

Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure Review (PTR) is an expanded and in-depth performance evaluation conducted by a committee of tenured peers and administered by the provost. Procedures for conducting PTR are set forth in the Appendix.

This policy recognizes that the work of a faculty member is not neatly separated into academic or calendar years. To ensure that performance is evaluated in the context of ongoing work, the period of performance subject to Post-tenure Review is the five most recent Annual Performance Review cycles. Furthermore, PTR is not a process of re-tenure. The goal is to facilitate faculty growth throughout an academic career in accordance with College and Department norms. The university is responsible for providing resources, pedagogical training, and ongoing support to assist faculty growth.

PTR will be initiated by the provost when a faculty member has received, during any four (4) consecutive Annual Performance Review cycles, any two (2) of the following:

- overall annual performance rating of “**Failure to Meet Responsibilities**”; or
- annual performance rating of “**Failure to Meet Responsibilities**” in teaching, research, service, or disposition sub scores; or
- overall annual performance ratings of “**Improvement Needed**”; or
- annual performance ratings of “**Improvement Needed**” in the sub score of “**Faculty Teaching**”.

A five member peer review committee is charged to review the information relevant to the faculty member’s performance and to conclude whether that performance has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. The expectations for faculty performance may differ by campus, academic unit, department, and even among sub-disciplines within a department or program. Those expectations may be commonly held standards in the discipline or sub-discipline. Those expectations may be stated explicitly in the faculty member’s own past Annual Performance Reviews, work assignments, goals, or other planning tools (however identified), as well as department or academic unit guidelines, this handbook, Board policies, and in other generally applicable policies and procedures.

The peer review committee must reach a conclusion as to whether the performance has satisfied expectations for the faculty member’s discipline and academic rank. If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member’s performance has not met the expectations for the discipline and academic rank, the committee must recommend to the provost that a post-tenure improvement plan be developed or that tenure be terminated for Adequate Cause, in accordance with TSU’s Faculty Handbook. The committee must report its conclusions and recommendations in writing, including an explanation for each conclusion or recommendation, and enumerating the

anonymously cast vote and a dissenting explanation for any conclusion or recommendation that is not adopted unanimously. **The faculty member must have an opportunity to review and respond to the committee's report and recommendations. All written conclusions, the reasoning upon which they are based, and the recommendations of the peer review committee must be reviewed and considered by the provost.**

The provost may accept the conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee or make different conclusions in a written explanation provided to the faculty member with copies to the dean, department chair, president, and members of the peer review committee. If the provost concludes that a post-tenure improvement plan is warranted, the provost will direct the department chair to develop and implement a post-tenure improvement plan in accordance with the procedures described in [the appendix](#). If the provost concludes that that the faculty member's tenure be terminated for Adequate Cause, then the Termination Procedures for Adequate Cause for Unsatisfactory Performance, described in TSU's faculty handbook (Procedures for Termination, Adequate Cause), shall be followed.

In the case where a Post-tenure Review process is concurrent with annual review process, the department chair will coordinate with post-tenure peer review committee. Coordination will take one of the following forms:

- a. In the case where a faculty member is undergoing a Post-tenure Review during the time that an annual faculty evaluation is due, when possible, the department chair will postpone the annual faculty evaluation until the post tenure review committee has issued its report and the report has been accepted by the president. The report will be advisory to the department chair in preparing the annual faculty evaluation. The faculty member has the right to respond to the report. If it is not possible to postpone the annual faculty review until the post-tenure committee's report has been accepted, then the department chair will perform annual faculty review without input from the committee.
- b. In the case where a faculty member is required to follow a post-tenure improvement plan, the peer review committee will provide a written interim report at the mid-point of the improvement plan to the faculty member and the department chair on the faculty member's progress in satisfying the expectations established in the post-tenure improvement plan. The report will be advisory to the department chair, and the faculty member has the right to respond to the report. Any Annual Performance Review materials produced while a faculty member is undergoing Post-tenure Review or under a Post-tenure Review improvement plan will be made available to the post-tenure peer review committee

Appendix 1 | Objectives of Post-Tenure Review

The Post-tenure Review policy and procedures provide a thorough, fair, and transparent process for:

- coordinating peer evaluation of a tenured faculty member's performance for years immediately preceding PTR;
- facilitating cooperation between a tenured faculty member and administrators in identifying effective strategies to assist the faculty member in meeting the expectations for the relevant discipline and academic rank; and
- distinguishing those unusual situations in which (despite efforts to facilitate improvement) the faculty member's performance fails to satisfy expectations for the discipline and academic rank, and which may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including proceedings to consider termination of tenure.

