

Post-Tenure Review

I. Faculty* Responsibilities

Faculty have the responsibility to optimize and deploy their talents and expertise in a way that furthers the mission of the University, the campus, the school, the department, and their own careers. Faculty must ensure that they demonstrate professional competence and that a satisfactory contribution is consistently made in all areas of faculty performance. Tenure requires mutual responsibilities and when faculty accept tenure, they also accept the obligation to grow and develop professionally, to keep current in their disciplines and to meet the evolving needs of the University. Most faculty already meet and exceed the generally understood and accepted standards of professional conduct.

*Faculty refers to all FTE instructors, including librarians, on faculty appointments.

II. Administration's Responsibilities

The University has the reciprocal responsibility to provide faculty with the environment and resources needed for them to be as productive as possible. This not only includes meaningful faculty development programs and opportunities, but also the structure, resources, and administrative support so that faculty efforts can be translated into achievement. Therefore, administrators must be willing and able to evaluate, counsel, and sanction faculty as well as provide a means by which faculty can raise their performance above minimally accepted standards.

III. Guiding Principles

University Faculty Council's "Guiding Principles for Faculty Review" informs post tenure review at Indiana University East. Those principles are:

- a. To preserve academic freedom
- b. To protect due process
- c. To recognize situational differences of diverse faculty
- d. To establish professional development as a goal
- e. To define a mechanism for initiating the in-depth review process
- f. To rely upon peer review at all steps in the process
- g. To incorporate existing faculty review mechanisms
- h. To include the concept of intermediate sanctions prior to dismissal
- i. To establish dismissal process consequent to misconduct or incompetence
- j. To specify outcome criteria for assessment of the effectiveness of the policy at the time of implementation of the policy

For faculty, the review process should take into consideration all facets of faculty performance, including the distribution of effort among teaching, scholarship, and service, while recognizing that a particular faculty member's contributions may be weighted more heavily towards one area or may shift, depending on the mission and needs of the department, school, and faculty member. For librarians, the

review process should take into consideration all facets of librarian activities, including the distribution of effort between performance, professional development, and service. It should recognize that a particular librarian's contributions may be weighted more heavily towards one area or may shift, depending on the mission and needs of the department, school, library, or librarian.

Because administrators play an active role in faculty success, deans, division chairs, program directors, and library directors should be provided with training programs on leadership and personnel management. These individuals are responsible for providing an environment and formulating policies that promote faculty success. They must be able and willing to make the difficult decisions in the rare instances where corrective measures are necessary. Review of administrators' abilities in leadership and personnel management should be incorporated into the regular administrative review process.

The program should incorporate as much of the review mechanisms already in place to minimize the creation of duplicate processes. Peer review must be part of the process. The initiating mechanism should be designed to identify those faculty members who, through annual reviews or feedback from annual reports, have been informed of persistent substandard performance over time, rather than those with a single year of reduced productivity or lack of effectiveness.

The campus and the divisions shall be required to determine what constitutes "unsatisfactory performance." This definition and mechanism for measuring who has "unsatisfactory performance" shall be determined with faculty input and with full written notice to faculty upon the implementation of Post-Tenure Review at Indiana University East. The definition of "unsatisfactory performance" must include the concept of lack of effort, such that there is no evidence that the individual is trying to improve, rather than merely lack of results, which must take into account mitigating circumstances, such as a competitive research environment.

IV. Purpose of Post-Tenure Review

A. Through an assessment of the duties that faculty have, post-tenure review can be used to advise the Chairs of ways for faculty to reorganize their duties that would allow the faculty to make necessary changes in their teaching , service, and scholarship.

B. In rare cases, faculty may engage in behavior contrary to generally accepted standards of professional conduct. Repeated instances of such behavior should be addressed through the post-tenure review process except when specific policies to address the conduct problem already exist, for example with sexual harassment or research misconduct.

