

## **Principles for Post-Tenure Review**

Drafted by the Faculty Senate (FS) and approved by at the FS meeting of [January 19, 2011](#)

First, that post-tenure review shall be a process distinct from annual evaluation. To fairly represent the body of a faculty member's work, formal post-tenure review should occur every third year, with more frequent evaluation occurring only if required by accreditation, RUSO policy, or at the request of the faculty member.

Second, that post-tenure review shall encompass the faculty member's entire body of work for the previous three years (i.e. not simply the most recent year).

Third, that in any formal post-tenure review there is a presumption of proficiency on the part of the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the evaluator(s) to determine sufficient deficiency to lead to and justify an unsatisfactory rating.

Fourth, that an unsatisfactory rating results only in cases in which it is determined there is a sufficient deficiency in at least two of three areas (teaching, scholarship and service). This preserves the parallelism with the Guidelines for Achieving Tenure, which requires noteworthy achievement in two areas (APPM 4.6.5).

Fifth, that the criteria for post-tenure review be developed by the faculty within a given discipline, in a manner consistent with the discipline's standards, the mission of the University, and levels of institutional support.

Sixth, that the faculty within a given field be given the primary responsibility for the review.

Seventh, any post-tenure review process must include specifics about an appeal process for the review itself (as well as the consequences of the review).

Eighth, in the case of a favorable rating by the post-tenure review committee (evaluators), the rating decision will stand and the review will proceed no further up the administrative chain of command.

Ninth, any post-tenure review policy must be clearly publicized and communicated to faculty before the policy is implemented.

Tenth, consistent with Southeastern's stated policies on faculty evaluation (APPM 4.4) post-tenure review must be primarily directed toward faculty development and improvement rather than used as a punitive measure. Toward that end, any review that determines faculty deficiencies must also include a clear explanation of what needs to be done to remedy these deficiencies.

Eleventh, post-tenure review policies must be subject to periodic review and recommendations by the relevant faculty (i.e. those that are subject to the policy) and/or the Faculty Senate.