Appendix 2 | Initiation of Post-Tenure Review by the Provost

As stated above, PTR will be initiated by the provost when a faculty member has received, during any four (4) consecutive Annual Performance Review cycles, any two (2) of the following:

- overall annual performance rating of “**Failure to Meet Responsibilities**”; or
- annual performance rating of “**Failure to Meet Responsibilities**” in teaching, research, service, or disposition sub scores; or
- overall annual performance ratings of “**Improvement Needed**”; or
- annual performance ratings of “**Improvement Needed**” in the sub score of “**Faculty Teaching**”.

The provost must first review any annual performance review that resulted in triggering Post-tenure Review. If the provost overrules the performance rating given during the annual performance review and determines that Post-tenure Review is not warranted, then the Post-tenure Review process ends. If the provost determines there is an issue with an annual review by a department head, then a formal review process of the department head that involves the Dean and Provost must be initiated by the provost. The review process will evaluate departmental review procedures and policies, fairness of the process, and potential issues with the department head that may require replacement of the position.

If the provost determines that Post-tenure Review is warranted, then the provost shall meet with the faculty member no later than 21 days after the determination to explain the decision and review the procedures for the Post-tenure Review process. The provost must also provide written notice of this decision within 30 days to the faculty member with copies to the department chair, dean, president, and Faculty Senate President that Post-tenure Review will be initiated.

Use the following links to navigate to a specific section of **Appendix 3**.

- A. **Appointment of the Peer Review Committee**
 - B. **Collection of Records**
 - C. **Review and Recommendations by the Peer Review Committee**
 - D. **Conclusions Regarding Performance and Recommended Action(s)**
 - E. **Review and Response to the Peer Review Committee's Report**
 - F. **Review and Action by the Provost**
-

A. Appointment of the Peer Review Committee

Within 45 days of the written notice that Post-tenure Review will be initiated, the provost must appoint the peer review committee in the manner described below and meet with the committee to review its charge.

Criteria: every member of the peer review committee must be:

- tenured;
- hold the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member undergoing review; and
- have some familiarity with the relevant performance expectations for faculty in that discipline and academic rank.

If an appropriate peer review committee cannot be assembled using these criteria, the provost must provide to the faculty member a written explanation for the deviation from the prescribed criteria.

Nomination Process:

- Consistent with the criteria for service stated above, the provost must appoint the peer review committee of five (5) faculty using the following nomination process:
- the **dean** nominates one (1) faculty member to serve both as chair and as a voting member of the peer review committee; when a faculty member has a split appointment across academic units, the dean of the academic unit in which the faculty member holds a majority appointment (that is, the faculty member's tenure unit) will provide the nomination;
- the **department chair** nominates two (2) faculty members from the department who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed; If the department

does not have faculty who meet the criteria for service as stated above, the department chair may nominate two (2) faculty external to the department who meet the criteria. For academic units without departments, the dean will nominate two (2) additional faculty members from the academic unit who meet the criteria for service as stated above. If the academic unit does not have faculty who meet the criteria for service as stated above, the dean may nominate two (2) faculty external to the academic unit who meet the criteria;

- the **faculty member undergoing review** nominates two (2) faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one committee member is appointed;
- the **Faculty Senate president or designee** nominates two (2) faculty members who meet the criteria above, from whom one (1) committee member is appointed; and
- the **academic unit tenure and promotion committee** nominates two (2) actively serving members who meet the criteria above, from whom one (1) committee member is appointed. If the academic unit tenure and promotion committee does not have faculty who meet the criteria for service as stated above, the academic tenure and promotion committee may nominate two (2) faculty external to the committee who meet the criteria.

B. Collection of Records

The provost is responsible for collecting the following records with respect to the faculty member under review:

- all annual performance reviews for the past five (5) annual performance review cycles, including materials submitted by the faculty member (or an administrator) or developed as part of the evaluation process;
- written performance expectations, which may have been established in the past five (5) annual performance reviews, in department or academic unit guidelines, in the Faculty Handbook, and/or in Board of Trustees policies.

The faculty member undergoing review may submit additional written materials relevant to the review period for the committee's consideration. Such materials must be submitted to the provost for distribution to the committee. The peer review committee may also request that the provost collect and provide additional written materials. Reasonable requests for relevant records will be honored when permitted by law and university policy.

External reviews may be deemed necessary by the PTR Committee, or the dean of the faculty member's majority appointment, or when requested by the faculty member undergoing PTR.

