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Post-Tenure Review

Over the past decade, higher education institutions have given increasing attention to the concept of post-tenure review. Because “post-tenure review” can convey both general and specific meanings, it is important to define the term. In the general sense, post-tenure review might apply to any form of evaluation or performance review of faculty members who have achieved tenure. Such forms of review are numerous, including annual performance or merit salary reviews, more thorough reviews at the time of promotion, student evaluations, peer reviews of research performance through federal research grant competitions, and faculty reviews as components of regional or specialized accreditation or other internal or external program reviews. In this brief note, however, we use the term post-tenure review (PTR) to refer to a formal periodic review procedure for tenured faculty that is separate from and operates in addition to traditional evaluation procedures such as those listed above. Post-tenure review policies have both supporters and opponents.

As early as 1983, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) stated a position on PTR:

The Association believes that periodic formal institutional evaluation of each postprobationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom.

In 1999, AAUP issued a report that reaffirmed the principles of its 1983 statement but also expanded on that position, expressing a strong concern that post-tenure review, if substituted for dismissal procedures, could obscure actions that might constitute violations of academic freedom. The 1999 report included a set of guidelines and “best practices” intended to ensure that post-tenure review, if implemented, would contribute positively to faculty development without infringing academic freedom.¹

In contrast to the reservations about PTR expressed by AAUP, a number of universities believe that their PTR procedures have produced clear benefits ranging from improving the quality of faculty performance to building support within the governing boards for the tenure system.

To better understand the extent and nature of PTR policies at AAU universities, the AAU Tenure Committee contacted AAU universities requesting information about any such policies they might have, and inviting comments from member presidents and chancellors on PTR. The responses to this request indicated that member institutions differ widely with respect to PTR policies.

¹“Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response,” a report endorsed by AAUP at its 1999 Annual Meeting (Attachment 1). It should be noted that several AAUP recommendations for PTR are reflected in PTR provisions adopted by a number of universities included in the AAU survey of university PTR policies.
1) **Institutional Responses**

- The committee received 41 responses to its query about PTR policies: 28 of 34 public institutions (including the two Canadian members) and 13 of 27 private institutions responded.

- Twenty-two of the 28 public institutions that responded had PTR policies, while only two of the 11 private institutions had institution-wide PTR policies, and one private institution’s engineering college had a PTR policy.

- Five sample policies are attached to this report (see Attachments 2-6).

2) **Variations among policies**

The various policies differ widely in their intent, degree of formality, and implementation. The impetus for some policies seems to have been the need to respond to external criticisms of tenure, while others are internally focused on faculty recognition and development; most policies have elements of both accountability and faculty development. Some policies apply to all faculty members at regular intervals; others apply only to those faculty members for whom annual reviews or other events trigger a set of PTR actions.

Because of their wide variation, it is difficult to characterize the institutional PTR policies by discrete properties, but the following descriptions attempt to give some sense of the nature of the policies submitted:

- **Purpose**: About half of the policies indicate that their purposes are both to facilitate and reward strong performance and to address substandard performance (13 policies). Four policies seem to focus solely or primarily on faculty reward and development, and five seem to be organized solely or primarily to detect and respond to substandard performance. Two policies also identify harmonizing faculty interests and departmental needs as a purpose, and three cite the provision of external accountability as a major purpose.

- **Coverage**: Twelve policies apply to all faculty members, with reviews conducted generally at least every five years. In contrast, ten policies are event-triggered: typically, an annual review triggers differential outcomes, with satisfactory reviews generating no subsequent action but unsatisfactory reviews triggering some more formal action such as a performance improvement agreement developed by the faculty member and department chair. Four policies include a review of department chairs and deans as well as faculty members.
• **Implementation**: Five policies leave the development of a PTR procedure to academic units; the rest are central policies applied institution-wide. In nine of the policies, the department chair or other unit head carries out the core evaluations; in ten policies, the evaluations are carried out by faculty peer review committees.

• **Outcomes**: Outcomes are tied to the purposes of the policies. Those that are designed to identify and reward exemplary performance often have provisions for extra financial support or benefits beyond the merit raises provided through annual reviews. Several policies indicate that a re-proportioning of teaching, research, and service might be an appropriate response in individual circumstances. Responses to substandard performance reviews typically involve a series of steps moving toward resolution of the problem or toward increasing sanctions. In some policies, such sanctions can end in dismissal, although three policies state that PTR cannot lead to dismissal, which is carried out under a separate process.

• **Date of adoptions**: Though it is sometimes difficult to differentiate the date of adoption of a new policy and the modification of an existing one, most of the PTR policies seem to be recently adopted: 16 of the 25 policies appear to have been adopted since 1995.

3) **Effectiveness of policies**

Several letters accompanying the submitted policies contain statements about perceived benefits of PTR—that the procedure has been a major factor contributing to high faculty productivity, has led to improved faculty development and heightened faculty morale, improved the connection between stated goals and individual performance, enhanced faculty participation in the mission of the university, maximized the allocation of faculty skills and resources to unit missions, and provided improved accountability both within and outside the institution.

On the other hand, faculty PTR can be quite costly in faculty and staff time, money, and other institutional resources. From a cost/benefit standpoint, the question becomes whether the added costs of PTR produce benefits beyond those resulting from annual performance reviews and other evaluation procedures that are sufficient to justify those costs. For many of the university respondents whose institutions do not have PTR policies, that cost/benefit analysis does not warrant adoption of PTR.

It should be noted that the costs of PTR vary widely based on the nature of the policy, ranging from the high costs of formal policies requiring the review of all faculty on a regular basis to the lower costs of policies that engage only at the margins of performance, triggered by events such as a series of annual reviews significantly above or below average. Moreover, a number of institutions which do not have formal PTR
policies have the functional equivalent, with strengthened annual reviews and informal procedures for providing differential treatment of special cases.

That PTR is so dominantly a phenomenon of public universities may suggest that in many cases PTR policies are developed in response to pressure from state legislators or publicly appointed or elected governing boards. Nonetheless, a number of institutions have clearly developed PTR policies based on internally perceived institutional needs and benefits. Faculties seem to react at least initially with suspicion or disapproval of proposed PTR policies, fearing that they will undermine tenure and threaten academic freedom, as noted in the attached AAUP report. Yet some institutions report that PTR policies, once implemented, have led not only to faculty acceptance but to strong faculty support, particularly in those cases where the policy is understood to have led to greater recognition of outstanding performance or earlier redirection of malperformance.

