Post-Tenure Review Policy (BOT-24)

Policy Committee Presentation to the Academic Senate

September 19, 2025

Topics

- Background
- What aspects of the review policy can be determined at campus level?
  - Next steps?
- Questions

Background: Policy

"Each tenured faculty member will complete a post-tenure review **within five years after tenure is granted** and **every five years thereafter** in compliance with Indiana law. The first post-tenure review shall assess the tenured faculty member's performance since the award of tenure, and subsequent post-tenure reviews shall assess the performance since the most recent post-tenure review.

Tenured faculty members holding administrative roles (chairs, directors or higher with faculty supervisory role or 0.5 or greater administrative full-time equivalent, FTE) shall be reviewed annually by their supervisors. These tenured faculty members shall undergo post-tenure review in the fifth year after their administrative appointment drops below 0.5 FTE."

Background: Process

Brief overview of the post-tenure review process

- Faculty submit CV + one-page summary per area.
- Chair reviews, writes assessment.
  - Initial rating, potentially
- Dean adds rating, letter.
- Faculty may respond.
- CAO reviews, then may accept, reject or modify the dean’s recommended rating.
- Chancellor reviews, then may accept, reject or modify the CAO's recommended rating.
  - Chancellor sends recommendation to President

Background: Areas of Review

"…the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty members will **measure productivity** and include, at a minimum, the following:

- The faculty member's **teaching workload**.
- The **total number of students** who the faculty member teaches at the graduate and undergraduate level.
- The **time spent on instructional assignments** and the **time spent on overseeing graduate students**.
- The **research and creative scholarship productivity** of the faculty member."

Background: Ratings

"A **productivity performance rating** will be given to each tenured faculty member at Indiana University. The rating categories for post-tenure review will include the following university level categories and definitions:

- **Exceeds productivity expectations**: Record of productivity and performance for this faculty member clearly and substantially exceeds expectations.
- **Meets productivity expectations**: Record of productivity and performance for this faculty member demonstrates a sustained record of performance. Annual reports for this faculty member provide evidence of an overall sustained meet expectations or higher rating during the last 5 years in the areas of productivity.
- **Does not meet productivity expectations**: Performance falls below the productivity expectations outlined for the faculty member. A faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory rating for their annual report during one of the previous 5 years and/or has demonstrated a pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by Indiana University, and/or has sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and/or Indiana University policies and procedures, all noted in the annual reports, are evidence of does not meet productivity expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory productivity**: Faculty member has failed to meet the expectations for productivity and performance. The faculty member has received an overall unsatisfactory annual report rating for two or more of the previous 5 years, and/or has demonstrated a pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by Indiana University, and/or has sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and Indiana University policies and procedures, all noted in the annual reports, are evidence of unsatisfactory productivity."

Note: Policy requires that annual reports are now also rated using these categories

Background: Performance Improvement Plans

“For a faculty member who receives a final productivity rating of “does not meet productivity expectations,” the dean, in consultation with the faculty member and the faculty member’s department chair/unit head, will develop a performance improvement plan. The performance improvement plan will be submitted to the CAO for review. The CAO and Chancellor will discuss modifications and finalize the improvement plan.”

Campus-Level Considerations: Criteria

"On each campus, each school, college and/or department shall have **discipline-specific criteria** that clearly describes **productivity expectations** for tenured faculty members that is commensurate with the academic standards of peer institutions. These specific criteria shall:

1. take into consideration the productivity requirements of the discipline;
2. be adaptable to approved differential allocation of effort in the productivity areas of teaching, scholarship and service; and
3. be clearly written such that a reasonable faculty member should not be uncertain or confused about what level of productivity or performance is expected to earn each performance rating. **Each campus, school, college and/or department shall review and revise its criteria no fewer than every three years."**

Campus-Level Considerations: Criteria

- At this time, Academic Affairs, working with the Deans, has suggesed that using **existing criteria** for evaluating annual reports and PTR cases will be used as a guide for the new discipline-specific criteria.

- Campus-wide criteria for teaching and service categories are a possibility, but considering the short timeline for the first reviews, may be discussed further before the three-year mark when policies for criteria must be reviewed

Campus-Level Considerations: Dept. Rating, Review Committee

- The policy states that "Each campus dean will determine if the department chair/unit head will recommend an initial overall productivity rating. Each campus dean may request a department chair/unit head to provide an overall initial productivity rating."
- Also left to the campuses is whether there will be a committee for assessing review materials.
  - "The dean of each school and/or college may choose to convene a post-tenure review committee to assist in the assessment of the Post-Tenure Productivity Review Packets. This committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the dean."

