Auburn University Post-Tenure Review Procedures for 2007-2008

I. Purpose

This document outlines the post-tenure review process to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year. Post-tenure review is intended to support faculty development and productivity. It considers the professional quality with which faculty members discharge the academic duties associated with their positions. It does not consider whether the previously tenured faculty member would meet current standards for the awarding of tenure. Additionally, the policy on post-tenure review is not a dismissal policy. The university's policy on dismissal appears in section 16 of chapter 3 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

II. Criteria

Every tenured faculty member shall be eligible for review every six years following the granting of tenure. The review may be delayed for reasons approved in advance by the provost (for example sabbatical leave, application for promotion, FMLA-related leave).

The review assesses the quantity and quality of the faculty member's work over the preceding six years with respect to her/his assigned duties in terms of teaching, research, outreach/extension, and professional and university service. These criteria are stated in general terms as the basis of an overall policy applicable to a wide range of academic disciplines. The criteria shall be applied in a manner that respects and safeguards first-amendment rights and academic freedom, and that produces a fair result. The application of the criteria shall not be biased by consideration of the faculty member's race, sex, religion, national origin, age, physical handicap, marital status, or sexual orientation.

The annual faculty reviews prepared by department heads are an important part of the evidence being assessed in post-tenure review, and teaching evaluations are an important part of the evidence being assessed in the annual faculty review process. Accordingly, in order to strengthen the evidentiary base on which post-tenure review is conducted, the teaching evaluation form currently in use is being replaced by an improved version, and the annual faculty review process is being strengthened in terms of providing a reasonable degree of consistency of form and content across the schools and colleges.

III. Process and Outcomes in the 2007-2008 Academic Year

A. Department heads and chairs and deans will be invited to participate in a post-tenure review training session provided by the Office of the Provost.

B. Selection of faculty for review.

1. All faculty granted tenure during 2002, 1996, 1990, 1984, 1978, and 1972 are the pool of faculty eligible for post-tenure review in 2008. This pool consists of approximately 129 faculty.

2. Exemptions will be granted this year to all members of the pool of eligibles who (a) participated in the post-tenure review field test in 2006-07, (b) have been promoted in faculty rank *since* 2002, (c) have filed retirement papers (not DROP applications) effective during (or at the conclusion of) the 2007-08 academic year, (d) have provided written notification of resignation effective during (or at the conclusion of) the 2007-08 academic year, and/or (e) are serving in a full-time administrative position (such as department head/chair, dean, assoc./assist. dean, vice-president, assoc./assist. vice-president, provost, assoc./assist. provost) that is subject to evaluation through the University Senate's administrator evaluation process. Documentation of one or more of these exemptions must be submitted to and approved by the provost before the exemption is granted. Written requests for exemption must be submitted to the Provost by September 17, 2007.

3. From the pool of eligible faculty remaining after exemptions have been granted, 60 faculty will be chosen at random to participate in the post-tenure review process for 2007-08. These faculty will be notified of their selection to participate by October 1, 2007.

4. The expectation is that when the 6-year review cycle is fully implemented, a department head and dean may recommend to the provost that a faculty member with two unsatisfactory annual reviews in the most recent six-year period participate in post-tenure review ahead of his/her cycle. By university policy set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, department heads are expected to provide faculty members with annual reviews that assess performance and, as appropriate, present suggestions for development and improvement.

C. Materials to be reviewed.

The faculty member and department head prepare materials for review and submit them to the provost through the Office of the Dean. The materials for review include:

1. annual reviews by department head (or dean if the school has no departments) for the previous six years *(Note that, for confidentiality purposes, these reviews will be retained in the Office of the Provost and will not be shared with anyone who is not in a direct line of administrative authority over the faculty member.)*;

2. a current *curriculum vitae*;

3. a summary of accomplishments and plans prepared by the faculty member, not to exceed two pages in length;

4. a letter of evaluation, not to exceed two pages, to the provost from the department head through the dean (or from the dean if a school has no departments), that describes the duties assigned to the faculty member during the review period and assesses the satisfactoriness of the faculty member's performance of the assigned work. The department head is expected to consider the viewpoints of all tenured faculty in the department while preparing this letter. The procedure for doing so is described below.