The committee believes it is not appropriate for the AAU to suggest any particular system of ongoing review and evaluation of tenured faculty. Rather, we believe it is important for all presidents and chancellors to assure themselves that their system for ongoing evaluation of faculty is sufficiently robust to support their intellectual goals and to meet their responsibilities to the worlds of scholarship and education.

Attachment 1: American Association of University Professors report on post-tenure review
Attachment 2: Iowa State University post-tenure review policy
Attachment 3: University of California, Davis post-tenure review policy
Attachment 4: University of Colorado System post-tenure review policy
Attachment 5: University of Southern California post-tenure review policy
Attachment 6: The University of Texas at Austin post-tenure review policy
If you would like a complete copy of the report including the attachments, please contact Sandie Dickerson, Assistant to John Vaughn, by email (sandie_dickerson@aau.edu) or phone (202-408-7500) and one will be sent to you by mail. The attachments are not available electronically.
The following report, approved in June 1999 by the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, was adopted that month by the Council and endorsed by the 1999 Annual Meeting. It is a briefer version of a report that was published in the September-October 1998 issue of Academe.

Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response

1. Introduction

The Association's existing policy on post-tenure review, approved by Committee A and adopted by the Council in November 1983, is as follows:

The Association believes that periodic formal institutional evaluation of each postprobationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom.

The Association emphasizes that no procedure for evaluation of faculty should be used to weaken or undermine the principles of academic freedom and tenure. The Association cautions particularly against allowing any general system of evaluation to be used as grounds for dismissal or other disciplinary sanctions. The imposition of such sanctions is governed by other established procedures, enunciated in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, that provide the necessary safeguards of academic due process.

More than a decade later, new forms of post-tenure review are fast becoming a reality: a significant number of legislatures, governing boards, and university administrators are making such reviews mandatory, others are in various stages of consideration. For this reason it has become necessary to reaffirm the principles of the 1983 statement, but also to provide standards which can be used to assess the review process when it is being considered or implemented. This report accordingly offers practical recommendations for faculty at institutions where post-tenure review is being considered or put into effect.

The principles guiding this document are these: post-tenure review ought to be aimed not at accountability, but at faculty development. Post-tenure review must be developed and carried out by faculty. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution's administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the
II. Post-Tenure Review and Academic Freedom: A General Caution

Post-tenure review should not be undertaken for the purpose of dismissal. Other formal disciplinary procedures exist for that purpose. If they do not, they should be developed separately, following generally accepted procedures. (Note 1.)

Even a carefully designed system of post-tenure review may go awry in a number of ways of serious concern to the Association. Many, though not all, proponents of post-tenure review purportedly seek to supplement preexisting ways of reviewing the performance of tenured faculty with a system of managerial accountability that could ensure faculty productivity, redirect faculty priorities, and facilitate dismissal of faculty members whose performance is deemed unsatisfactory. Despite assurances by proponents that they do not so intend, the substitution of managerial accountability for professional responsibility characteristic of this more intrusive form of post-tenure review alters academic practices in ways that inherently diminish academic freedom.

The objectionable change is not that tenured faculty would be expected to undergo periodic evaluation. As noted here, they generally do—and they should. Nor is there any claim that tenure must be regarded as an indefinite entitlement. Tenured faculty are already subject to dismissal for incompetence, malfeasance, or failure to perform their duties, as well as on grounds of bona fide financial exigency or program termination. Nor is the issue, as many faculty imagine, simply who controls the evaluation. Faculty members as well as administrators can and do err.

Rather, the most objectionable feature of many systems of post-tenure review is that they ease the prevailing standards for dismissal and diminish the efficacy of those procedures that ensure that sanctions are not imposed for reasons violative of academic freedom. Some proponents of post-tenure review, motivated by a desire to facilitate the dismissal of tenured faculty, seek to substitute less protective procedures and criteria at the time of post-tenure review. But demanding procedures and standards are precisely what prevent dismissal for reasons violative of academic freedom.

If the standard of dismissal is shifted from "incompetence" to "unsatisfactory performance," as in some current proposals, then tenured faculty must recurrently "satisfy" administrative officers rather than the basic standards of their profession. In addition, some forms of post-tenure review shift the burden of proof in a dismissal hearing from the institution to the tenured faculty member by allowing the institution to make its case simply by proffering the more casually developed evaluation reports from earlier years. Effectively the same concerns arise when the stipulated channel for challenging substantively or procedurally unfair judgments in the course of post-tenure review is through a grievance procedure in which the burden of proving improper action rests with the faculty member.
Even on campuses where there is not thought to be a problem with so-called "deadwood" or incompetent faculty members, many proponents of post-tenure review, as well as those who adopt it in the hope of forestalling more comprehensive and blatant attacks on tenure, sometimes envision such review as a means for achieving larger management objectives such as "down-sizing," "restructuring," or "re-engineering." Individual faculty reviews should, however, focus on the quality of the faculty member's work and not on such larger considerations of programmatic direction. Downsizing may be properly accomplished through long-term strategic planning and, where academically appropriate, formal program discontinuance (with tenured faculty subject to termination of appointment only if reasonable efforts to retrain and reassign them to other suitable positions are unsuccessful).

It might be thought that the untoward impact on academic freedom and tenure may thus be eliminated by implementing a system of post-tenure review that has no explicit provision for disciplinary sanctions. Even here, however, where the reviews are solely for developmental ends, there is a natural expectation that, if evidence of deficiency is found, sanctions of varying degrees of subtlety and severity will indeed follow absent prompt improvement. Hence, even the most benign review may carry a threat, require protections, and inappropriately constrain faculty performance. This point warrants further elaboration.

A central dimension of academic freedom and tenure is the exercise of professional judgment in such matters as the selection of research projects, teaching methods, student evaluations, and course curricula, as well as the choice of colleagues. Those who have followed recent attacks on faculty workloads know that the issue rapidly shifted from the allegation that faculty did not work enough (which it turned out they plainly did) to the allegation that faculty did not do the right sort of work. Some proponents of post-tenure review will thus not be content with the identification of the few "slackers" already known to their colleagues by other means, nor even with the imposition of a requirement of faculty cooperation and institutional loyalty. They also want faculty members to give back some portion of their ability to define their own work and standards of performance. For example, increased emphasis on students' evaluations of teaching may lead to the avoidance of curricular experimentation or discourage the use of more demanding course materials and more rigorous standards. Periodic review that is intended not only to ensure a level of faculty performance (defined by others than faculty) but also to shape that performance accordingly, and regardless of tenure, is a most serious threat to academic freedom.

