**Section 3.15 Post-Tenure Review DRAFT**

**Subdivision 3.151 Purpose**

The source of the intellectual vitality of the University of Northern Iowa is the faculty. Individual faculty members, through the performance of their professional duties, create and nourish this vitality for the benefit of our students and the wider society. Tenured faculty members have an especially important role to play in sustaining and enhancing an academic environment in which free and rigorous inquiry can be pursued. Given their central role in serving our students and the wider community, it is critically important for the tenured faculty to be provided a mechanism for periodic assessment and reflection.

Post-Tenure Review affords the opportunity for the professional performance of each tenured faculty member to be assessed longitudinally. Self-reflection within departmental and university contexts presents the faculty member with a guidepost for further professional growth and re-tuning to, for example, better address current institutional priorities. In addition, these periodic assessments allow UNI to reward tenured faculty for consistently high-quality work. Finally, for those faculty members who are found to be deficient in one or more areas, there will be an opportunity to design and implement a performance improvement plan.

Ultimately, the goal of Post-Tenure Review is to assist tenured faculty to engage in a process of professional development over the length of their careers.

Academic freedom is paramount in order for faculty members to be fully effective as teachers and scholars. The post-tenure review process at the University of Northern Iowa shall be conducted fully in accordance with the AAUP principles of academic freedom.

**Subdivision 3.152 Frequency of Review**

**Paragraph 3.1521 Standard Schedule**

A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year following: (i) tenure; (ii) the most recent promotion; (iii) the last post-tenure review; or return to full-time faculty duties after service as a full-time administrator.

**Paragraph 3.1521 Early Review**

A post-tenure review can be scheduled earlier than the standard schedule indicates in the event of repeated performance deficiencies. Please see Section 3.154.

**Paragraph 3.1521 Requested Review**

A faculty member may request a post-tenure review one year before the next scheduled review for good cause, including exceptionally meritorious performance. This request must be made to the department head in writing by August 31 of the fall semester during which the requested review is to be performed.

**Subdivision 3.153 Substitutions**

If a faculty member applies for promotion during the same year that a post-tenure review is scheduled, the evaluation process attendant to promotion substitutes for post-tenure review.

**Subdivision 3.154 Departmental Standards**

Each department shall create specific standards and criteria for the evaluation of faculty in the post-tenure review process. These standards shall be consistent with applicable University Guiding Standards (Section xxx) and documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Section xxx).

**Subdivision 3.155 Post-Tenure Review Process**

The annual review process is the foundation of post-tenure review. As described in Section 3.xx, the department head conducts an annual review of the performance of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. Performance in each of the three areas will be judged to be meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, or not meeting expectations on the basis of departmental post-tenure review standards and criteria. The extensiveness and timing of the post-tenure review process will depend on the outcomes of annual reviews over time.

**Paragraph 3.1551 Summary Review**

If a faculty member is found to be meeting or exceeding expectations in all three areas of review every year prior to a scheduled post-tenure review, the post-tenure review shall be a summary evaluation conducted by the department head. The department head’s report shall be submitted to the dean and the faculty member. The faculty member may submit a written response to the department head and the dean.

**Subparagraph 3.15511 Materials Required for Summary Review**

(i) Statement from the faculty member reflecting on accomplishments over the review period and outlining goals for the next review period;

(ii) Annual Review letters from the department head over the review period;

(iii) Faculty Activity Reports over the review period;

(iv) Curriculum Vitae

**Subparagraph 3.15512 Department Head’s Report**

The department head shall summarize the results of the annual reviews over the post-tenure review period. The head may make recommendations for performance improvement and discuss professional development opportunities or workload adjustment per Chapter 4 of this Handbook (Subdivision 4.93 Extended Teaching Portfolio Application Process). An overall performance rating of “Meeting Expectations” shall also be given.

**Paragraph 3.1552 Comprehensive Review**

If a faculty member is found to be not meeting expectations in one or more review areas in three annual reviews prior to a scheduled post-tenure review, a comprehensive review shall be separately conducted by the departmental PAC and by the department head during the next academic year. The PAC’s report (along with any minority report) shall be submitted to the faculty member, department head and the dean. The department head’s report shall be submitted to the faculty member, the dean, and the PAC chair. The faculty member may submit a written response to the department head and the dean.

