have been assembled in the Dean's office, the Six-Year Review packets will be sent from the Dean's office to the Dental Branch's designated review committee, the Dental Branch Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (DB-FAPT).

5. Submission Process for Department Chairs and Associate Deans with Academic Appointments: As with the departmental faculty, the chairs and associate deans will submit their packets to the Dean's office by the submission deadline. Once received, the Dean will review those packets for completeness and provide a letter assessing the overall (performance) record over the preceding six years for department chairs and associate deans with academic appointments. These packets will then be sent from the Dean's office to the Dental Branch's designated review committee, the Dental Branch Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (DB-FAPT).

Further information may be requested from or provided by the faculty member at any stage during the review, as appropriate within the review timeline.

6. Guidelines for Review: The DB-FAPT Committee will evaluate all faculty members' performance including department chairs and associate deans, using the guidelines listed below.

A. For tenured faculty members, the Six-Year Review should not be a repeat of the process used for attaining tenure. Primary consideration should be continuous, valuable contributions to the missions of the department, school, and UTHSC-H.

B. The review should be appropriate to the nature of the appointment.

C. The DB-FAPT Committee should consider in its review, the goals, expectations, assignments, and resources that were agreed upon by the faculty member and the chair during the Faculty Development Plan review process.

D. The committee should review scholarly activity from the broad perspective of scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and teaching.

E. Administrators should be evaluated with regard to their academic contributions as well as administrative and leadership skills, including recruitment and retention of faculty members, support of faculty development, and compliance with the annual and Six-Year Review process. Department chairs will submit their annual Activity Reports to the departmental Merit Review Committee for peer review regarding their academic contributions.

F. The committee must consider factors beyond the individual faculty member's control that may have affected performance.

G. The committee may request additional information.

H. All of the material provided to the committee will be considered strictly confidential.

I. The complete review packet with the committee's recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean within the timeline specified for the review.

7. Communication of Review Outcomes: The DB-FAPT will submit the review outcomes in writing to the Dean within twenty working days after the completion of the review. The Dean will then convey a review assessment and outcome(s) based upon the DB-FAPT report, to the faculty member and the respective department chair.

8. Faculty Disagreement with the Review: Reviewed faculty who disagree with the review outcome(s) have the right to submit additional (pertinent and new) information to the department chair for submission to the Dean within 10

days of the receipt of the letter from the Dean for further consideration. The Dean will submit the additional information submitted by the faculty member to the DB-FAPT for their consideration and re-review, and report to the Dean any change from their previous review of the faculty member.

9. Review Categories:

A. Satisfactory: For faculty with Satisfactory annual reviews, no further action is required.

B. Satisfactory with Comment: For faculty with Satisfactory annual reviews but whose documented performance record indicates that they would benefit from additional institutional assistance in relationship to their university duties and responsibilities. The review should address the nature and focus of any recommended assistance, be it teaching effectiveness, counseling, interpersonal relationships, mentoring in research, service expectations, and/or any additional area or areas that the review process identifies. The department chair and/or the Dean (as appropriate) will direct and monitor the progress of this structured assistance with the assistance from the OPD. The DB-FAPT reserves the right to reevaluate the faculty member during subsequent Six Year Reviews.

C. Not Satisfactory: Faculty who have received less than satisfactory annual reviews or who have not submitted the appropriate materials for the Six-Year Review process, will receive an unsatisfactory outcome. In response to this outcome, the DB-FAPT will make specific recommendations which may include the following:

C1. For faculty whose documented performance record indicates that they would benefit from additional institutional assistance in relationship to their university duties and responsibilities. The review should address the nature and focus of any recommended assistance, be it teaching effectiveness, counseling, interpersonal relationships, mentoring in research, service or teaching expectations, and/or any additional area or areas that the review process identifies.

These faculty must receive specific advice from the department chair in conjunction with the Associate Dean for Educational Research and Professional Development (as appropriate) on how to improve observed and delineated areas of concern. The faculty member will receive written guidelines for improvement, along with necessary assistance and a timeline needed for demonstrating improvement. Progress will be monitored during predetermined evaluation periods, as determined by consensus of the faculty member, the department chair, and/or by the Dean or their designee (as appropriate).

The DB-FAPT reserves the right to reevaluate the faculty member with an unsatisfactory outcome during the next three years subsequent to the regularly scheduled Six-Year Reviews.

C2. Termination of non-tenured faculty member by non-reappointment processes detailed in the HOOP (4.09: Reappointment and Non-reappointment).

C3. Dismissal for cause of tenured faculty by processes detailed in the HOOP (4.08 Termination for Good Cause) and in the Regents' Rules and Regulations (Part I, Chapter III, Section 6.3).

C4. Other appropriated action as identified and judged necessary by the DB-FAPT.

10. Dean's Role Upon Completion of the Review: The completed Six-Year Review will be submitted to the Dean for assessment. The Dean will determine and implement appropriate actions concerning the outcome or outcomes of the review and forward this conclusion, with comments (if pertinent), to the faculty member being reviewed, and the appropriate UTHSC-H offices (see 6. **Communication of Review Outcomes**, above).

References:

1. SB 149; (Section 1. Subchapter Z. Chapter 51, Education Code.) The Legislature of the State of Texas, 1997.
2. Guidelines for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty UT System Board of Regents, November 14, 1996.
3. UTHSC-H HOOP 4.07: Faculty Review. (Updated 01/05)