D. Advice from tenured faculty

Prior to preparation of the department head's letter, the department head is to make available to the tenured faculty for their review (a) the *curriculum vitae* and (b) the summary of accomplishments and plans prepared by the faculty member. The tenured faculty are to inspect these documents and vote (by secret ballot) whether or not they believe the faculty member under review is discharging satisfactorily the academic duties associated with his/her position. The faculty member under review is to be informed of the results of the vote. *At the option of the faculty member under review, the results of the vote—including the actual numerical vote—may be included in the department head's letter.*

E. Review committee

The university-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee shall consist of a tenured faculty member from each school or college and be chaired by the provost. The members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be appointed by the president in a manner similar to the process by which candidates to serve on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee currently are appointed.

F. Outcomes

1. The review committee, chaired by the provost, shall provide the faculty member with a concise written summary of its review and a conclusion as to whether the faculty member's performance is deemed satisfactory. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to appeal this decision to the president using the appeals process described below.

2. The university-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee will have the additional responsibility of making recommendations through the provost to the president for special recognition of those faculty members whose work the committee deems to be particularly meritorious. Forms of recognition will include formal letters of commendation and referral to existing recognition processes such university awards for research, teaching and outreach, or appointment to a titled professorship.

3. Faculty members whose performance the review committee assesses to be unsatisfactory will undertake a development plan to be prepared jointly by the faculty member and academic unit administrator and approved by the dean and provost. The development plan will outline what is needed to move the faculty member to a higher level of performance. It must have specific, measurable goals that can reasonably be attained during a twelve-month period (although longer-term goals may also be included). The nature and source of any resources needed to accomplish the plan must be spelled out in writing.

4. At the conclusion of the twelve-month development period, the department head and dean will review the faculty member's progress and prepare a report to the provost. Faculty members who are judged not to have demonstrated progress after completing a development plan will be notified and given an opportunity to respond to the provost

before the imposition of further sanctions. The provost's decision can be appealed to the president, whose decision shall be final. If the provost (or president through the appeal process) decides that sufficient progress has been made, the faculty member shall be deemed to have completed the post-tenure review process for the current cycle.

5. Sanctions for unsatisfactory performance may include, but are not limited to, a letter of notice to the faculty member, withholding merit-based salary increases, and/or referral by the provost to the faculty dismissal process.

G. Appeals procedure

There are two points in this process where decisions made by the provost can be appealed in writing to the president: (1) The review committee's decision regarding unsatisfactory performance (step 1 above) and (2) the provost's decision that the faculty member has not satisfactorily completed the development plan (step 4 above). In both cases the faculty member may appeal the decision within ten working days of receipt of the provost's decision. The president shall have twenty working days to respond to the faculty member's appeal.

IV. Implementation Calendar for 2007-08

By August 15, 2007: Faculty in the pool of eligibles for post-tenure review during 2007-08 are notified and informed of how to document exemptions.

By September 17, 2007: Faculty seeking exemptions will notify the Provost in writing and provide proper documentation.

By October 1, 2007: The 60 faculty selected at random from the remaining pool of eligibles will be notified of their selection to participate in the 2007-08 post-tenure review process.

By November 1, 2007: Faculty participating in the process will provide to the department head the *curriculum vitae* and two-page summary of accomplishments and plans. These materials will be made available to all tenured faculty in the department for their review and a secret ballot vote shall be taken to advise the department head.

By December 3, 2007: Each participating faculty member's packet (consisting of annual reviews, *curriculum vitae,* faculty member's two-page summary, and department head's letter) shall be provided by the department head, through the dean, to the Office of the Provost.

By March 3, 2008: The university-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee shall have completed its work and the reviewed faculty shall be notified of the outcome. Appeals and/or preparation of development plans shall commence following that date.

By March 17, 2008: Written appeals of the decision of the Post-Tenure Review Committee must be received by the president.

By April 18, 2008: The president shall have ruled on all written appeals. (Note: This time period takes into account a week for "Spring Break.")

By May 16, 2008: Development plans prepared jointly by the faculty member and department head—and approved by the dean—must be submitted to the provost for approval. They will then remain in effect for one year. At that time the dean and department head will submit their progress report to the provost, who will decide if sufficient progress has been made or if disciplinary action is warranted. As noted above, disciplinary action would be subject to appeal to the president.