

## Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process

### PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The review has three components that all faculty will undergo: the Annual Review; the Dean's Level Audit; and the Academic Program Review.

#### A. Annual Review

- Normally covers the immediately preceding 36-month period with substantial emphasis on current year for evaluation of teaching.
- There will be four measurements--teaching, scholarship, service, and overall performance.
- Conducted by unit head and/or peer committee.
- Based on a written, goal-based agreement negotiated by the individual and unit head that fits within unit and campus mission and guidelines.
- Every annual review of teaching will contain and seriously consider student input, including evaluation of faculty classroom performance in all classes.
- Every instance of unsatisfactory evaluation in teaching will be addressed (see outcomes and consequences of performance evaluation).

#### B. Dean Level Audit

- Covers a proportion of reviews each year, so that over a maximum of 5 years, every file is reviewed.
- Panel is convened by the Dean.
- Checks the adequacy of the process and makes appropriate recommendations to unit peer committee.
- If appropriate, refers files back to the unit peer committee.

## Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process

### C. Academic Program Review

- Occurs every 5-7 years.
- Conducted by Dean and a panel of qualified members, which shall include external experts, community representatives, and recent alumni of the program.
- Where appropriateness of contribution is questioned, the file will be returned to the unit peer committee for intense examination.

## OUTCOME OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW AND CONSEQUENCES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

- Satisfactory performance in all areas of evaluation allows the faculty member to remain in the regular evaluation process with the possibility of merit pay raises.
- Overall satisfactory with a single area of unsatisfactory leads to a faculty development plan at the unit level.
- An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory or may result from one area of unsatisfactory (for example, teaching) depending upon the emphasis assigned to that area in the goal-based agreement and the extent of the deficiency.
- Overall unsatisfactory leads to a Performance Improvement Plan approved at the college level.
- The Chief Academic Officer on each campus shall ensure that every unit develops a clear definition of unsatisfactory performance that is appropriate to the mission of that particular unit and consistent with the mission of the university.

### Addressing Unsatisfactory Performance

Faculty members found to be performing at an unsatisfactory level are required to enter one of two processes, depending upon the extent of deficiency. Any single area of unsatisfactory performance--for example, teaching--will be addressed in a Faculty Development Plan at the unit level. Faculty members with overall unsatisfactory performance go directly into the Performance Improvement Process.

## **Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process**

### **Faculty Development Plan (at unit level)**

- Addresses a single area of deficiency, where the overall performance is satisfactory, before it becomes sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member's overall performance.
- Maximum of 1-year duration with appropriate interim monitoring and feedback.
- If satisfactory in all areas at the end of the Faculty Development Plan, the faculty member returns to the regular performance evaluation process.
- If plan objectives are not achieved at the end of the year, the faculty member shall receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory and must enter the performance improvement process.

### **Performance Improvement Process**

- Development and implementation of a performance improvement plan shall occur no later than the semester following the overall unsatisfactory evaluation.
- Performance improvement plan is developed in concert with appropriate administrators and peers.
- Performance Improvement Plan identifies areas of specific deficiency, and identifies the means by which the faculty member will improve performance.
- Teaching and service deficiencies will generally be addressed through a one-year performance improvement plan. In those rare circumstances where the nature of the deficiency cannot be fully remedied in one year, the duration of the plan may go beyond one year. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the provost.
- Annual or more frequent benchmarks tied to performance goals must be met.
- Failure to demonstrate adequate progress relative to these annual or more frequent benchmarks and performance goals shall lead to a recommendation for dismissal.

## Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process

- For a research deficiency or for the research component of an overall deficiency, the duration of the plan shall be as brief as is reasonable, but under no circumstances will it be longer than three years. Any plan that exceeds one year must be approved by the provost.

## IMPLEMENTATION

- Each university shall adopt procedures to implement Board policy and common elements for the 1997-1998 academic year.
- Procedures shall be reviewed for consistency by appropriate university and central office staff.

## Documenting the Impact of Post-Tenure Review

The goal of post-tenure review is to create an institutional climate that motivates faculty to continuously improve and maintain high levels of performance, and provides a timely mechanism with which to deal with faculty whose performance continues to fall below institutional expectations. The success of this policy will be evidenced by ongoing improvements in faculty performance. To document the way in which the policy is being implemented, a number of reporting mechanisms are proposed:

The Tenure Audit will contain:

- The number of faculty members who are evaluated as satisfactory or better.
- The number of faculty members who enter Faculty Development Plans, the nature of the deficiencies, and the outcomes of those Plans.
- The number of faculty members who enter the Performance Improvement Process, the nature of the deficiencies, the number of plans of different lengths, and the outcomes of the Process.

The Dean's Level Audit Report:

- The deans will report annually to the Regents on their audits of the annual reviews.

## **Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process**

The Academic Program Review Report will contain:

- Summary data on the evidence about the appropriateness of faculty contributions to the unit and university's mission.