Post-Tenure Review
Summary of Conversations and
DRAFT Recommendations

Background and Chronology

The University established a post-tenure review system to “…recognize and foster excellence, to help good faculty become better, and to identify and help underachieving faculty fulfill the potential that was recognized upon hiring and reaffirmed on the awarding of tenure.”

The Task Force on Post-Tenure Review Guidelines were approved by the Faculty Senate on December 3, 1998, by President Risser on May 29, 1999, and by the OUS Academic council on March 16, 2000. The Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines became effective December 2001. Since that time many units have developed their own guidelines and have implemented multi-year plans for post-tenure review of their faculty. Based on these experiences, questions and issues have arisen related to the post-tenure review process.

• Limitation of Performance Ratings

The Post-Tenure Review Implementation Guidelines states that “an overall performance rating for the five-year review period will be determined using the following three levels: Extraordinary Performance, Strong and Positive Performance, or Unsatisfactory Performance.”

This rating system is perceived to be limited by the lowest rating in that all must be either extraordinary or strong and positive to not be unsatisfactory. Units have revised their rating systems as part of unit-level Post-Tenure Guidelines. Examples of levels of performance in unit-level guidelines include:
  - Extraordinary, Strong and Positive, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory
  - Meritorious, Very Good, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the suggested performance rating system be revised as follows:
  - Extraordinary or Meritorious
  - Strong and Positive or Very Good
  - Satisfactory
  - Unsatisfactory

• Timing

The Post-Tenure Implementation Guidelines are not clear as to the timing of post-tenure reviews, e.g., when dossiers will be prepared, when committees will be formed,
and how long they will have to complete the review. Guidelines indicate that “the unit head is responsible for developing and maintaining a multi-year plan for post-tenure review to maximize effective use of faculty and staff resources. The unit head will discuss the post-tenure review process with each eligible faculty member during the winter or spring of the academic year prior to a planned review.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the post-tenure review process follow a similar schedule and timeframe as promotion and tenure review. Because there are fewer review steps than in promotion and tenure review, it is suggested that the dossier is completed by Fall Term and the review is completed by the end of the Winter Term.

- **Levels of Review**

The Post-Tenure Implementation Guidelines state that “the unit head, after reviewing the dossier and peer committee’s evaluation and recommendation, will prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in each of the assigned areas of responsibility, as well as an overall performance rating.” Questions have been asked as to who will make the final decision in situations when the peer committee and unit head disagree as to the overall performance rating. In some units, when this occurs, the dean is asked to give an overall performance rating.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that when the peer committee and unit head disagree as to the overall performance rating, the dean will review all documents and give an overall performance rating.

- **Discussion of evaluation with the faculty member**

The current Implementation Guidelines do not include discussion of the written evaluation with the faculty member or an opportunity for the faculty member to respond to the written evaluation.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that Step 4 be revised as follows (inserted language is in italics):

The unit head, after reviewing the dossier and peer committee’s evaluation and recommendation, will prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in each of the assigned areas or responsibility, as well as an overall performance rating. *Written evaluations from the peer committee and unit head will be provided to and discussed with the faculty member, who may attach comments, explanations, and rebuttal.*
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