Another consequence of the misapplication of the managerial model to higher education is the ignoring of another important dimension of academic freedom and tenure: time. The time required to develop and complete serious professional undertakings. Shortening the time horizon of faculty, so as to accord with periodic reviews, will increase productivity only artificially. if at all. More frequent and formal reviews may lead faculty members to pick safe and quick, but less potentially valuable, research projects to minimize the risk of failure or delayed achievement.
a. What are the problems that are calling for this particular solution? Are they of a degree that requires more elaborate, or more focused, procedures for enhancing faculty performance?

b. If the answer to the latter question is Yes, would it be possible to devise a system of post-tenure review on the basis of existing procedures—for example, a five-year review that is piggybacked onto the annual reviews? It should be noted that this system may serve a constructive purpose for those departments that do not do an adequate job in their annual review.

c. Is the projected post-tenure review confined to developmental purposes or is it being inappropriately projected as a new and easier way of levying major sanctions up to and including dismissal?

3. If the institution does not already have in place standards for dismissal-for-cause proceedings, it should adopt such procedural standards as are set forth in existing Association policy statements rather than moving to post-tenure review as an alternative dismissal route. (Note 4.)

4. Just as the Association has never insisted on a single model of faculty governance but only on the underlying premises that should guide a college or university in respect to that governance, so here any particular form of post-tenure review will depend on the characteristics of the institution: its size, its mission, and the needs and preferences of the faculty, as well as on the resources that it can bring to bear in the area of faculty development. Again, the questions to be asked include, but are not necessarily limited to:

a. whether the review should be blanket for all tenured faculty or focused on problematic cases;

b. whether a review can be activated at the request of an individual faculty member for purposes that he or she would regard as constructive;

c. whether a cost-benefit analysis shows that institutional resources can adequately support a meaningful and constructive system for post-tenure review without damage to other aspects of the academic program and to the recognition of faculty merit, since the constructiveness of such a system depends not only on the application of these standards but also on the ability to support and sustain faculty development.
6. Except when faculty appeals procedures direct that files be available to aggrieved faculty members, the outcome of evaluations should be confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.

7. If the system of post-tenure review is supplemented, or supplanted, by the option of a formal development plan, that plan cannot be imposed on the faculty member unilaterally, but must be a product of mutual negotiation. It should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment. The standard here should be that of good faith on both sides--a commitment to improvement by the faculty member and to the adequate support of that improvement by the institution-- rather than the literal fulfillment of a set of non-negotiable demands or rigid expectations, quantitative or otherwise.

8. A faculty member should have the right to comment in response to evaluations, and to challenge the findings and correct the record by appeal to an elected faculty grievance committee. (Note 5.) He or she should have the same rights of comment and appeal concerning the manner of formulating, the content of, and any evaluation resulting from, any individualized development plan.

9. In the event that recurring evaluations reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question his or her ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable reassignment to other duties or separation should be explored. If these are not practicable, or if no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then the administration should invoke peer consideration regarding any contemplated sanctions. (Note 6.)

10. The standard for dismissal or severe sanction remains that of adequate cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not in any way diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause for dismissal in a separate forum before an appropriately constituted hearing body of peers convened for that purpose. Evaluation records may be admissible but rebuttable as to accuracy. Even if they are accurate, the administration is still required to bear the burden of proof and demonstrate through an adversarial proceeding not only that the negative evaluations rest on fact, but also that the facts rise to the level of adequate cause for dismissal. The faculty member must be afforded the full procedural safeguards set forth in the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings and the Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which include, among others, the opportunity to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.
**Position Responsibility Statement.** A position responsibility statement for each faculty member is to be completed during the annual review process that occurs during the 1998/99 academic year. Beginning July 1, 1999 this statement or its revisions should guide all subsequent reviews (annual, promotion, tenure) regardless of the P&T document chosen.

---

**Approved by Faculty Senate (3/23/99)**
**Approved by Faculty Vote (4/30/99)**
**Approved by Board of Regents (6/16/99)**

Faculty in each department are charged with developing and implementing a plan for review of each tenured faculty member in the unit. Such review should be done periodically, at least once every seven years. The review should address the quality of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service, consistent with the faculty member’s position responsibility statement. Ideally, the review shall result in recommendations for enhancing performance and provide a plan for future development.

This review does not change the university’s commitment to academic freedom, nor the circumstances under which tenured faculty can be dismissed from the university. Grounds for dismissal remain those listed in the *Faculty Handbook* under "Faculty Dismissal Procedures."

The plan for review should designate the following:

- the review participants
- review procedures and timelines
- materials to be reviewed
- distribution and use of the results of the review including communication beyond the department
- mechanisms for the faculty member to respond

The departmental post-tenure review plan shall be reviewed, approved, and revised in accordance with the collegiate governance approval process that applies to departmental promotion and tenure documents.

---

From the ISU Faculty Handbook
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL
Section UCD-220A - Academic Review Process--General Policy and Procedures
10/1/99

I. PURPOSE

This section sets forth the general procedures for the processing of UCD academic personnel actions (appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal). These procedures should be used for each personnel action, taking into account specific variations outlined in Sections UCD-220B through UCD-220H relating to each category of action. The Supplementary Campus Guidelines contained in the "annual call" for academic personnel actions, issued by the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel, should be used in conjunction with this document.

II. APPLICABLE TITLES

The procedures in this section generally apply to the following title series:

- Professor
- Professor in Residence
- Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine)
- Adjunct Professor
- Acting Professor
- Visiting Professor
- Clinical (Compensated) Professor
- Clinical Professor
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension
- Cooperative Extension Specialist
- Lecturer - Potential Security of Employment
- Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE)
- Agronomist in the Agricultural Experiment Station
- Supervisor of Physical Education
- Professional Research Specialist

III. DEFINITIONS

A. ACADEMIC FEDERATION (AF) ADMINISTRATIVE SERIES PERSONNEL COMMITTEE--standing committee of five members appointed by the Academic Federation to advise the Chancellor on actions in the Academic Administrator series, the Academic Coordinator series, the Assistant Law Librarian series, the Assistant University Librarian series, and the Associate University Librarian series.

B. ACADEMIC FEDERATION (AF) PERSONNEL COMMITTEE--standing committee of seven members appointed by the Academic Federation to advise the Chancellor on academic staff personnel actions.

C. AD HOC COMMITTEE--committee of three Academic Senate members--expert in the field of a specific candidate, which evaluates the review file in depth. One member is from the candidate's department.

