

Augusta University

Policy Library

Post Tenure Review Policy

Policy Manager: Office of the Provost

POLICY STATEMENT

Augusta University seeks to secure and maintain a faculty of the highest quality. This goal requires that Augusta University provide periodic assessment of faculty performance that is useful for faculty review and development. The purposes of the post-tenure review process are to support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. Furthermore, the post-tenure review process assists faculty members with identifying opportunities for professional development that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader 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.

Criteria

- a. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution through their teaching; scholarship, research, or creative activities; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate.
- b. *For the purposes of the AU Faculty Evaluation System, student success activities (SSA) is a comprehensive term for those faculty activities whose purpose is to 1) enhance student learning and engagement for the learner through continuous improvement of the learning environment, and/or 2) position the learner to be successful in achieving their short-term and long-term academic, career, and personal growth goals. Faculty support student success through in and out of class efforts. Involvement in SSA is included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in the workload categories of teaching, research / scholarship / creative work, service, and administration, as applicable. The inclusion of SSA is appropriate for learners at all levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees). [NOTE: Definitions for the workload categories are found in the [Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload](#)]. The standalone student success activities metrics is referenced in AU ASA Guidance 2022.04.18.*
- c. Student Evaluations are required for all faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching. For faculty whose primary responsibility is not teaching, the evaluation will focus on excellence in those area where the individual's major responsibilities lie.
- d. All tenured faculty members will be reviewed regardless of administrative appointment.
- e. All evaluations will appropriately reflect the assigned workload and effort assignments.

Office of Legal Affairs Use Only

Executive Sponsor: EVP, Academic Affairs & Provost

Next Review: 3/2028

AFFECTED STAKEHOLDERS

Indicate all entities and persons within the Enterprise that are affected by this policy:

- Alumni Faculty Graduate Students Health Professional Students
 Staff Undergraduate Students Vendors/Contractors Visitors
 Other:

DEFINITIONS

Intentionally left blank.

PROCESS & PROCEDURES

- a. All academic units are required to conduct a periodic, regularly scheduled, review of tenured faculty to provide ongoing assessment of teaching through evaluation of instruction, scholarly achievement, research, and service activities of the individuals after they have been granted tenure. Each academic unit shall establish written criteria and procedures governing these periodic reviews to ensure transparency in the review process and that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the review in a consistent manner, in accordance with the following process.
- b. The review process for an individual shall be conducted five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. It shall be completed no later than the end of the 5th academic year. If an individual is on leave at the time of review, he/she will be reviewed during the first academic year after his/her return. Faculty may volunteer to undergo the review process prior to the five-year timeline.
 - i. Faculty will have the opportunity to pause the post-tenure review timeline for up to two years at the discretion of the President due to the following circumstances:
 1. the faculty member was on approved extended leave during the five- year period (e.g. birth or adoption of a child, or disability, sabbatical, or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member); therefore, the clock is paused and not reset;
 2. the faculty member is currently on leave at the planned time of review, in which case the post-tenure review may occur when the faculty member returns from leave; therefore, the clock is paused and not reset;
 3. the faculty member was promoted to a higher academic rank (i.e., Professor), which resets the five-year clock;
 4. the faculty member was promoted to an academic leadership position (e.g., Department Head, Dean, Associate Provost), which resets the five- year clock;
 5. in the case of interruption due to circumstances outside of faculty control (e.g. pandemic, natural disaster, etc.) the clock is paused and not reset.
 - ii. Faculty members may elect early, voluntary post-tenure review, in which case the review

- will occur sooner than five years; the clock will reset if the early, voluntary post-tenure review is successful.
- c. As academic units develop a rating scale and rubric for rank and tenure status, each of the faculty workload areas should be addressed as they pertain to the unit. Each area to be reviewed should include, as appropriate, information related to the student success as previously identified. In addition, the expectations associated with each category (teaching, research, service, clinical practice, and administration) should be appropriately scaled to reflect differences in assigned workload allocation. See Faculty Affairs: Faculty Effort Definitions for specific guidance.
 - d. Portfolio requirements will be based upon the faculty member's current job description and assigned faculty effort. Documentation required for post-tenure review will be the post-tenure review portfolio, other reports/forms as determined by the college, and a Curriculum Vitae consistent with Augusta University format (curriculum vitae). The portfolio should include, as appropriate, evidence of research, scholarship, teaching, and student success, encompassing the five-year review period or since the last promotion or tenure milestone.
 - i. Academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at Augusta University and aligned with an academic unit will undergo a post-tenure review, and a 360° feedback assessment at least every five years. Each academic unit should specify the process and procedures for this comprehensive evaluation of academic administrators. It is intended that an academic administrator's post-tenure review include a review of traditional faculty activities (teaching, research, scholarly activity, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the administrator.
 - ii. For areas in which the faculty member has 0% effort, the portfolio should include a brief statement indicating the category is not applicable to the review. Portfolio guidelines for post-tenure review should include additional documentation of administrative efforts.
 - e. The college level Promotion and Tenure committee, or a sub-committee thereof, will serve as the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. The committee shall contain no less than three-tenured faculty members with at least one member from the individual's department or college. In the event there is only one representative from the individual's department serving on the PTR, a second tenured representative of the individual's department or college may be included as a non-voting member of the review committee at the request of the individual subject to review. The additional departmental representative does not need to be a member of the college Promotion and Tenure committee. In addition, academic units may develop a policy to allow the faculty member under review to request that one member of the review committee be replaced for any reason, and then establish a process to appoint an alternate member from the college level Promotion and Tenure Committee. Any such academic unit policy must be approved by the college dean and the Provost prior to being implemented.
 - i. The review will encompass, as appropriate, teaching, research/scholarly achievement,

