



Post-Tenure Review Policy

Area:	Division of Academic Affairs	Number:	
Applies to:	Division of Academic Affairs	Issued:	May 23, 2013
Sources:		Revised:	July 15, 2019
		Reviewed:	August 9, 2018
Policy Owner:	Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs	Page(s):	4

I. Policy Statement

Introduction

Post-tenure review, the systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all tenured faculty, is an extension of the evaluation system currently in place. Coupled with any evaluation process is the obligation to provide faculty development opportunities that allow all faculty to realize their full potential. Post-tenure review focuses on identifying faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty that mutually benefit the individual and the institution. The ultimate purpose of post-tenure review is to recognize, reward, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty.

Purpose and Criteria

The post-tenure review process and the process for deciding promotion and tenure share the same evaluation criteria; however, their purposes and evaluation standards are different. The purposes of post-tenure review are:

- to recognize and reward tenured faculty who have made and continue to make significant contributions to the missions of their departments, colleges, and the University;
- to provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, but also scholarship and/or service, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the University; and
- to provide a systematic faculty development plan to remedy instances where a tenured faculty member's contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service are found to be deficient with respect to the missions of the department, college, or University.

Post-tenure review not only concentrates on the period under review, but also considers the cumulative contributions of faculty. For this reason, and because it focuses on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and the individual, judgments regarding post-tenure review should be based on contributions over one's career as well as those since the last review. A satisfactory post-tenure review indicates that the individual continues to make contributions which benefit the University, its students, and its other constituents.

In an institution devoted to "teaching first," teaching and contributions to the learning environment are of paramount importance in the post-tenure review process. Evidence of contributions in the areas of scholarship and service is also required. The three criteria, teaching, scholarship, and service, are described in *Section 306* of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Each unit should define the exact criteria and how they will be assessed (see Roles and Responsibilities), taking into consideration the uniqueness of the individual, the variations within disciplines, and the differing expectations and assignments that influence faculty contributions. Individual differences are reflected in varying combinations of emphasis in teaching, scholarship, and service; however, teaching and contributions to the learning environment are the primary focus of post-tenure review.

Schedule

Board of Regents policy stipulates that each tenured faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, as defined below, and at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, a written declaration to retire within five years (submitted through the appropriate dean's office to the Provost's Office), or a leave of absence. In the latter case, the faculty member will be reviewed upon returning to active employment. Tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities are in administration, including interim appointments, will be reviewed five years after returning to a full-time faculty position. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review will submit their materials for evaluation to the department chair or unit head by mid-January.

Roles and Responsibilities

Each department, school, college, and the library will develop written procedures and specific criteria for post-tenure review as outlined below and will provide a copy of the procedures to each tenured and tenure-track faculty member. Reviews may be carried out at the department, school, or college level as agreed upon and described in the units' written procedures. The phrases "department chair" and "unit head" as used in this document refer to the line officer who is the immediate supervisor of the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review.

Faculty are responsible for providing documentation of their performance as follows:

- an up-to-date curriculum vitae and copies of the annual performance review for each of the five years under consideration;
- measures of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service (including but not limited to a combination of written (or online) student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations);
- a self-evaluation narrative of accomplishments for the period under review and projected goals for the next five-year period; and
- other documentation as specified by the college or department/unit.

Faculty may submit other materials which may enhance the review committee's understanding of their performance. It is recognized that materials submitted by non-teaching faculty will differ substantially from those submitted by teaching faculty. The faculty member and the department chair or unit head will develop the documentation and provide it to the review committee.

The post-tenure review process will be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty peers with tenure, with the committee composition and selection process to be determined at the department, school, or college level in consultation with the appropriate dean. Units should strive to ensure diversity of membership in post-tenure review committees. After reviewing documentation of performance as outlined in the unit's post-tenure review document, the committee will be expected to provide informed and candid feedback in a written report on the quality of the faculty member's performance, accomplishments, and contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Meritorious accomplishments should be noted by the committee in any review. Likewise, major, chronic, or ongoing deficiencies should be identified and

supporting documentation provided.