**Subparagraph 3.15521 Materials Required for Comprehensive Review**

(i) Statement from the faculty reflecting on performance over the review period and indicating how deficiencies have been or will be addressed. Goals for the next review period should also be discussed;

(ii) Annual Review letters from the department head over the review period;

(iii) Faculty Activity Reports over the review period;

(iv) Curriculum Vitae;

(v) Additional materials consistent with departmental review policies, as documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

**Subparagraph 3.15522 Departmental PAC’s Report**

The PAC shall conduct a detailed evaluation of the performance of the faculty member over the review period, determining if the faculty member “Meets Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” or “Needs Improvement” for each area of performance in their portfolio. Special emphasis must be given to recommendations for improvement. An overall rating of “Meeting Expectations” or “Not Meeting Expectations” shall also be given.

**Subparagraph 3.15523 Department Head’s Report**

The department head shall conduct a detailed evaluation of the performance of the faculty member over the review period, determining if the faculty member “Meets Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” or “Needs Improvement” for each area of performance in their portfolio. Special emphasis must be given to recommendations for improvement. The PAC’s report, along with the materials specified above, shall be used in the preparation of the department head’s report. An overall rating of “Meeting Expectations” or “Not Meeting Expectations” shall also be given.

**Subparagraph 3.15524 Satisfactory Comprehensive Review**

If the department head gives an overall rating of “Meeting Expectations” for a Comprehensive Review, the post-tenure cycle is restarted. The department head may ask the faculty member to develop a Performance Improvement Plan in order to strengthen performance in future annual reviews.

**Paragraph 3.1553 Reviews for Other Levels of Performance**

If a faculty member’s annual reviews exhibit deficiencies but not at a level for which a comprehensive review is mandatory, the head can request either a summary review or a comprehensive review for the scheduled post-tenure review. In these cases, an adjustment of the faculty member’s workload may be considered as a means of strengthening overall performance, in addition to other professional development mechanisms.

**Paragraph 3.1554 Performance Improvement Plan**

In a comprehensive review, if a faculty member is judged by the department head to be not meeting expectations, the faculty member must meet with the department head to design a Performance Improvement Plan. Faculty colleagues and the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning shall also be consulted. The plan shall contain specific actions and measures to address the deficiencies found in the review. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended. The Performance Improvement Plan must be completed within three months of an unsatisfactory review and signed by the faculty member, department head, and dean.

During the next two subsequent annual reviews, the department head shall use the Performance Improvement Plan as a basis for evaluation. Significant progress on all corrective elements of the plan will be expected by the second annual review.

**Paragraph 3.1555 Sanctions**

In extremely rare cases, sanctions, up to and including termination, may be levied due to poor performance that is both persistent and unresponsive. If sanctions are invoked, it must be done in strict accordance with Faculty Handbook procedures and university Policies and Procedures.

**Paragraph 3.1556 Appeals**

A faculty member may file a faculty petition to appeal an unsatisfactory review according the procedures in Chapter 11 of the Faculty Handbook. Sanctions levied due to poor performance that is both persistent and unresponsive may also be appealed via this mechanism. Termination decisions may be appealed according the procedures in Chapter 12 of the Faculty Handbook.

**Subdivision 3.156 Special Circumstances**

(i) A faculty member may petition to defer post-tenure review for good cause. The faculty must submit a written petition to the department head as soon as practicable. If a deferment is granted, it shall be for a period of one year.

(ii) A faculty member who plans to go up for promotion the following year may delay post-tenure review for a year. In the case that the faculty member does not go up for promotion, the faculty member will undergo post-tenure review as scheduled.

(iii) A faculty member who will fully retire within one year after a post-tenure review is scheduled may choose to forgo the review.

(iv) Faculty members on phased retirement shall not be required to undergo post-tenure review.

**Subdivision 3.157 Distinguished Performance Awards**

Full professors who have especially meritorious performance at the time of post-tenure review are eligible for a salary increase award.

**Paragraph XXX Eligibility**

Faculty are eligible for consideration for a post-tenure review salary award when they receive an overall rating of “meets expectations” and have had three or more years of “exceeding expectations” in teaching/librarianship and scholarship/creative activity or service (or all three).

**Paragraph XXX Process**

The College Review Committee shall review the post-tenure review files, department head letter, and faculty letter for faculty meeting the eligibility criteria above. They shall select especially meritorious faculty for consideration in a given year by the Faculty Handbook Committee for a post-tenure review award. No more than 3 faculty from each college or 6 from CHAS shall be selected.

The Faculty Handbook Committee shall review the post-tenure review files, department head letters, and faculty letter. From that group, the committee shall select based on meritorious performance no fewer than 6 faculty to recommend to the provost for post-tenure review salary increase awards, unless fewer than six faculty meet the eligibility criteria. Their selection should fairly reflect the academic diversity of the university. The provost shall award no fewer than 6 post-tenure reviews with a salary increase to the faculty member’s base pay.