D. CANDIDATE--academic appointee undergoing review.

E. COLLEGE/DIVISION/SCHOOL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (CPC/DPC/SPC)--subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) whose membership is determined by CAP (on the advice of the individual school or college executive committee and dean) to advise the dean on redelegated actions; appointed by the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.
review file; solicits letters of evaluation;
notifies Dean--Graduate Studies to prepare
comments on service of candidates who are
graduate group chairs (see Section UCD-245B); etc.

NOTE: See Exhibit A for detailed sequential
checklist of chair's duties and responsi-
bilities. See Exhibit B for instructions
pertaining to language required when letters of
evaluation are solicited or received and for
model formats for letters. Exhibit C provides
guidelines for preparation of supporting
documentation.

5. Consults with faculty who meet, discuss
candidate's record, and vote. (See Exhibit D
for information regarding consultation and
voting on personnel actions.)

6. Prepares departmental recommendation letter;
obtains review of letter by voting faculty;
provides candidate with redacted copies of
extramural letters and copies of all
nonconfidential documents.

7. Gives candidate opportunity to write rejoinder
to departmental recommendation.

8. Obtains Candidate Disclosure Certificate from
candidate that review file has been perused.
(See Exhibit E.)

9. Forwards complete review file to dean.

NOTE: If candidate wishes to submit items
requiring special handling, e.g., valuable
books, art objects, or recordings, they should
be clearly labeled as such and should be
accompanied by separate receipt (Exhibit F).

Dean--Graduate Studies
10. Forwards comments on graduate group chair
service to dean of college/school.

Dean
11. Assures that review file is assembled in format
for evaluation and screened for irregularities.

For redelegated actions:

Dean
12. Submits directly to CPC/DPC/SPC normal and
1-year accelerated merit increases through
Professor V and appointments through Assistant
Professor III.

NOTE: This does not apply to department chairs,
administrators, or members of a CPC/DPC/SPC.

CPC/SPC
13. Evaluates review file and makes recommendation
to dean.

Dean
14. Makes final decision; prepares written decision
letter.

NOTE: When final decision is different from
recommendation of CPC/DPC/SPC, reasons for the
Ad hoc committee
32. Examines review file in detail.
33. Meets, discusses, and makes recommendation.

Ad hoc committee chair
34. Drafts final report; returns report and review file to Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.

Vice Provost--Academic Personnel
35. Prepares final ad hoc committee report; requests members to sign report in Office of the Provost. (Ad hoc members can make revisions.)
36. Forwards report to personnel committee.

Personnel Committee
37. Reads report; studies review file; reviews publications, student evaluations, and other supporting documentation.
38. Meets, discusses, and votes on recommendation.
40. Forwards review file and recommendation to Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.

Vice Provost--Academic Personnel
41. Reviews ad hoc and personnel committee reports and review file.
42. Prepares written final recommendation letter.

NOTE: When final recommendation is different from recommendation of personnel committee, reasons for the recommendation must be included in the letter.

43. Forwards recommendation to Chancellor, President, and/or The Regents for final approval, if required.
44. Transmits written final decision to department chair and dean.

Department chair
45. Transmits final decision and copy of reviewers' comments to candidate in writing.
46. After candidate signs certification form (Exhibit G) indicating he/she has received reviewers' comments, sends form, through dean's office, to Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.

VI. PROCEDURE--PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT AND APPEAL

A. Preliminary assessment (for candidate being considered for promotion to Associate Professor)

Preliminary assessments will be sent to departments only in cases
3. May consult with department and provide departmental letter.

4. Transmits appeal materials to dean.

Dean

5. Reviews appeal and makes notation of its receipt; may add cover letter.

6. Transmits materials to Office of the Provost if 31 days after effective date of action.

Vice Provost--
Academic Personnel

7. Submits materials to personnel committee.

Personnel committee

8. Reviews appeal.

9. Forwards written recommendation to Vice Provost--
Academic Personnel.

Vice Provost--
Academic Personnel

10. Reviews all materials.

11. Makes final decision; transmits written final decision to department chair and dean.

NOTE: When administrative appeals have been exhausted, Academic Senate members have the right to appeal any questions regarding the review process directly to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Academic Senate Office (752-2231) should be contacted to obtain information on procedures. Non-Senate members should refer to APM-140, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances.

VII. REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICY

A. Academic Personnel Manual:

1. Section 158, Rights of Academic Appointees, Including Rights Regarding Records.


3. Section 200, Appointment and Promotion/General.

4. Section 210, Review and Appraisal Committees.

5. Section 220, Professor Series.

6. Section 615, Salary Increases/Merit.

B. Academic Senate Bylaw 55, Departmental Voting Rights.

C. Office of the Provost: Annual Call for Merit Increases and Promotions and for Appraisals. (Issued in June.)
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL
Section UCD-220G - Academic Review Process--Appraisals
10/1/99

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this section is to outline Universitywide and campus policy and procedures for appraisal of Assistant Professors and equivalent ranks. Refer to additional information in Section APM-220-83.

II. POLICY

An appraisal is a detailed analysis and evaluation of an academic appointee's past achievement. The appraisal is intended to provide junior faculty members with their peers' and colleagues' frank and candid assessments of their performance to date and collegial recommendations for further career development. The appraisal is not an administrative judgment; rather, it is collegial advice. Copies of appraisal letters are not included in subsequent academic personnel actions.

III. ELIGIBILITY

A. Each Assistant Professor shall be appraised at one of the following times, whichever occurs sooner:

1. During the first half of the candidate's fourth year of service in the rank of Assistant Professor.

2. During the first half of the candidate's fifth year of service under any combination of eligible titles (as outlined in Section 133), including that of Assistant Professor.

B. Appraisals may occur earlier than stated in A-1 above, as the department chairperson, dean, Chancellor, or personnel committee may request appraisals at any time. Moreover, the candidate may request an earlier appraisal by contacting the department chairperson.

C. No appraisal shall be required if the Assistant Professor:

1. Is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year;

2. Has given written notice of resignation; or

3. Is under written notice, following proper review, that he or she will not be reappointed.

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Submission of appraisals

It is imperative that the department forward more than a merely discursive, noncommittal account of the academic appointee's performance; it should make as definite an appraisal as the evidence warrants of the achievement and promise of the candidate with regard to teaching, research or other creative work, University and public service, and professional status and activity. A clear statement regarding the appraisee's prospects for achieving or not achieving tenure in due course should also be included in departmental appraisals.
14. Meets, discusses, and makes recommendation.