The committee will provide a written summary of its findings and any recommendations for faculty reward or development to the department chair or unit head who will transmit the written summary to the faculty member and discuss it with him or her. The unit head should append his/her comments, and both the faculty member and the unit head should sign the document to indicate that they have discussed the committee's report and the unit head's comments. The faculty member may append a written response. A copy of the committee's report, the unit head's comments, and any written response by the faculty member will then be sent to the administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member's administrative unit where they will be reviewed and commented on by the dean/administrative director. All written comments will also be forwarded to the faculty member. These comments, along with all other documents that played a substantive part in the review not readily available elsewhere, will then be placed in the faculty member's personnel file at the department/unit level. The dean composes a memorandum to the provost, summarizing the findings at each level of review for each candidate and including a final assessment on whether the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations. This memorandum is submitted *electronically* to the Provost's Office by mid- March.

In response to post-tenure review, the unit head will be responsible, in consultation with the faculty member, for deciding whether the faculty member should be rewarded for meritorious accomplishments (see "Relationships to Other Campus Processes" below) and/or engage in faculty development activities that would be helpful to the faculty member and in the best interest of the institution. Funding for any required development plan will be arranged by the unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above. In most cases, the results of the post-tenure review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development plan would focus on further enhancing the faculty member's performance (e.g., enhancing knowledge and skills in the use of current technologies in teaching or scholarship). Faculty development is an important opportunity for all faculty members as they seek to reach their full potential and perform at their full capacity.

In cases where a faculty member is identified in the post-tenure review as having deficiencies, the administrative unit head, in consultation with the faculty member, must establish a formal plan of development. A formal plan includes identifying appropriate resources for faculty development on campus, on other campuses of the University System, at the System level, or in other locations. The plan for faculty development should (a) define specific goals or outcomes that the plan is designed to achieve; (b) outline the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes; (c) set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and (d) indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member will monitor progress. The faculty member's unit head will be responsible for forwarding the formal faculty development plan resulting from a post-tenure review to the appropriate administrative office at least one level above the faculty member's unit. The unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above are jointly responsible for arranging for appropriate funding for the development plan, if required.

At the time of the annual evaluation, the administrative unit head will meet with each faculty member who is working on a development plan because of deficiencies to review progress toward achieving the goals of the formal faculty development plan. A progress report, which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the appropriate administrative officer at least one unit above the faculty member's unit. It will be the responsibility of the unit head and the current post-tenure review committee to determine if, after a specified period of three years, the faculty member has been successful in completing the formal faculty

development plan; they will report that finding to the appropriate administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member's unit. An individual who successfully completes a development plan will be reviewed five years from the date of the original post-tenure review. If the faculty member has not been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan, the University may move for dismissal for cause under existing Board of Regents policy, *Section 8.3.5.4*, provided that the deficiencies meet the strict requirements of that policy.

A faculty member who disagrees with the results of a post-tenure review, including the need for a development plan, shall have the right to appeal as defined by the unit in implementing this policy. Each unit will develop an appeal procedure. The unit will provide the provost as well as all tenured and tenure-track faculty with a copy of this procedure.

Relationships to Other Campus Processes

Academic Freedom This policy is written in the spirit of upholding the University's commitment to academic freedom, and committees and individuals who act under this policy must ensure the academic freedom of faculty under review. The policy is not designed to abridge academic freedom, hinder the tenure or annual review process, or facilitate the dismissal of faculty (see the Academic Freedom Policy, approved by the Faculty Senate in June 1998, in § 301 of the *Faculty Handbook*).

Termination for Cause Nothing in the post-tenure review policy alters current Regents policy on dismissal for cause or its due process requirements. While dismissal for cause as the result of the post-tenure review process will be rare, it may be justified in certain instances as defined in Regents policy, *Section 8.3.9*.