4.6 Post-Tenure Review

The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to system institutions. Post-tenure review is one of several types of faculty performance reviews (e.g., annual, promotion, and tenure reviews) and is intended to provide a longer term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member’s career.

With the exception of tenured administrators whose majority of duties are administrative, all tenured faculty will be reviewed. Each faculty member must be assessed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews will continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion.

Specific written post-tenure criteria and procedures must be stated in writing and available in a faculty handbook on an institution’s website.

The review should focus on the faculty member’s accomplishments, research agenda (where applicable), teaching program, and service contributions, relating these to the stated expectations for performance developed by the institution. The results of post-tenure reviews must be linked to rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the results of the review will be related to merit pay increases, and study and research leave opportunities.

When deficiencies are identified, the faculty member’s supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal plan for faculty development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. If, after three years, the faculty member has not been successful with remediating the identified deficiencies, he or she may be subject to dismissal for cause (regular, independent dismissal processes will apply).
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Post Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty at an interval of five years. These reviews are conducted by departments and dean's offices, and submitted to Faculty Affairs. Some financial support to facilitate the resulting professional plans is supplied to faculty by Faculty Affairs through the dean's offices. Faculty Affairs is also charged with annual reporting of post-tenure review results to System Administration.

Boulder Campus Process
Effective Fall 2006

On the basis of a decision by the Board of Regents in 1997, CU's tenured faculty undergo post-tenure review (PTR) every five years. This document describes the Boulder campus' implementation policies associated with the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement on Post-tenure Review dated November 1, 2006. The System policy is available on the web at https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies/HR_Post-Tenure-Review.html.

When tenure is granted, there is an expectation of continued professional growth and productivity in the areas of research/creative work, teaching, and service. In accordance with CU System policy, the purposes of PTR are: (1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with academic needs and goals of the University and with 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.

The post-tenure review process begins with the award of tenure, and the first PTR occurs five years after the faculty member is continuously tenured and continues to occur at five year intervals unless a promotion review takes place. A promotion will re-start the PTR clock. The Office of Faculty Affairs, working with the schools and colleges, maintains a calendar for post-tenure review. Reviews can be delayed for a year upon the concurrence of the chair, the dean, and Academic Affairs.

As part of System post-tenure review policy, all faculty are required to prepare and regularly update their Professional Plan. Faculty members are to prepare their initial professional plan within twelve months of the award of tenure. System policy regarding Professional Plans is available at https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies/HR_ProPlanFaculty.html. Samples of the Professional Plan form used by the Boulder campus may be downloaded from the Faculty Affairs forms page at https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/forms.

Each tenure-bearing unit should have a Post-Tenure Review Committee, comprised of members of the tenured faculty. During the year in which a faculty member is undergoing PTR, she or he should not serve on the PTR evaluation committee. This committee will review the faculty member's vita, professional plan, annual merit reviews, multiple measures of teaching, and other relevant information about the faculty member's efforts in research, teaching, and service. In addition to the regular five-year review, faculty members may undergo a triggered or extensive review, as described below. Faculty members shall be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation by the department chair or dean, depending on whether PTR is managed by the primary unit or school/college. Copies of these evaluations will be kept by the Office of the Dean and the Office of Faculty Affairs.
The outline below describes the steps followed by the Boulder campus in fulfilling the University’s policies on Professional Plans and Post-tenure Review. Questions concerning application of these policies can be directed to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

I. Annual Review and Post Tenure Review

A. The Primary Unit conducts its annual merit evaluation process according to the rules of the unit. In making this review, the unit should consult the Professional Plan written by the faculty member for the year under review.

B. Each faculty member will update his/her Professional Plan for the upcoming calendar year, as needed.

C. Faculty receiving an overall (or composite) annual performance rating of "Below Expectations" will prepare a Professional Improvement Agreement (PIA).
   1. The PIA is an agreement between the faculty member and the Primary Unit chair or a review committee. The PIA details a plan which the faculty member and unit will follow to improve performance in the problem area or areas.
   2. Usually, the PIA will be established for one year. But, if research deficiencies warrant a longer period, the PIA may be set for two years.
   3. If the goals of the PIA are being/have been met, as evidenced in the next annual evaluation, the faculty member continues in the regular five-year post-tenure review cycle. If the goals of the PIA are not met at the next annual merit evaluation, an extensive review process shall be initiated. (See Section III.)