Vice Provost--Academic Personnel
16. Forwards report and review file to personnel committee.

Personnel committee
17. Reads report; studies review file; reviews publications, student evaluation, and other supporting documentation.
18. Meets, discusses, and votes on recommendation.

Vice Provost--Academic Personnel
20. Reviews CPC/DPC/SPC and personnel committee reports and review file.
21. Forwards letter to candidate, with copies to department chair and dean, enclosing redacted copies of reviewers' comments.

B. Appeal or correction of the record

The standard appeal procedure, as outlined in Section UCD-220A, may be used in appealing or correcting the record of an appraisee.

C. Initiation of reappraisals

1. Except in cases where immediate termination is recommended, reappraisal may be requested by the personnel committee, the dean, the department chair, or the individual involved.
2. Such reappraisal, if requested, must occur prior to the midpoint in the individual's sixth year of service.

V. REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICY

A. Academic Personnel Manual:

1. Section 133, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles.
2. Section 210, Review and Appraisal Committees.

B. Office of the Provost: Annual Call for Merit Increases and Promotions and for Appraisals. (Issued in June.)
INTRODUCTION

Discussions during academic year 1996-97 regarding tenure and post-tenure review, by a committee of faculty and administrators from the four campuses of the University of Colorado, led to a recommendation, among others, that the University institute a practice of having faculty prepare and keep updated a professional plan. This administrative policy statement establishes the requirement for the professional plan.

The Professional Plan is designed to provide a clear statement of a faculty member's goals and the nature of effort to be made in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. Professional Plans make clear to primary units and other evaluative bodies what the faculty member has set as his/her goals. The Plan should be developed in consultation with the primary unit so that the faculty member's planned activities, when combined with those of other faculty in the unit, result in the primary unit meeting its responsibilities to students and the university.

Faculty are assigned workloads made up of specified percentages of effort for teaching, research/creative work, and service. They are evaluated proportionally on their performance in these areas. The Laws of the Regents state that, in evaluating faculty performance in order to determine salaries, "equal consideration shall be given to teaching and research or other creative work; in addition, service to the state and nation shall be considered" (Article 11.A.2 (B)), unless there is a differentiated workload agreement. Primary units and colleges/schools interpret and define work roles in teaching, research/creative work, and service that are appropriate to the needs of the unit. For example, some colleges or schools might have heavy service requirements, others might have mandates for clinical activities.
6. Professional Plans must be kept current. Significant changes, such as being awarded a large grant to work in a new area of scholarly inquiry, or winning a fellowship to teach or research abroad for a semester, should be incorporated into a revision of the Plan as soon as possible. The updated Plan must be provided to the primary unit head/committee and commented upon/signed as needed. Deans are responsible for insuring that the Professional Plans of the faculty in their college/school are updated at least once per year. Campuses may incorporate the Professional Plan into the annual performance evaluation form if they so desire.

7. Tenure-track faculty, beginning in their second year at the University, will prepare a Professional Plan. This Plan should be designed to set goals in teaching, research/creative work, and service that help the faculty member progress toward tenure. The senior faculty of the primary unit have a special obligation to assist junior faculty in the development of Professional Plans that produce the scholarly and pedagogical growth and achievement needed to attain tenure. However, untenured faculty must keep in mind that achievement of departmentally-approved professional plan goals does not ensure the award of tenure. The tenure decision is made by representatives of the entire campus and by the Board of Regents. That decision is based upon a broad judgment of the cumulative product and promise of a faculty member. Faculty members who have been tenured, but have not been promoted to full professor, should keep in mind the requirements for promotion when writing their Professional Plans.

8. All campuses must develop campus policies and procedures to implement the Professional Plan by July 15, 1998. The campus chancellors will report on the progress of implementation at the September, 1998, meeting of the Board of Regents.

9. In order to assess the success of this policy in terms of enhancing faculty development and accountability, the vice president for academic affairs and research will gather information from the faculty and administration and report to the Board and the Faculty Council in December of 1999. If the report identifies the need for change, the policy can be modified or revised at that time. Thereafter, evaluations of the effectiveness of this policy may be undertaken at the discretion of the Regents.
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INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1996, in response to legislative concerns about tenure, President John C. Buechner appointed an ad hoc committee of faculty and administrators from the four campuses of the University of Colorado. In April of 1997, the Committee on Tenure and Post-tenure Review submitted its report and recommendations on post-tenure review (PTR) to the President. At its meeting on October 16, 1997, the Board of Regents adopted amendments to the Laws of the Regents (Section 5B.41B1) regarding the evaluation of faculty. These revisions changed existing policy regarding post-tenure review and added to annual merit evaluations the possibility of a performance improvement agreement and a development plan for faculty performing inadequately.

The purpose of this administrative policy statement is to implement both the changes made in the Laws regarding evaluation of faculty and the major recommendations for revising the PTR process made by the ad hoc committee on post-tenure review. This policy replaces the Administrative Policy Statement of Post-tenure Review of Spring, 1984. It is consistent with the principles adopted by the Faculty Council at its meeting on June 19, 1997, and with the Laws of the Regents as revised on October 16, 1997.

STATEMENT OF POLICIES

1. The purposes of PTR are: (1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University and the most effective use of institutional resources; and (2) to ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member's performance.
academic vice chancellor on the results of all the post-tenure reviews in the college/school. A copy of the PTR report will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

B. The Performance Improvement Agreement

1. Faculty who receive a “below expectations” summary rating as the result of their annual performance evaluation must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) designed to improve their performance. Of course, a faculty member may appeal the “below expectation” evaluation to the primary unit head and/or dean and then to the dean’s review committee or another suitable college committee. No action will be taken to begin a PIA until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less.

2. Working with the primary unit head or an appropriate committee of the primary unit (as determined by primary unit policy), the faculty member develops a PIA that includes specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that shall be used to measure progress at periodic intervals. Usually, PIAs will be established for one year. But, if research deficiencies warrant longer, the PIA may be set up for two years.

3. If the goals of the PIA are being/have been met, as evidenced in the next annual merit evaluation, the faculty member continues in the regular five-year post-tenure review cycle.

4. If the goals of the PIA are not being/have not been met at the next annual merit evaluation, an extensive review process shall be initiated.

C. Extensive Review

1. Faculty who have received two "below expectations" ratings within the previous five years will undergo Extensive Review. As soon as a faculty member receives a second rating of "below expectations" (within a five year period), he/she will be subject to Extensive Review. A faculty member may appeal a "below expectations" evaluation to the primary unit head and/or dean and then to the dean’s review committee or another suitable college committee. No action will be taken to begin an Extensive Review until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less.