V. Initiation of Post Tenure Review

Faculty subject to post tenure review include, but are not limited to, those who through the annual review process have been informed of unsatisfactory performance for two consecutive years

or

Faculty may be subject to post tenure review if their immediate supervisors believe that the mission or purpose of the position is not being fulfilled, i. e., part of the person's job description is being carried out, but the primary purpose of the position is not. Before faculty would be subject to post tenure review, supervisors must show documentation that this has been discussed with the faculty in question and has been a consistent problem for a minimum of two years.

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs notifies faculty identified for review in writing and informs them of the nature and procedures of the review. This notification will include the proposed sanctions, including dismissal, as a consequence for failure to raise performance to accepted minimum expectations.

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs may exempt a faculty member subject to review if there are extenuating circumstances, such as documented health or emotional issues, which may have contributed to unsatisfactory performance.

VI. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will consist of three tenured faculty: two non-division members and one member from the faculty's division (or discipline if none are available within the division). The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will appoint the PTR Committee in consultation with the faculty under review and the faculty member's Chair. The final decision will rest with the Vice Chancellor. No faculty at or above Chair will serve on this committee.

VII. Responsibilities of the PTRC

- A.** The PTRC will establish the grounds for the review; an enhancement plan for the faculty member along with a time frame to complete it; and what sanctions, including dismissal, are appropriate should the enhancement plan fail. The PTRC can terminate the process at any time if it finds that there is no basis for the review.
- B.** The PTRC will analyze the faculty member's Annual Reviews of the years in question. Should a review be deemed necessary, the findings of

the PTRC will report into which of three categories the faculty member fits and why:

1. The PTRC has found that the faculty member has met minimum performance expectations; therefore, all concerned parties will be informed that the review has been terminated.

2. The PTRC has found that the faculty member has fallen below minimum performance expectations in some areas. All concerned parties will be notified of the deficiencies and an enhancement plan will be designed for the faculty that will include sanctions, if any, and will specify a probationary period (not to exceed two years) for the goals of the plan to be reached. If the goals are not satisfactorily reached, additional sanctions may be imposed, potentially including dismissal.

3. The PTRC has found that the faculty member has fallen below minimum performance expectations, particularly in key areas of his or her job description. All concerned parties will be notified of the deficiencies and an enhancement plan will be designed for the faculty along with sanctions, a time frame for the goals to be reached (not to exceed two years), and a date for dismissal should the goals not be reached.

C. Enhancement Plan: The faculty member under review and the PTRC will work together to draw up a development plan. The plan will provide specific guidance and advice to help the faculty member remedy the identified deficiencies. The plan should:

1. identify specific strengths that should be maintained or enhanced.
2. identify the specific deficiencies to be addressed
3. define specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies.
4. outline specific activities and programs that should be completed to achieve these goals and outcomes.
5. set appropriate timelines for the completion of these activities.
6. indicate appropriate benchmarks to be used in monitoring progress. The benchmarks will be marked out at least every semester.
7. indicate the criteria for annual progress reviews

8. direct faculty to funding or resources that the faculty member may need and that the institution can reasonably make available in order to ensure the best possible opportunity for the faculty under review. However, in no case should preferential treatment in the allocation of existing faculty development resources be given to faculty under review.

D. The plan becomes final upon the signatures of the faculty member, the chair of the PTRC, the chair or dean of the division, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If the faculty member refuses to sign the plan, sanctions are immediately imposed once any appeal, if any, has been completed.

E. The faculty member can appeal the findings of the PTRC, including the development plan, to the Faculty Board of Review. Neither sanctions nor the development plan begin until the appeal procedure is completed.

F. At the end of the probationary period (no later than two years after the implementation of the development plan), the review committee shall make a final report to the faculty member, the Chair of the appropriate division, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

G. Following the third year of implementation, and at least every five years thereafter, this policy will be reviewed by a committee of the Indiana University East Faculty Senate to determine its success in fulfilling the principles of the UFC statement on "Guiding Principles for Faculty Review."

Passed by Faculty Senate: November 2, 1999