February 7, 2013

To: Andrew Torrance, Faculty Senate President
    Chris Crandall, University Senate President

From: Jeffrey S. Vitter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Re: Charge to Develop a Post-Tenure Review Policy

As you know, the Kansas Board of Regents has asked each of the Regents institutions to develop a post-tenure review policy that will be in place by April 2014. In the spirit of the “Sense of the Senate” motion passed by Faculty Senate on December 6, 2012, I charge you to lead the development of a university post-tenure review policy for the University of Kansas, working in collaboration with my office. This policy will be a university level policy, as is the policy on annual evaluation of faculty, and will be in addition to the annual evaluation policy. Its goals include providing appropriate feedback to faculty to maximize their professional development over time, encourage their continued innovation and productivity in all aspects of their faculty responsibilities (teaching, scholarship, and service), and ensure that all faculty members are meeting their responsibilities to students, colleagues, the university, and the profession.

Post-Tenure Review Policy Guidelines

To accomplish these goals, the post-tenure review policy should meet the guidelines outlined below:

1. Include a review cycle of five to seven years.
   The Regents have stated their expectation “that each tenured faculty member will be assessed seven years after the most recent promotion, and reviews will continue at intervals of five to seven years unless interrupted by a further review for promotion.” As a research intensive institution, our post-tenure review cycle should ideally be at the lower end of this range to have maximum benefit to faculty members. KU’s expectation is that associate professors will apply for promotion to full professor in five to six years after the promotion to associate professor. The review cycle after promotion to full professor should be consistent with that employed at other AAU institutions with periodic post-tenure review.

2. Involve a summative evaluation of accomplishments over the years specified. Although annual reviews are necessary and include information relevant to the summative post-tenure evaluation, a compilation of annual reports and evaluations would not be sufficient to meet this criterion owing to the need for a comprehensive long-term review as well as such factors as the variety of formats in use across campus, possible repetition of items across annual reports, etc. The policy should specify:
   a. The materials that the faculty member would submit for the review that would be a sufficient basis for the summative evaluation.
The rating scale that will be used to evaluate those materials (e.g., satisfactory, unsatisfactory; exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations; etc.).

3. Include, at a minimum, a mechanism for evaluation at the school/college level as well as the department or program level culminating in a school/college report to the Provost. A university level review mechanism may be included instead of a Provost report.

4. Specify outcomes for satisfactory and unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluations. These could be adapted from other university policies such as the annual faculty evaluation or progress toward tenure review policies or from policies at peer institutions.

5. Define the conditions that would replace a scheduled post-tenure review (e.g., application for promotion, application for a university distinguished professorship, retirement, etc.).

6. Reference the relationship between departmental, school, and university standards/criteria for tenure and promotion, and standards/criteria for post-tenure review. These standards/criteria should be consistent with those for tenure and promotion in rank.

7. Reference how differential allocation of effort across teaching, scholarship, and service should be taken into account in the application of performance standards/criteria in the post-tenure review evaluation.

8. The post-tenure review policy should be consistent with other policies on faculty evaluation (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, progress toward tenure, differential allocation of effort, etc.). It should reference those policies where appropriate rather than repeat them.

9. Develop a post-tenure review schedule for current faculty members at the associate and full professor ranks that would be phased in over a seven year period beginning in the 2014-2015 academic year.

Target Dates

I have outlined an ambitious schedule for this semester so that you can devote the Fall 2013 semester to campus-wide vetting of the policy.

Draft policy for review by Faculty Senate and Deans: April 15, 2013

Campus-wide review and feedback completed: November 1, 2013

Final vote and approval by Faculty Senate for submission to Provost and Chancellor: February 1, 2014

Initial Tasks

Your first task will be to identify and recruit a chair or co-chairs of a work group on post-tenure review to develop the draft policy. I ask that you work collaboratively with me and Vice Provost Mary Lee Hummert to select the chairs and work group members. I would be happy to issue the invitation to the chairs and committee members if that would be helpful. In addition to the 30 faculty members nominated by Fac Ex, we have received nominations from the deans (attached). It will be important to have a balanced work group that includes some members from both groups, is representative of faculty across the university, yet small enough to ensure manageable scheduling and full participation of committee members to meet the April 1 target above. Mary Lee would be an appropriate ex officio member of the work group.
Resources

We have compiled examples of post-tenure review policies at AAU institutions to share with you along with University Leadership Council reports on post-tenure review which the work group should find helpful. I know that you have also been collecting these policies, but only those that have scheduled periodic reviews in addition to annual evaluations are appropriate for consideration in light of the Regents’ expectations.