- practice, and service including student success activities across those areas of effort over the five-year period or since the last tenure and promotion milestone.
- ii. The faculty member is responsible for providing review materials.
 - iii. The committee will ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the review in a consistent manner.
 - iv. The committee will ensure that review of annual evaluations since the last award of tenure or PTR is performed.
 - v. The committee will come to an agreement on the conclusions of the review. If they cannot come to an agreement, they may choose to consult with the Chairperson or Dean for guidance.
 - vi. Results and recommendations of the review committee will be communicated in writing to both the individual faculty member and the Department Chairperson. In the case of reviews of Department Chairpersons, the results will be communicated directly to the Dean. Chairpersons, the results will be communicated directly to the Dean.
 - vii. The Chairperson will then conduct an independent review of the faculty member considering the recommendations of the PTR Committee. The Chairperson will then review the findings with the individual faculty member. The individual faculty member will be provided with a written copy of the chair's report at least 5 business days prior to the meeting. The faculty member and the Chairperson will sign the document acknowledging that the review has been completed. This signature does not indicate agreement with the outcome of the review. In the case of reviews of Department Chairpersons, the Dean will then review the findings with the individual Chairperson.
 - viii. The Chairperson will then transmit the report and any response to the Dean of the school. In the case of reviews of Department Chairpersons, the Dean will communicate the results directly to the Office of the Provost.
- f. The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. The results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.
 - g. In the case of a negative post-tenure review, the faculty member will be subject to a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP, previously known as Post-Tenure Development Plan in AU policy)

- a. In instances where an area of deficiency is noted, the faculty member's appropriate supervisor and faculty member together will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the PTR committee based around the deficiencies identified by the committee. The PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the review. The PIP's goals or outcomes must

be reasonable, achievable within the designated timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of the Provost.

- b. The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will:
 - i. specify goals or outcomes that are required for the faculty member to overcome identified deficiencies;
 - ii. outline specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes;
 - iii. specify available resources and supports;
 - iv. set appropriate deadlines which the goals or outcomes will be accomplished (which should not exceed three years);
 - v. indicate the criteria by which progress will be monitored;
 - vi. include a plan to monitor progress, reassess the plan, and provide feedback at least twice per semester in the fall and spring including the faculty member's annual evaluation;
 - vii. and specify possible remedial actions if progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory.
- c. Financial Support for Performance Improvement Plan
 The Dean will be responsible for financial arrangements associated with the PIP. If the nature or scope of the PIP is such that the individual cannot carry out other duties, the Chair and the Dean shall make other arrangements for these duties to be completed.
- d. Review of the Performance Improvement Plan Progress
 At the end of the PIP, the individual shall be reviewed by the Chairperson and Dean. Results of the PIP review will be communicated in writing by the Department Chairperson.
- e. Completion of the PIP:
 - i. The Chairperson and Dean will make a determination as to the sufficiency of the faculty member's progress towards the established PIP.
 - ii. In the case of a satisfactory completion of the PIP, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the outcome and that the five-year review PTR window will commence with the start of the upcoming academic year.
 - iii. If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials, the Chairperson and Dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the PIP (or has refused to reasonably engage in the process), the Chairperson and Dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. Disciplinary actions include, but are not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The faculty member must be informed in writing of the determination and proposed sanction along with their right to appeal and the associated appeal process.
 - iv. A copy of the decision of the Chairperson and Dean shall be provided to the Office of the Provost (or designee).

f. Appeals and Due Process:

- i. A faculty member may appeal the decision of the Chairperson and Dean with respect to a determination of an unsatisfactory progress towards a PIP within 10 business days of receiving written notification of the decision and proposed sanction by requesting a review by the current PTR committee formed in accordance with section III e. above.
- ii. The PTR committee will review the PIP, progress towards the PIP and the recommendation of the Chairperson and Dean. The PTR committee may base their review solely upon the record or exercise their judgment to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The PTR committee will issue its recommendation in writing to the Office of the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
- iii. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation from the PTR committee, the Provost (or designee) shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.
- iv. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost (or designee).
- v. Upon receipt of the appeal, the President will charge the University Promotion and Tenure (UPT) committee with reviewing the record and making a recommendation. The committee should ensure that the candidate received due process and equitable disciplinary actions at a university level. Upon the conclusion of the review, the UPT shall make a recommendation to the President either supporting the recommended sanction or proposing an alternative outcome. The UPT review shall be completed within 10 business days during the fall or spring terms.
- vi. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action and shall notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application pursuant to BOR POLICY 6.26 APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW within 10 days of receiving the recommendation from the UPT committee.

Record Retention

All records of reviews will be retained by the Dean's office. At the end of each academic year the college must forward to the Office of the Provost the names of the faculty members reviewed that year, the results, and the names of each member of the review committees.

Implementation

- a. The promotion/tenure unit shall prepare a plan for scheduling reviews of tenured faculty. The five-year cycle of reviews should begin during the 2023-2024 academic year with the initiation of PTR for administrative faculty, not subject to the review process under prior policy, being phased in over three review cycles beginning in 2025-2026.
- b. In all cases in which the unit head is the person being reviewed under this policy, an

administrative officer one level above the unit head shall assume the unit head's function in this review.

- c. PTR evaluators should exercise prudent judgement and flexibility as new policies and procedures are implemented.

REFERENCES & SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Intentionally left blank

RELATED POLICIES

Intentionally left blank

APPROVED BY:

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Augusta University

Date: 3/29/2023

President, Augusta University

Date:3/29/2023