- Letters from no more than three external reviewers may be considered by the PTR committee;
- Requests for external letters by faculty undergoing PTR must be made in writing to the committee chair at the time their materials are submitted to the PTR committee;
- The Provost, or their designee, shall request the external reviews, in conformity with the following requirements:

- o One reviewer will be chosen from a list provided by the faculty member undergoing PTR;
- o One or more reviewers will be chosen from a list provided by the tenured faculty in the department of the faculty member undergoing PTR.
- Each member of the PTR committees will record the time devoted to the review process.

C. Review and Recommendations by the Peer Review Committee

The peer review committee is charged to review the available performance information and to conclude, based on that information, whether performance during the review period has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. This review and a written report of the committee's conclusions and recommendations should be **completed within 75 days** from the provost's charge to the peer review committee.

Interviews:

- The peer review committee may conduct a reasonable number of interviews in person or electronically. If the committee chooses to conduct interviews, both the faculty member undergoing review and the administrator who assigned the negative rating(s) must be given the opportunity to be interviewed.
- All interviews must be conducted separately. Unavailability of the faculty member or administrator for an interview does not constitute grounds for an extension of time to complete the Post-tenure Review.

Voting:

- Voting must be conducted by anonymous ballots. No member of the committee may abstain or recuse himself or herself from voting.
- All conclusions and recommendations are adopted upon the vote of at least three members of the peer review committee.

D. Conclusions Regarding Performance and Recommended Action(s)

All conclusions and recommendations of the peer review committee must be made in writing, with copies to the faculty member, department chair, dean, and provost. Minority reports may be attached. While the committee is not permitted to share written materials directly with the Faculty Senate, the faculty member under review remains free to do so.

Based on the judgment of its members, the peer review committee must conclude either:

1. That the performance satisfies the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank; or
2. That the performance does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank. In such a case, the committee must recommend either:
 - a. that a post-tenure improvement plan be developed and implemented; or
 - b. by a vote of at least three (3) committee members, that the provost should initiate proceedings to consider termination of tenure based on Adequate Cause for Unsatisfactory Performance as defined in the Faculty Handbook.

E. Review and Response to the Peer Review Committee's Report

The faculty member must submit a written response to the committee's report to the provost **within 14 days** of receiving the report.

F. Review and Action by the Provost

The provost will make an independent evaluation of the faculty member's performance and must provide to the faculty member, department chair, dean, president, and members of the peer review committee a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken. If the provost concludes that the performance under review has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the Post-tenure Review process is concluded.

If the Provost concludes that the performance under review does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the provost may take the following further actions:

- Require that a post-tenure improvement plan be implemented for a period of up to 18 months, as further described below in Appendix 4; and/or
- Impose disciplinary sanctions other than Termination for Adequate Cause in accordance with the Faculty Handbook or consider tenure termination based on Adequate Cause for Unsatisfactory Performance as defined in the Policy on Academic Tenure, 5:02:03:60.

Use the following links to navigate to a specific section in Appendix 4.

- A. **Plan Contents Notification**
 - B. **Development of the Post-Tenure Improvement Plan**
 - C. **Post-Tenure Development**
 - D. **Committee Review After Post-Tenure Review**
 - E. **Review and Action by the Provost**
-

4.A Notification

If the provost concludes that a post-tenure improvement plan should be developed, the provost must promptly notify in writing the faculty member under review that a post-tenure improvement plan must be implemented with copies sent to the department chair, dean, president, and peer review committee.

Only one improvement plan may be offered to a faculty member during a given Post-tenure Review process; however, the Post-tenure Review process may be implemented more than once during a faculty member's career. A Post-tenure Review improvement plan may extend no more than 24 months from the time it is implemented by the provost.

4.B Development of the Post-Tenure Improvement Plan

The **department chair** is responsible for drafting the post-tenure improvement plan in close collaboration with the peer review committee, dean, and provost. In drafting the improvement plan, the department chair should attempt to address any written concerns raised by the faculty member during the relevant annual review cycles.

Within 30 days of notice that an improvement plan must be developed, the department chair is expected to produce a plan approved by the dean, provost, and at least three (3) members of the peer review committee. Once such an improvement plan is developed, the provost shall forward the proposed plan to the faculty member. If the department chair fails to produce within 30 days an improvement plan approved by the provost, dean, and at least three (3) members of the peer review committee, then the peer review committee must assume responsibility for drafting an improvement plan. In such a case, the committee must complete the plan within **14 additional days**. Upon approval by at least three (3) members of the peer review committee, the proposed plan must be provided to the dean and provost for review and approval. In either case, the provost must ensure that an improvement plan is approved by the dean, and at least (3) members of the peer review committee. The provost will send the approved improvement plan to the faculty member for review and response.