2. Because Extensive Review is designed to assist faculty who are falling below the level of satisfactory professional performance, it takes place whenever a faculty member establishes a pattern of unsatisfactory performance, i.e., two evaluations of performance “below expectations” in a five year period. The faculty member, the department, and the students of the University all benefit from promptly addressing emerging deficiencies in professional performance.

3. For an Extensive Review, the primary unit will examine: (1) the five previous annual performance evaluation reports; (2) the FCQs from those years, peer evaluations, and, if desired, other types of teaching evaluation; (3) the faculty member’s previous Professional Plan (and any amendments to the plan, and differentiated workload agreements, where present); (4) the faculty member’s self-evaluation of performance as it relates to the Professional Plan(s); and (5) any other material the faculty member would like the unit to consider.

4. The primary unit prepares an evaluative report of the faculty member’s teaching, research/creative work, and service based upon its review of the materials and information covering the period in question. If there is disagreement about the faculty member’s performance in research/creative work, or if the faculty member under review or the primary unit so requests, the review will also include evaluations from qualified persons external to the University. In this case, the faculty member and the primary unit shall
and service duties in a consistent and satisfactory professional manner. A judgment of professional incompetence is based upon peer review of the faculty member’s performance. The PTR process provides such peer review. (Other causes for dismissal also exist and are outlined in Article 5.C.1 of the Laws of the Regents.)

F. Assessment of PTR

1. After two complete years of implementation, the vice president for academic affairs and research, having consulted with faculty and campus administrators, shall report to the Board and to Faculty Council on the effectiveness of the revised PTR process. If serious problems are identified, they should be remedied at this time. Thereafter, assessments of the effectiveness of the PTR process will be made at the discretion of the Regents.
Policy on Evaluation of Department Chairs and Faculty

Chair Evaluation. Each school will put in place an evaluation process for department chairs and, modified as needed, for heads of divisions or sections of departments, heads of divisions of schools, and academic directors in schools where that title is used. A plan detailing the process for chair evaluation, and metrics of excellence to gauge progress toward academic goals,* should be drawn up by each school’s dean, working with department chairs and faculty (through the elected faculty council or other committee as appropriate) and submitted by the dean for approval by the Provost. The Provost may from time to time change the plan or these guidelines, or authorize exceptions to them, as he deems appropriate.

Purpose. The purpose of chair evaluation is to support chairs in their fundamental roles of helping faculty members flourish academically and leading their academic program to achieve high quality. The school’s plan should emphasize leadership development and improvement, safeguard academic freedom, and be consistent with University policies. Training and development programs for department chairs are offered by the Committee on Academic Leadership Development; all deans are expected to encourage chairs to participate.

The faculty role in the appointment and re-appointment of department and division heads is set out in the Faculty Handbook, § 2-1 (C). The President appoints and determines the term of office of chairs. Whatever the expected length of service, a review process should be conducted (or the Provost’s special permission obtained) before any individual serves more than five years as department chair (seven years in the Keck School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry). When the expected term is five or more years, there may also be an abbreviated mid-term process for faculty feedback.

Faculty committee. For each school or department, or division, or other appropriate unit, there will be a faculty academic consultative committee (by whatever name), which will be responsible for chair evaluation and may have other designated functions which further the unit’s academic goals. We have experience with widely differing practices for selecting committees to consult on important academic matters. In some schools, the tenured and tenure-track faculty have annually elected committees; other schools have different practices. A school’s plan may provide for members appointed by the dean, and may include faculty external to the unit. If it fits the circumstances of the school, chair evaluation may be conducted as part of the periodic Academic Program Review of the unit. Each school’s plan will detail how its evaluation will be conducted and its committees selected. Committees should consist of faculty (preferably tenured) who are respected by their colleagues as productive scholars as well as fine teachers. The committees should make the most effective use of the limited time of these busy individuals.

Method of evaluation. The school plan will generally provide that the first part of chair review is enunciation of the role of chair. Chair review will include self-evaluation by the chair,

*Some chairs, particularly in the Keck School of Medicine, also have budgetary responsibilities, so that they should be evaluated in regard to a wide set of goals like those of deans. (See the appendix)
Faculty committee. In each school, or department, or division, or other appropriate unit, there will be a faculty academic consultative committee (by whatever name) which will be responsible for faculty merit review, and may have other designated functions which further the unit's academic goals. We have experience with widely differing practices for selecting committees to consult on important academic matters. In some schools, the tenured and tenure-track faculty have annually elected committees. Other schools have different practices. A school's plan may provide for members appointed by the dean, and may include faculty external to the unit. Each school's plan will detail how its committees will be selected. Committees should consist of faculty (preferably tenured) who are respected by their colleagues as productive scholars as well as fine teachers. The committees should make the most effective use of the limited time of these busy individuals.

Faculty responsibilities. The school's faculty review plan will describe the method and criteria used to evaluate faculty performance, along with usual and alternative expectations. Baseline faculty responsibilities are set out in the faculty contract and the Faculty Handbook, § 3-2 (C). Faculty are expected to teach courses and perform service assigned to them by the department chair, after consultation with department faculty, on the basis of departmental, school and University needs. The most common profile will be 35-45% each for teaching and research, and 5-15% for service and other duties appropriate to the school's mission, though probationary faculty should have minimal service responsibilities and a higher research expectation. There will be variation among schools and departments in the quantity of teaching required to meet the usual teaching responsibilities, and the definition of the research expectation, which in many departments includes the ongoing submission of research proposals of appropriate magnitude which earn high ratings in national peer review processes.

Individual expectations and goals are established in annual meetings of the faculty member and the department chair or dean, leading to an activity profile allocating the individual's efforts for the year ahead, consistent with the needs of the department, school, and University. If the individual has been performing more or less teaching, research, or service than is typical in the school, the chair, after consultation, may adjust the profile so that the total effort amounts to full-time service. The possibility of variation in the profile provides a concrete recognition that faculty often can better serve the university and themselves if flexibility in focus is allowed over the course of a career. The performance of the faculty member is reviewed in accord with the individual profile. Thus, those who carry heavier than usual teaching responsibilities and are highly effective teachers will be recognized for their contribution, while those with a larger than usual research allocation will be recognized if they produce scholarship of a quality and volume appropriate to that effort.

Methods of evaluating teaching and scholarship. Every faculty member will submit an annual report, in a format determined by the school, summarizing activities and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service, proposing an activity profile consistent

""The report of the Provost's and Academic Senate's Joint Sub-committee makes detailed suggestions.""
use of additional categories if necessary.

