

Guidelines for the Post-Tenure Review Process

(tenured faculty)

[ACD 506–11](#), “Post-Tenure Review,” describes post-tenure review and the principles that guide it. The steps of the post-tenure review process are described below. These steps are not necessarily separate or sequential.

Step 1. Performance Evaluation

An annual performance evaluation is required for all tenured faculty. The academic unit chair/director and/or peers from the individual faculty member’s unit evaluate performance, normally covering the immediately preceding 36-month period, with substantial emphasis placed on the current year (see [ACD 506–10](#), “Annual Evaluation of Faculty”). According to their workload assignment for the performance period under review, faculty members are given ratings on teaching, research, scholarship, and/or creative activities and service, and a composite rating for overall performance. The criteria and methods to determine these ratings are developed by the academic unit and are approved by the dean and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University.

Step 2. Academic Unit Development Plan

Any rating of unsatisfactory in any area of assigned responsibility will result in an academic unit development plan. Each individual unit should have specific, measurable definitions of satisfactory performance, and the individual faculty member’s mix of assigned responsibilities and their corresponding weights should be taken into consideration. This developmental plan will have specific goals for the faculty member to achieve, within one year, with appropriate interim monitoring and feedback. The purpose of this developmental plan is to help the faculty member improve performance. A second consecutive unsatisfactory performance rating in the same area will result in an overall unsatisfactory rating.

Step 3. Performance Improvement Plan

An overall unsatisfactory rating may result from two or more areas of unsatisfactory ratings in consecutive years, or from one area of unsatisfactory rating (for example, in teaching), depending on the emphasis assigned to that area in the workload assignment and the extent of the deficiency. An overall unsatisfactory rating will result in a Performance Improvement Plan.

The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is formulated by the academic unit chair/director and the dean. The faculty member will have the opportunity to provide input. The PIP must identify, at a minimum, the following points:

1. the specific deficiencies that led to the unsatisfactory performance rating
2. specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies
3. an outline of activities to be undertaken to achieve the outcomes
4. the timeframe within which the deficiencies are to be rectified. Typically, this is one academic year. 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. For a research deficiency or 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 Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University.

Guidelines for the Post-Tenure Review Process

(tenured faculty)

5. milestones with specific criteria so that progress toward goals or outcomes can be measured periodically (at least annually)
6. reasonable resources that can be made available to assist the faculty member in the achievement of goals. Such resources include, but are not limited to, faculty development and employee assistance.

The Performance Improvement Plan, once developed, will be discussed with the faculty member, the academic unit chair/director, and the dean. Should the faculty member, chair, and dean not agree after earnest discussion or if the faculty member fails to participate in the discussions, the chair and dean will establish the plan. The formulation of the PIP will not eliminate the rights of the faculty member to use the grievance process available in [ACD 509-02](#), "Grievance Policy for Faculty;" however, the filing of any grievance will not stay the implementation of the PIP. Once the plan is established, the faculty member's performance will be evaluated against the PIP rather than through the normal annual review process. If the faculty member fails to participate in the Performance Improvement Plan, the appropriate administrator may begin the process for dismissal for just cause. The process that will be followed is outlined in [ABOR Policy 6-201](#), "Conditions of Faculty Service."

Step 4. Monitoring and Follow-Up

Once a Performance Improvement Plan has been established, progress will be monitored with specific regard to the milestones mentioned in Step 3, part 5. A three-person committee appointed by the dean, or a three-person subcommittee from the College Personnel Committee selected by the chair/director, has the responsibility to monitor progress. At the completion of each milestone date, progress will be reported to the academic unit chair/director and the dean. Should the appropriate progress toward goals as measured by the specific criteria previously established not be met, the dean may exercise the option to initiate the dismissal for cause process.

Step 5. Completion of the Performance Improvement Plan

The PIP is completed when the faculty member has achieved the goals or outcomes specified in Step 3, or when the time allotted to the plan has expired. If the PIP is completed successfully, that is, goals or outcomes are satisfied, the faculty member will return to the normal annual performance evaluation process. If the goals and outcomes are not achieved by the expiration of the PIP, the dean may exercise the option to initiate the dismissal for cause process. In either case, a final report will be made by the academic unit chair/director to the faculty member and the dean.