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1. **Preamble:** In recognition that an outstanding faculty is essential to the accomplishment of its teaching, scholarship, and service mission, and in accordance with Kansas Board of Regents policy, the University of Kansas has adopted this post-tenure review policy.

   Post-tenure review provides an opportunity to assess the long-term trajectory of a faculty member’s career, including both past accomplishments and future directions. It is a formative and developmental review that facilitates and encourages professional vitality through collaborative discourse between the faculty member and the unit concerning his or her role in the unit, the college or school, and the university, as well as in the discipline or field. Post-tenure review promotes faculty development and achievement by recognizing and rewarding contributions and accomplishments, identifying the support needed to facilitate faculty success, and addressing areas of performance that need improvement. In some cases, post-tenure review may indicate the need for corrective action if the faculty member has failed to satisfy the unit’s stated criteria.

2. **Post-tenure Review:** Post-tenure review provides a summative assessment of a faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, service, and/or professional performance for a seven-year review period, viewed in the context of the faculty member’s overall career.

   a. **Requirement of Review:** Each faculty member with tenure shall undergo post-tenure review once every seven years. Any year that would be excluded from time in rank pursuant to university or Regents policy shall not be included in determining this period. Evaluation for promotion or the appointment to a distinguished professorship will substitute for post-tenure review and restart the seven-year period. This requirement does not apply to faculty members with an administrative appointment at .75 or greater FTE, or to faculty members on phased retirement or whose retirement date has been approved by the university. At the start of each spring semester, the provost and executive vice chancellor (provost) shall notify faculty members who will undergo review in the coming academic year.

   b. **Criteria and Procedures for Review:** Except as otherwise provided in this policy, each unit that conducts an initial or intermediate review for purposes of promotion and/or tenure shall conduct post-tenure review in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by a vote of the faculty pursuant to the unit’s by laws and approved by the dean and provost. Copies of the unit’s approved criteria and procedures for post-tenure review shall be provided to faculty members in the unit and posted in the university’s policy library.

   c. **Relation to Annual Evaluation:** Post-tenure review is a summative periodic review of a faculty member’s performance conducted in addition to annual evaluation. However, in
any year when post-tenure review is conducted, that review may take the place of the annual evaluation.

3. Criteria: Each unit responsible for conducting post-tenure review shall adopt criteria that state the expectations of the unit for tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and/or professional performance (as appropriate to the unit and position). The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (the college) and schools with multiple departments may adopt criteria expressing expectations for all units within the college or school, to which departmental criteria must conform. In developing such criteria, units may draw on statements used in their current faculty review procedures.

a. General Requirements: A unit’s criteria shall reflect the responsibilities of faculty as stated in the Code of Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, describing expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, and/or professional performance in light of disciplinary practices and the overall mission of the unit as part of an international research university. Criteria shall be consistent with the summative character of post-tenure evaluation and establish expectations that encourage continuing faculty development, including promotion from associate to full professor. The criteria shall provide for the assessment of whether a faculty member’s performance in each area (1) meets expectations; (2) exceeds expectations; or (3) fails to meet expectations.

b. Flexibility: Criteria should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities and interests and the variation in a faculty member’s activities over time. Criteria should recognize that innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail. The application of the unit’s criteria must account for an individual faculty member’s job description and, when applicable, differential allocation of effort.

4. Procedures for Initial Review: Each unit responsible for conducting the post-tenure review shall adopt post-tenure review procedures for the evaluation of a faculty member’s performance in light of the unit’s criteria. In the college and schools with multiple departments or programs, however, smaller units may elect to have the college or school conduct the initial review. The college or schools with multiple departments may develop general procedures for all units to follow. While the procedures adopted by the unit may reflect the distinctive circumstances and practices of the unit, each unit’s procedures shall include the following elements:

a. Preparation of a dossier: Procedures for the initial review shall provide for the preparation of a dossier that includes a current curriculum vitae, annual evaluations covering the period under review, and other evidence of the faculty member’s relevant accomplishments and contributions during the review period. Although the post-tenure review covers the same time period as prior annual reports and references the same documents and information, annual reports should not be included in the dossier. The faculty member shall provide a brief narrative statement outlining goals for professional development and describing past accomplishments and future objectives specific to those goals, and may submit appropriate letters or other evidence of accomplishment. Multiple sources of information, including student evaluations, must be used to evaluate teaching, including, where appropriate, supervision of graduate students and advising activities.
b. **Post-tenure Review Committee**: A unit’s procedures shall provide for the formation of a committee of tenured faculty to conduct the review. The committee may function as an initial review committee if it conducts the initial review on the basis of the dossier, or as an intermediate review committee if it is a college or school committee reviewing the initial review conducted by a department or program. The unit may elect to conduct post-tenure reviews using the same committee that conducts other faculty evaluations, such as annual evaluations or consideration for promotion and tenure. The unit’s procedures shall specify the composition and selection of the committee and any additional qualifications for serving on the committee. Procedures shall also include a means of addressing conflicts of interest. No individual scheduled for post-tenure review in a given academic year or whose spouse or partner is scheduled for post tenure review shall serve as a member of a post-tenure review committee at any level during that year.