- The highest rating must be reserved for work meeting the highest aspirations of the school and the department, which should be calibrated to national standards through measurable indicia. (E.g., publication in the top journals in the field, of a quality and at a rate of productivity which would be outstanding even in the top [5]-[15] departments in the field. A department may devise other ways to state the teaching and scholarly standards to which it aspires.)

In comparing evaluations, the dean will have in mind that some departments have higher aspirations than others.

**Procedures and procedural fairness.** Individuals may see their evaluations in writing (at their request or if the school's plan so provides routinely), will discuss them with the chair or dean, and may respond in writing. If the evaluation is provided in writing, the individual will sign a copy. The school's plan will provide information on when and how appeals may be filed. If the individual appeals or the dean otherwise determines it to be justified, the chair, the dean, or both, will review evaluations and may revise them. The dean has the ultimate responsibility to determine faculty merit evaluation, because he or she is responsible under the University bylaws for the proper conduct of the school's educational program and has the duty to look after the academic welfare of the students of the school. Evaluations seen by the individual, and responses, will be placed in the individual's personnel file.

**Timing.** Non-tenure-track full-time faculty will be reviewed at least triennially. The school's plan will provide either annual or triennial reviews for tenured faculty, but annual reviews will be conducted at the request of either the individual or the dean. As mentioned above, reviews will take into account each individual faculty member's annual reports since the last review, as well as overall achievements and stature in the field. Tenure-track (probationary) faculty will be reviewed annually and will receive a full review and report midway in the probationary period. Chairs and senior colleagues should keep in mind the importance of providing probationary faculty with ongoing mentoring and annual constructive feedback on progress toward tenure.

**Outcomes of evaluation.** Evaluation may reveal opportunities for collaboration; the need for research leaves, financial or other support from the department, or a period of reduced teaching load or service responsibilities; or highlight changes in the department's needs or even its definition.

Merit raises start with peer merit review, following these evaluation guidelines, unless the Provost has approved an exception. In determining merit raises, as a first approximation the dean may use a department chair's recommendation or a formula that links a given merit rating to a given raise percentage or amount. After this first step, the Provost requires each dean to consider carefully what adjustments are called for in those figures to make sure that the relative salary levels reflect the ordering of the school's faculty by performance and stature, and to take account of equity, the competitive situation, promotions in rank, and the school's budget.
APPENDIX

A POSSIBLE FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT CONCERNING CHAIRS

As an example, following is an illustration of a survey instrument, instructions, and possible role definition for medical school department chairs and division heads, which could be adapted for use in any other school. This example is based on the report of the Provost’s and Academic Senate’s Joint Sub-Committee, which in turn based its role definition in large part on language developed in a draft report of the School of Medicine Governance Document Committee.

* * * * * * *

TO ALL FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT:

As part of the University’s regular process, we are surveying faculty for feedback on the functioning of the department chair [and division head.] Set out below is one description of the role of a leader [in academic medicine.] After reading this role description:

(1) If you have suggestions for the chair [and head] on how they could better contribute to the unit’s excellence, please send your comments. For example, you might suggest that the unit would be better served if more or less weight were placed on one of these functions. Or you may have suggestions on how better to achieve one of these functions. You may also have suggestions that go outside this role description, or you may have comments on functions that have been particularly well carried out.

(2) Please include examples and explanations for all your suggestions.

(3) Whether your comments are lengthy or brief (or you just want to say “generally satisfied”) PLEASE RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY either by e-mail [to xxxxxxxxxx,], by comments on this form, by signed note, or by using the enclosed anonymous two-envelope system, to the [department’s] [faculty academic consultative] committee, by [date].

The committee will summarize all the responses, preserving anonymity when requested, and will forward the summary to the academic leader being reviewed and the dean.

ROLE DESCRIPTION: The central mission of the leader [in academic medicine] is promoting the academic excellence of the unit; maintaining standards of excellence in teaching, scholarship, [patient care] and university [and community] service, [while insuring fiscal integrity.] The department chair [and division head] are responsible for all of these functions:

• developing and maintaining outstanding educational programs [for medical students, graduate students and postdoctoral trainees];

• recruiting and retaining a faculty that excels in educational,[and] research [and clinical] endeavors;
CHAPTER 3
FACULTY AND ACADEMICS

Excerpt From the Handbook of Operating Procedures
(issued November 13, 1997)

Sec. 3.14. Annual Review and Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

The following constitutes the implementation at The University of Texas at Austin of the UT System
"Guidelines for Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty" (approved November 14,
1996; amended August 14, 1997):

1. The purpose of the sixth-year period performance evaluation is to assess whether the tenured
faculty member is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
These contributions can vary widely in terms of individual professional responsibilities. They can be
100% administrative. They can include teaching in more than one program, and they can include
substantial duties in advising students. In each and every case, the focus of the review needs to be
commensurate with the specific professional responsibilities the faculty member has been assigned.
For faculty members performing substantial duties outside their department, the evaluation committee
shall consider information from University personnel who are familiar with the faculty member's
performance outside the department.

2. Every department (or non-departmentalized college or school) shall, through an appropriate faculty
committee, conduct an annual review of all its faculty. This review may be conducted in connection
with the determination of merit raises. Faculty members shall provide an annual report and evidence
of teaching quality. Faculty may also provide further evidence of research and publication, service,
and other professional or creative activities. Each faculty member will be informed in writing of the
result of the review. (See Sec. 3.17, UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures.)

3. In addition, tenured faculty will be evaluated every six years. This evaluation shall be combined
with the sixth annual review; reasonable individual notice of at least six months of intent to evaluate
will be provided by the department chair (or equivalent). At a reasonable time prior to the evaluation,
the department shall give the faculty member a copy of previous annual reports, statistical summaries
of student teaching evaluations for the review period, and the results of previous annual reviews for
the evaluation period. The faculty member shall submit a resume and annual report, and may provide
any additional materials he or she wants considered.

4. The six-year evaluation will be carried out by an appropriate faculty committee at the level of the
department. Faculty who are budgeted 50% in two departments shall designate one department as the
locus for the evaluation. Evaluation shall include review of the resume, student evaluations of
teaching for the review period, annual reports for the evaluation period, and all materials submitted by
the faculty member. Upon his or her request, the faculty member will be provided with the
opportunity to meet with the evaluation committee. The evaluation shall address itself to the specific
professional responsibilities the faculty member has been assigned. The chair of the department shall
communicate the result of the evaluation in writing to the faculty member and to the dean for review
and appropriate action in accordance with the UT System Guidelines for Period Evaluation of
Tenured Faculty (approved by the Board of Regents on November 14, 1996; amended on August 14,
1997). The results of the satisfactory evaluation shall be taken into account in determining merit raises
and other forms of recognition.