D. Faculty members receiving a rating of "Below Expectations" who do not agree with the finding may request a peer review of their annual performance through the standard process set by the primary unit. Subsequently, faculty members who believe the finding of the primary unit is mistaken may appeal to the appropriate review committee at the next administrative level. Appeals must be submitted in writing by the first day of the following fall semester. Appeals should be resolved by the primary unit by October 15. Any further appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date it is initiated by the faculty member.

E. Faculty members who have signed a formal and binding retirement contract shall undergo post-tenure review as scheduled until their retirement begins.

II. Regular Review

Faculty members receiving annual evaluations of “meeting expectations” or better since their last PTR (or since undergoing tenure if this is the first PTR) will undergo Regular Review.

The PTR evaluation will be conducted by appropriate faculty peers within the campus, either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee. This committee will be called the Post-Tenure Review committee. The Post Tenure Review committees will be composed of faculty approved by members of the primary unit. Size and composition may be defined by the primary unit.

A. The Post Tenure Review Committee will examine at least the following:
   1. Five Year Annual Review history
   2. Five Year FCQ history
   3. Peer Evaluations of Teaching and other multiple measures of teaching, as available
   4. Professional Plan(s) from last cycle
   5. Updated Professional Plan for upcoming year.

B. The Post Tenure Review Committee pursues the following process:
1. The committee writes a brief summary report that addresses teaching, research/creative work, and service and assigns an overall evaluation rating as either outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, or below expectations. The committee submits the draft to the faculty member for review.

2. The faculty member reviews the report, and approves or appends comments.

3. The Unit forwards the report and any comments to dean.

4. A copy of the report is placed in the “Personnel File” within Dean's Office and in OFA.

5. The Dean reports to Provost on Annual PTR results.

III. Triggered Review

A Triggered Review is required when a faculty member receives a “Below Expectations” rating during the five year PTR cycle.

A. Faculty who receive a summary evaluation of “below expectations” at any time during the five year PTR cycle are required to meet with members of their primary unit and/or the unit head, as determined in the by-laws of the primary unit, to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and to plan and implement a written Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) to address the situation. (See Section I.C.)

IV. Extensive Review

An Extensive Review is required whenever a second overall (or composite) "Below Expectations" in five years is earned.

A. THE POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE will examine at least the following:

1. Five Year Annual Review history
2. Five Year FCQ history
3. Peer Evaluations of Teaching and other available multiple measures of teaching
4. Evidence of research/creative work
5. Professional Plan(s) and the PIA from the last cycle
6. Any differentiated workload agreements
7. Faculty member’s written self-evaluation of performance
8. Any other material submitted by the faculty member
9. An assessment of research or scholarly work may include use of reviews external to the University if either the Primary Unit or faculty member requests external reviews.
10. When external reviews are used, primary unit and faculty member will recommend a list of reviewers, which will be invited by the Primary Unit Review Committee (external reviews shall remain confidential, i.e., the faculty member shall not have access to this part of the file).

B. THE POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE shall write a summary EVALUATIVE REPORT of teaching, research/scholarly work and service and it shall share this report with the faculty member.

1. The report must contain an enumerated list of DEFICIENCIES.
2. This report is not subject to approval by the faculty member.
3. The form used by the Boulder campus for the Evaluative Report is available on the web at https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/forms

C. Upon receipt of the Evaluative Report, the faculty member must write within 20 calendar days a DEVELOPMENT PLAN, covering one or two years, which must

1. describe performance goals, strategies for attaining goals, and a timeline for attaining goals for each deficiency listed in the Evaluative Report; and must
2. describe specific means of measuring progress towards or achievement of goals.
D. **THE POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE** must review a draft of his/her plan and provide written feedback to the faculty member and to the primary unit head.

1. The Post Tenure Review Committee shall review a second draft (if necessary) and make a recommendation to the primary unit head to accept or not accept the Development Plan.

2. The Primary Unit head shall accept the plan, or work with the faculty member to develop an acceptable plan. In the case where either the primary unit head or the faculty member feels that an impasse has been reached, both parties shall be subjected to the provisions defined in E, below.