c. **Evaluation by the Committee**: The post-tenure review committee shall provide a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in light of the applicable unit criteria and university standards. The evaluation shall be a summative review that considers the trajectory of the faculty member’s performance during the review period in light of his or her overall career. While annual evaluations during the review period should be consulted for relevant information, the review is conducted separately from the annual evaluations and may not simply aggregate their results. The review shall include a narrative description of the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, service and/or professional performance (as appropriate to the unit and position), the committee’s ratings in each category, as well as an overall evaluation and rating, and recommended outcomes (as described in paragraph 5, below). A unit’s procedures may include an opportunity for a faculty member to meet with the committee for a collegial and collaborative discussion of the faculty member’s career, in terms of both the faculty member’s accomplishments during the review period and future plans and career development. A committee conducting intermediate review may accept the initial review or prepare its own evaluation of the faculty member’s performance.

d. **Consideration by the Chair/Director or Dean**: The initial review committee shall forward its final evaluation to the chair of the department or program director, or in the cases in which the college or schools conduct the initial review, the dean. The committee shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member, who may file a written response with the chair/director or dean. The chair/director or dean shall indicate his or her agreement or disagreement with the determinations of the committee. In the event the chair/director or dean disagrees with the committee’s determinations, he or she shall explain the reasons for the disagreement in writing and provide a copy to the faculty member and the committee.

e. **Consideration by College or School**: If the department or program conducting initial review is part of the college or a school that conducts intermediate review, the chair/director shall forward the review (along with his or her agreement or disagreement) to the post-tenure review committee of the college or school conducting intermediate
review. The intermediate review committee shall evaluate the dossier in accordance with the approved procedures.

f. **Response to Negative Evaluation:** If the initial or intermediate review includes a rating of “fails to meet expectations” in any category, or if the chair/director or dean disagrees that the faculty member has met expectations in any category, the faculty member may submit a written response for inclusion in the dossier. In any such case, the faculty member may request that outside letters evaluating his or her scholarship be solicited in a manner that provides adequate assurances that reviewers are qualified and unbiased.

g. **Consideration by the Provost:** The dean of the college or school shall forward the review to the provost. If a review was conducted at both the departmental and the college or School level, the Dean shall forward both reviews. The provost may accept the review or determine that review by a university level post-tenure review committee is required. Any such review shall be conducted using the criteria and ratings adopted by the unit, in accordance with procedures adopted by the provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate. These procedures shall protect the procedural rights of faculty members as outlined in this policy, including the opportunity to submit additional information, receive a written copy of the evaluation, and respond to a negative review.

5. **Recommendations:** Based on its evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, service, and/or professional performance, the committee shall make recommendations to administrators concerning outcomes. These recommendations are not binding and the responsibility for determining appropriate steps remains with the responsible administrator in consultation with the affected faculty member. Possible recommendations include, but are not limited to the following:

   a. **Recognition of Achievement:** When a faculty member’s performance in one or more areas has exceeded expectations, the post-tenure review committee may recommend steps to recognize the faculty member’s accomplishments. Such recommendations may include nomination for promotion and/or a distinguished professorship (when one becomes available), nomination for awards or grants, and other forms of recognition appropriate to the circumstances.

   b. **Career Development:** The post-tenure review committee may identify support that would leverage a faculty member’s development and promote excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, and/or professional performance. Such recommendations may include faculty development opportunities (such as intra-university professorships or additional training), differential allocation of effort to concentrate on areas of strength, and other forms of support that will facilitate a faculty member’s career objectives.

   c. **Improvement of Performance:** The post-tenure review committee may recommend steps to address aspects of a faculty member’s performance that require improvement. Such recommendations may include a performance improvement plan with timeline, access to a center for improvement of instruction or scholarly effort, or differential allocation of effort or reallocation of department assignments to concentrate on areas of
strength. Such steps should follow procedures consistent with the university’s Faculty Evaluation and Differential Allocation of Effort policies.

d. **Recommendation for Dismissal:** If the review reflects a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the committee may recommend that the dean and provost take steps to dismiss the faculty member in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Policy and the procedures for removal of tenured faculty.

6. **Relation to Other Policies:** The post-tenure review policy shall be interpreted and applied consistently with other university policies.

   a. **Academic freedom and tenure:** Post-tenure review does not affect tenure rights or academic freedom, and must be conducted in conformity with those principles.

   b. **Faculty rights and responsibilities:** Nothing in this policy alters the rights or responsibilities of faculty members or the policies and procedures governing the imposition of sanctions, including dismissal, on faculty members.

   c. **Confidentiality:** Post-tenure review is a confidential personnel matter and those responsible for conducting review shall take appropriate steps to protect the confidentiality of the dossier and evaluation.