5. If the result of the evaluation is unsatisfactory and the dean determines that more intensive
evaluation of a faculty member is needed, or if the faculty member requests it, the dean, in
consultation with the tenured faculty in his or her college or school, shall appoint a peer committee
whose members shall be representative of the college or school and who will be appointed on the

http://www.utexas.edu/admin/fvpp/
faculty/post_tenure/n0314.html
April 6, 2000

To: Academic Deans

From: Sheldon Ekland-Olson

Subject: Post-tenure Review Procedures

Based on the experience obtained over the last two years, I write to amplify and clarify our policies and procedures regarding the sixth-year periodic evaluation of tenured faculty. The detailed procedures and guidelines are described in Section 3.14 of Handbook of Operating Procedures and the schedule and timetable for conducting these reviews were outlined in a June 19, 1998, memorandum from this Office. These documents and related post-tenure review materials can be found at http://www.utexas.edu/admin/evpp/faculty/post-tenure/index.html.

The previously recommended timetable for conducting the annual review of all faculty and the sixth-year periodic review of tenured faculty is reaffirmed. The additions and clarifying comments shown below in bold address issues that have been raised during the past two years and are designed to strengthen these procedures.

Timetable for Post-tenure Review

March 31 All tenured faculty members to undergo the sixth-year periodic evaluation in the fall of the following academic year will be notified. Faculty are to be given individual notice of at least six month of intent to evaluate.

May 31 Copies of previous annual reports, statistical summaries of student teaching evaluations for the review period, and the results of previous annual reviews for the evaluation period are given to each faculty member to be reviewed.

October 1 Faculty member submits a resume and annual report for the prior academic year to the department chair (or dean in non-departmentalized colleges/schools), as well as any additional materials the faculty member wants considered.

Oct.-Dec. Every department (or non-departmentalized college/school) shall establish an appropriate faculty review committee to conduct the sixth-year periodic evaluations. For those tenured faculty undergoing the sixth-year periodic evaluation, this review will be combined with the annual review.

The sixth-year periodic review by the departmental committee shall be based upon an evaluation of the resume, student evaluations of teaching for the review period, annual reports for the evaluation period, and all materials submitted by the faculty member. Upon his or her request, the faculty member shall be provided an opportunity to meet with the evaluation committee. The committee should base its decision on this record. As discussed below, in the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation, and if a dean determines that a more intensive evaluation is needed, the peer committee appointed by the dean may solicit additional evaluation information.

A departmental evaluation committee shall advise a faculty member when it appears that an unsatisfactory evaluation is likely. The committee shall offer the faculty member the opportunity to meet with the committee and provide any additional information he or she wants considered before the committee concludes its deliberations and makes its findings.

In the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation the evaluation committee’s report to the department chair (or dean in non-departmentalized college/school) shall provide sufficient written documentation to identify the area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and the general basis for the committee's decision.

February No later than February 1, the department chair (or dean in non-departmentalized colleges/schools) shall communicate the results of the sixth-year periodic evaluation in writing to each faculty member who was evaluated, and to the dean for appropriate action.

February Dean forwards a summary report of departmental or school outcomes to the Provost. To permit the Provost's Office to maintain a central database for post-tenure review schedules, the names of the faculty reviewed and the outcome in each case should be included in the report you forward. The names of the faculty subject to review but who were not reviewed due to retirement, resignation, or other reason should also be reported with a notation as to why they were not reviewed.
Memo to the Members of the General Faculty  
From the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR)  

October 1999

As the Committee responsible for having written and overseen the adoption of UT’s Post-Tenure Review Policy (PTR), we felt it incumbent on us, as we did last year which was the first year of the policy’s implementation, to reiterate what it is and is not, and to inform you of our continuing responsibilities in this matter.

First, PTR applies to all tenured members of the faculty, regardless of the positions they currently hold. Moreover, PTR affirms all current University and System commitments to tenure, academic freedom, due process, and good cause for dismissal. It is intended to build on what currently works, the annual reviews conducted by individual departments and schools, and thus to minimize bureaucracy and the time spent evaluating and being evaluated, and to make the review process regular and routine. In the first instance, faculty promoted within the last six years are to be reviewed six years from their last promotion; the timing of the reviews of the remaining tenured faculty are to be chosen randomly or by any other legal means agreed to by the faculty of the department or school. Faculty are to be given six months notice to prepare for the review and sufficient opportunity to provide input. In addition, results of the review are to be given to faculty in writing, and they are to have opportunity to respond before any recommendation is made from the department or school to the next administrative level.

Finally, the process is to be monitored by CCAFR, which is charged to receive reports of faculty problems and concerns, and to recommend changes in PTR where, in its judgment, they are needed.

Electronic versions of all the major documents concerning post-tenure review are located on the World Wide Web at http://www.utexas.edu/admin/evpp/faculty/post.tenure/index.html. Included there are links to the Timetable for Annual Review and Post-Tenure Review, the section from the Handbook of Operating Procedures entitled Annual Review and Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, and the UT System Guidelines for Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. You might also wish to consult an issue of “Academe” (September/October 1998, pp. 61-67), which contains the AAUP response to PTR. We believe that our version addresses their concerns. In addition to consulting these documents, please feel free to contact any member of CCAFR to express any concerns you have about the implementation of PTR. Thank you.

Alan Cline, Computer Sciences, Chair, cline@mailbox.cs.utexas.edu
Janet Staiger, Vice Chair, Radio-Television-Film, jstaiger@uts.cc.utexas.edu
Katherine Arens, Germanic Studies, karen@mail.utexas.edu
Neal Armstrong, Civil Engineering, neal_armstrong@mail.utexas.edu
Alan Friedman, English, Chair, friedman@uts.cc.utexas.edu
Rachel Fouladi, Educational Psychology, rachel.fouladi@mail.utexas.edu
G. Karl Galinsky, Classics, galinsky@utsvms.cc.utexas.edu
H. Douglas Laycock, Law, dlaycock@mail.law.utexas.edu
Melvin Oakes, Physics, oakes@hagar.ph.utexas.edu

14 October 1999
Executive Vice President & Provost at UT Austin
Send comments to: evpp@www.utexas.edu
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