E. Disagreements between the faculty member and either the primary unit review committee or the primary unit head will be subjected to the following arbitration process:

1. When either the primary unit head or the faculty member feel that an impasse has been reached after following the steps described in C, above, the matter shall be referred to the **COLLEGE/SCHOOL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE** (in units where the college or school is the primary unit, the VCAC shall serve this function). The College/School Personnel Committee shall consider the materials assembled for the extensive review, the recommendation of the primary unit review committee, and any additional materials submitted by the two parties or requested by the Personnel Committee, and issue a binding set of findings which will constitute the Approved Development Plan.

   a. At the completion of the Development Plan period (1 or 2 years), the head of the primary unit, in consultation with The Post Tenure Review Committee, will assess the progress of the faculty member towards meeting the goals of the Development Plan and then shall submit to the dean (or to the Provost in cases when the primary unit head is the dean) a report and recommendation as to whether or not the Development Plan Goals have been satisfactorily met.

   b. Following consultation with the school or college personnel committee, the dean shall make a recommendation to the Provost.

   c. The Provost, following consultation with the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC), shall determine whether or not the faculty member has met the Development Plan goals. If the goals have been met, the faculty member shall prepare a new Professional Plan and begin a new five-year PTR cycle.

F. **SANCTIONS** In cases where the faculty member is judged by the Provost not to have attained the goals of the Development Plan, the Provost will recommend appropriate sanctions to be applied to the faculty member by the Chancellor.

1. Possible sanctions are defined in the Administrative Policy Statement on post-tenure review dated 11/1/2006 and include reassignment of duties; loss of eligibility for sabbaticals or for campus travel funds; salary freeze; salary reduction; demotion of rank; and revocation of tenure and dismissal.

2. The Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee shall make recommendations to the Provost with regard to sanctions. The Provost will then consider the recommendations of the Provost’s Committee in making his or her final recommendation to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will review the recommendations of the Provost and impose appropriate sanctions. If the Chancellor decides to recommend the revocation of tenure and dismissal of the faculty member to the Board of Regents, the Laws of the Regents provide the faculty member with an opportunity for a hearing and set other conditions for handling such cases (See Laws, Article 5.C.1 and 5.C.4; and Regent Action 8/27/86). See also [http://www.cu.edu/regents/LawsPolicies/](http://www.cu.edu/regents/LawsPolicies/)
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POST-TENURE REVIEW
1. Purpose of Post-Tenure Review
The primary function of post-tenure review is faculty development. Post-tenure review is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. Moreover, although the failure of a faculty member to make substantial progress toward meeting the goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may be evidence of “incompetence and/or habitual neglect of duty,” the post-tenure review process may not be used to shift the burden of proof in a proceeding to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause.

2. Faculty Subject to Post-Tenure Review
Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, shall be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six-year period, the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., dean, a chaired professorship, promotion to a higher professorial rank). However, post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing prior to the next scheduled review, of plans for retirement within three years after the review would have been scheduled. Post-tenure review will be conducted by tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank.

Tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments will undergo post-tenure review according to the criteria, and by the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank, of the primary unit. Input from appropriate evaluators (e.g. faculty, chair, dean) of the secondary unit including performance reviews, teaching evaluations, service and research evaluation must be solicited by the primary unit in reaching their determination.

3. Process for Adopting Unit Post-Tenure Review Standards and Procedures
The faculty of each tenuring unit shall propose unit post-tenure review standards and procedures and forward the proposed standards and procedures to the dean and the provost for approval. Any disagreements between the dean and the unit over the content of the post-tenure review standards or procedures may be resolved by the provost. Disagreements between the provost and the unit over the content of the post-tenure review standards or procedures shall be referred to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion for final resolution.

The unit post-tenure review procedures must:
a. Require the unit to provide a faculty member under review with written copies of all previous annual performance reviews, post-tenure reviews and development plans.
b. Require the post-tenure review process to incorporate annual performance reviews accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.
c. Require: (i) an assessment of teaching based upon student and peer evaluations, (ii) an assessment of research or creative activities; and (iii) an assessment of service. In assessing a faculty member’s research or creative activities the unit procedures must require an assessment of objective indicia of quality as well as internal peer reviews. Objective indicia of quality include reviews by peers outside the unit, publication of refereed articles, book chapters or books, publication in respected unrefereed journals, or other reviewed research or creative exercises. The unit post-tenure review procedures must also require a thorough assessment of the outcome of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year period prior to the review.
d. Provide that upon completion of the unit post-tenure review process, the unit shall prepare a written post-tenure review report. The unit post-tenure review report must include an assessment of the faculty member’s performance in teaching, research/creative activities, and service and must assess the faculty
member’s performance in each category as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The unit post-
tenure review report must also assess the faculty member’s overall performance as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. If the unit post-tenure review report concludes that the faculty member’s overall performance is unsatisfactory, the unit shall recommend a development plan for restoring the faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level.