The faculty member under review must be given an opportunity to review and respond to the proposed improvement plan **within 14 days**. The peer review committee must review and consider

the faculty member's response, including any modifications requested by the faculty member **within another 14 days**. At its discretion, the peer review committee may revise the proposed plan after considering the faculty member's response. The committee must then forward the proposed improvement plan to the provost for review and approval. The approved improvement plan will be sent to the **department chair, dean, and faculty member** for implementation.

In the case where a faculty member is required to follow a post-tenure improvement plan, the peer review committee will provide a written interim report at the mid-point of the improvement plan to the faculty member and the department chair on the faculty member's progress in satisfying the expectations established in the post-tenure improvement plan. The report will be advisory to the department chair, and the faculty member has the right to respond to the report.

Any Annual Performance Review materials produced while a faculty member is undergoing Post-tenure Review or under a Post-tenure Review Improvement Plan will be made available to the post-tenure peer review committee.

4.C. The Post-tenure Improvement Plan

The Post-tenure Improvement Plan must indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated college/department criteria developed under the provision of this rule) will be remedied. The plan will be developed and agreed upon by the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, and the dean. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good-faith effort to implement the plan adopted. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a Post-tenure Improvement Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the provost or provost's designee. Should mediation fail, the plan will be determined by the provost or provost's designee. Although each Post-tenure Improvement Plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan must:

1. List specific deficiencies to be addressed;
2. Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
3. Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
4. Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan;
5. Set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and
6. Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan.

The faculty member and department head will meet regularly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. The faculty member provides an annual progress report to the review committee and to the department head. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g., annual review) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set forth in the Post-tenure Improvement Plan. If a faculty member does not make sufficient progress on the Post-tenure Improvement Plan yearly, this may constitute adequate cause for dismissal or other academic discipline deemed appropriate by Academic Affairs.

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than two years after the start of the Post-tenure Improvement Plan, the department head must submit a final report to the faculty member and dean, with a copy to Academic Affairs. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflect a success for the entire university community.

If, after consulting with the review committee, both the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the Post-tenure Improvement Plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute adequate cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

4.D Committee Review After Post-Tenure Review

At the end of the time allotted for the Post-tenure Improvement Plan, the peer review committee must reconvene to review performance under the plan, and to determine whether such performance during the review period has satisfied expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank.

The peer review committee must vote anonymously and provide a written report of its conclusions and recommendations, including majority and minority reports (if applicable), to the **faculty member, department chair, and dean, and provost**. The faculty member may submit a written response to the peer review committee's report to the provost **within 14 days** of receiving the report.

4.E Review and Action by the Provost

The **provost** will make an independent evaluation of the performance under the improvement plan during the review period. The provost will provide a written explanation of the rationale for any conclusions, decisions, or further actions to be taken to the faculty member with copies sent to the **department chair, dean, president, and members of the peer review committee**. If the provost concludes that the performance under review has satisfied the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the Post-tenure Review process is concluded. In doing so, the provost may overrule previous performance ratings.

If the provost concludes that the performance under review does not satisfy the expectations for the faculty member's discipline and academic rank, the provost shall impose disciplinary actions, in accordance with this policy, or consider tenure termination based on Adequate Cause for Unsatisfactory Performance as defined in the Faculty Handbook

Appendix 5 | Timeline for Conducting Post-Tenure Review

All post-tenure deadlines are counted in **calendar days rather than business days**, except when the last day of the time period falls during a holiday or administrative closure lasting five business days or longer (such as the administrative closure between fall and spring semesters or an extended weather-related closure).

On a case-by-case basis, the provost may approve a written request from the peer review committee for an extension of time to complete the initial review. Only one extension may be granted to the peer review committee during a single Post-tenure Review period, and the provost will determine the length of the extension.

Concurrent Appeals – While a general appeal of an annual performance review or other procedure may overlap in time with the five (5) year review period, Post-tenure Review is purposefully different from the annual performance review process. To the extent provided under this handbook, the faculty member may choose to initiate or maintain an appeal of the most recent annual performance review while Post-tenure Review is underway. Any appeal or other process must be conducted without interference or influence from the Post-tenure Review, and vice versa. Faculty leaders should take care to ensure the integrity of all procedures by confirming that no person serves in multiple proceedings related to the same faculty member. Except as may be required by law any such appeal or other university process must proceed simultaneously with the Post-tenure Review and must have no impact on the timing of procedures described in this policy.