Additional Policy Information, for Reference

Process, Part 1

1. “The faculty member will provide a current curriculum vitae and a single page per productivity area …highlighting accomplishments and summarizing productivity over the previous five years.”
2. Materials are then reviewed by: Department Chair, Dean, EVCAA, Chancellor, IU President
3. “Faculty member’s department chair/unit head will review the materials submitted by the faculty member, along with the last five years of annual report letters. Additional information that was not included in the annual reports regarding community engagement, sponsored research, performances, etc. may also be reviewed. The department chair/unit head will provide a written assessment of the overall productivity of the faculty member. The collection of these materials will be considered the Post-Tenure Productivity Review Packet and will be submitted to the dean’s office. …
4. The dean will review the materials and assess the faculty member’s disciplinary record in their personnel file. The dean will add a brief letter that assesses and recommends the faculty member’s productivity rating for the five-year period under review.”

Process, Part 2

1. The dean will provide their letter and all materials from the Post-Tenure Productivity Review Packet to the faculty member for their review. The faculty member will have five (5) business days from receipt of the dean's letter to submit an optional response that can be added to the packet before it moves to the campus Chief Academic Officer for review.
2. The dean will forward the packet to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) for review.
3. The CAO shall review the Post-Tenure Productivity Review Packet and assess the faculty member's productivity, professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The CAO may accept, reject, or modify the dean's recommended rating. Each faculty member reviewed will receive **a final performance rating** from the CAO:
   - Exceeds productivity expectations
   - Meets productivity expectations
   - Does not meet productivity expectations
   - Unsatisfactory productivity
4. The CAO will forward the packet along with their recommendation to the chancellor. who will review the dossier and accept, reject, or modify the CAO's recommendation. The Chancellor will send their recommendation to the President.

Performance Improvement Plans

“For a faculty member who receives a final productivity rating of “does not meet productivity expectations,” the dean, in consultation with the faculty member and the faculty member’s department chair/unit head, will develop a performance improvement plan. The performance improvement plan will be submitted to the CAO for review. The CAO and Chancellor will discuss modifications and finalize the improvement plan.”

Performance Improvement Plans, cont'd

"The performance improvement plan will outline specific deficiencies in the productivity of the faculty member's performance and how it will be remedied. The performance improvement plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against university standards and college and unit criteria) will be remedied. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. Although each performance improvement plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan must: list specific deficiencies to be addressed; define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes; identify institutional resources available to support the plan; set timelines for achieving goals and outcomes; and indicate the criteria for assessment in regular reviews of progress."

Performance Improvement Plans, cont'd

"The five-year post-tenure productivity review should not be the first time that a tenured faculty member who has received an overall annual report rating of unsatisfactory rating should be on a performance improvement plan. School/college and/or units should establish procedures to create performance improvement plans for tenured faculty members who receive an overall annual report rating of unsatisfactory. Evidence that the faculty member has met the requirements of the performance improvement plan can be used as evidence in the five-year post-tenure productivity review for the "meets productivity" expectation."

Potential Dismissal

- A faculty member who fails to meet the probation requirements of their performance improvement plan from the post-tenure productivity review by the established deadline may result in dismissal. The CAO, in consultation with the dean and department chair, shall make a recommendation for dismissal to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will accept, reject, or modify the CAO's recommendation. The Chancellor will send their recommendation to the President. The CAO will issue the final decision for faculty members who fail to meet their probation and performance improvement plan requirements.
- A faculty member who receives a final productivity performance rating of "unsatisfactory" shall receive a notice of dismissal from the CAO.
- A faculty member adversely affected by the final decision issued by the CAO has the right to a campus Faculty Board of Review.
- The dismissal process set forth herein for failure of a faculty member to meet the requirements of the performance improvement plan is distinct from and supersedes the separation processes and requirements set forth in BOT-52.

Update to Annual Report Procedure

The review of the annual report will be conducted using the established discipline-specific criteria and the department chair/unit head will issue **a standardized annual review letter for each faculty member** that will include the following:

- standard introductory paragraph indicating the review is required by policy, a statement that the evaluation will be used for potential merit increases, and identification of the evaluation period;
- reference to the individual faculty member's approved allocation of effort in teaching, research and service;
- summary of university level standard performance rating categories for annual review to be used in rating the individual assigned area of responsibility and **overall performance rating**:
    - Exceeds productivity expectations
    - Meets productivity expectations
    - Does not meet productivity expectations
    - Unsatisfactory productivity
- written summary and performance rating in each assigned area of responsibility;
- an overall performance rating; and
- documentation of concerns.