e. Provide the department chair and the dean with a copy of all unit post-tenure review reports and any recommendations for development plans. The offices of the department chair and dean shall retain these reports and recommendations as permanent records.

f. Provide that if the unit post-tenure review report assesses the faculty member’s overall performance as superior, or satisfactory, the unit shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the unit post-tenure review report. The summary must provide specific evaluative information on the faculty member’s performance in the categories of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The summary must be sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development.

g. Provide that if the unit post-tenure review report assesses a faculty member’s overall performance as unsatisfactory, the unit shall provide the faculty member a copy of the unit post-tenure review report, redacted to remove references that would identify any external reviewers, along with any recommendations for a development plan. If the faculty member disagrees with the unit report’s unsatisfactory assessment of the faculty member’s overall performance or with any aspect of the unit’s recommendations for a development plan, the faculty member may appeal to the unit tenure and promotion committee, or a subcommittee of the unit tenure and promotion committee designated to hear issues arising in the post-tenure review process, by submitting a written statement of the faculty member’s basis for disagreeing with the report or recommendation. The findings of the unit tenure and promotion committee, or subcommittee, together with its recommendations for action and any statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the dean through the department chair.

5. Dean’s Assessment

The dean shall review the unit’s post-tenure review report, any statement of a faculty member appealing an unsatisfactory assessment, and any recommendations of the unit’s tenure and promotion committee. The dean shall then assess, in writing, the faculty member’s overall performance as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The dean shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the dean’s assessment.

OUTCOMES IN ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. A Superior Review

A superior evaluation will be noted in a faculty member's personnel file when both the academic unit and the dean assess the faculty member's performance as superior. Any faculty member who receives a superior evaluation in a post-tenure review may receive a financial reward including merit increase to base pay as determined by the provost, in addition to any annual raise.

2. A Satisfactory Review

A satisfactory evaluation will be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file when either the academic unit or the dean assesses the faculty member's performance as, at least, satisfactory.

3. An Unsatisfactory Review

a. An unsatisfactory evaluation will be noted in a faculty member’s personnel file only when both the unit and the dean assess the faculty member’s overall performance as unsatisfactory.

b. A faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation is subject to the procedures set forth below in Section 5 of "Outcomes in Annual Performance Review and Post-Tenure Review."

c. When a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation, the dean must deliver to the provost copies of: (1) the unit post-tenure review report and any recommendations for a development plan; (2) the written statement of a faculty member if the faculty member appealed the unit’s assessment; (3)
any recommendation of the unit tenure and promotion committee or subcommittee; and (4) the dean’s assessment.


In summary, the matrix of outcomes for annual performance and post-tenure review assessment is as follows

(_matrix deleted; could not copy formatting)

5. Procedures Following an Unsatisfactory Evaluation

a. Following consultation with the faculty member and with the faculty member’s concurrence, the unit shall establish a development plan designed to restore the faculty member’s overall performance to a satisfactory level. The plan shall include the appointment of a unit development committee to assist the faculty member in improving performance. The unit chair following consultation with the faculty member shall appoint the unit development committee. The members of the unit development committee must hold a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored.

b. In the event that the faculty member consults with the unit development committee but does not concur with the committee’s proposed development plan, both the faculty member and the unit development committee shall submit proposed development plans to the dean for final determination of the plan. In the event that the faculty member refuses to consult with the unit development committee in designing a development plan, the unit development committee will write the plan and forward the plan to the dean.

c. After the implementation of a development plan and until the dean determines that the faculty member’s overall performance has been restored to a satisfactory level, the faculty member’s annual review will include an assessment by the unit chair and the development committee of the progress that the faculty member has made under the development plan. This assessment will be forwarded to the unit tenure and promotion committee. The unit tenure and promotion committee will review the assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. The assessment and the unit tenure and promotion committee’s response will be forwarded to the dean and the faculty member. The dean will make the final determination on the faculty member’s progress under the development plan and whether further measures are necessary to restore the faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level.