Northern Kentucky University has two major procedures in place for the thorough review of faculty productivity both before and after the granting of tenure. All tenure-track faculty members, both tenured and untenured, undergo a comprehensive annual performance review conducted by each individual’s department chairperson. That performance review includes an evaluation of the contributions of each faculty member in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activity, and institutional and public service. This review forms a basis for the individual’s performance goals and recommended salary for the following year. The annual performance review is an important means by which faculty members at Northern Kentucky University are held accountable for their efforts in fulfilling the missions of the University, the goals of their department, and their professional responsibilities.

The process of granting tenure includes additional careful annual reviews of untenured faculty. This culminates in an evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as documented in a portfolio covering a period of up to six years. This tenure process includes evaluation of the faculty member’s productivity by a series of evaluators including a departmental committee of tenured faculty, the department chairperson, the dean, and the University Provost, with final approval by the Board of Regents. Each faculty member who is granted tenure should in turn understand that with tenure comes a profound professional responsibility: the obligation to devote one’s energies to fulfill the teaching, research, and service missions of the academy. The long-term best interest of the University must be foremost in the minds of its tenured faculty.

Post-tenure review at Northern Kentucky University is a natural extension of our system of annual assessment of faculty productivity. This policy for implementing post-tenure review is modeled after the policy used by the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Kentucky, but it is tailored to correspond to the mission statement and unique circumstances of this University.

It is the intention of this policy that post-tenure review should function in concert with, and as a possible consequence of, the current system of evaluation of faculty performance. Structured properly, post-tenure review can
take place without undermining the concept and practice of tenure, without stifling faculty creativity, and without leading to increased bureaucracy.

B. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

The goal of this system of post-tenure review is to provide appropriate intervention, useful feedback, timely and affirmative assistance, and effective evaluation for tenured faculty members to ensure that they continue to experience professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of their careers.

This system and its implementation must be compatible with the concepts of academic freedom and tenure which are essential to the University and its mission. The intention of post-tenure review is not to abridge our long standing tradition and practice of academic freedom as stated in Part Two, Section III. of this Handbook, but rather to strengthen the responsibility of faculty to effectively perform their job duties. There is a presumption of competence on the part of each tenured faculty member as established by the rigorous process through which tenure is granted. Post-tenure review must conform to fair and reasonable expectations as recognized by faculty peers in each department or program. The process is to be conducted in a manner free of arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory elements.

This post-tenure review system focuses on those tenured faculty who are judged by the department chairperson or program director to fall repeatedly below the standard for adequate performance established by the statement of expectations for that unit. It is thus intended for selected faculty and not as a new requirement for all tenured faculty members. The system is thus a supplement to, but not a replacement for, the annual performance review process.

Post-tenure review, as embodied in this policy, involves issues of faculty performance only. It does not directly address matters of professional misconduct. Standards of conduct and the obligations and responsibilities of faculty to students, colleagues, the University, and the community are stated in various University policies, many of which are included in Part Two of this Handbook. It is those specific policies that provide the procedures for resolving allegations of misconduct and the sanctions for violations.
C. DEFINITIONS

1. "Post-tenure review" is an extension of the performance review system in which a committee of peers (the P-TR committee, defined below) reviews and evaluates the performance of a selected faculty member and, when appropriate, creates a professional development plan in consultation with the faculty member and his or her department chairperson. When such a plan is established, the committee will monitor its implementation and ultimately make a determination as to whether the objectives of the plan have been met.

2. A "post-tenure review" (hereinafter, P-TR) committee consists of three tenured faculty members, chosen as set forth below, who are charged with carrying out the responsibilities of the P-TR committee specified in this policy.

D. INITIATION OF THE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

1. Each department or program will develop a narrative statement of expectations for adequate performance by tenured faculty that will form the basis for annual performance reviews and for post-tenure review. Such statements will be consistent with the criteria for performance review specified in Part One, Section IX.B. of this Handbook and will be as specific as possible without unduly restricting the diverse contributions of individual faculty. Each statement, and revisions thereof, must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track faculty in the department and will be reviewed by the dean and the Provost to assure it is consistent with college and University expectations for faculty performance and with the established missions of the college and the University.

2. Post-tenure review will be triggered by the second annual performance evaluation of a tenured faculty member, by his or her chairperson, that judges the faculty member's overall performance to be unsatisfactory. These unsatisfactory evaluations must be for two consecutive years, exclusive of leaves and exclusive of years with greater than 50% administrative reassigned time. Reassigned time for research or faculty development would not exclude faculty members from the process.
3. If the faculty member decides to pursue appeal of his or her most recent performance evaluation as outlined in Part One, Section IX.D. of this Handbook, the remainder of this procedure will be delayed until the appeal process has been completed.

E. CREATION OF A POST-TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. At the beginning of every academic year the tenured faculty in each department will elect a P-TR committee consisting of three members and one alternate member. Members and alternates must be tenured faculty, excluding the department chair, who belong to the department and who are willing and able to carry out the responsibilities of the P-TR committee specified in this policy.

2. If the department has fewer than four tenured faculty members who meet these requirements, then tenured faculty from the college to which the department belongs may be elected to fill out P-TR committee membership. Such members or alternates must also be willing and able to carry out the responsibilities of the P-TR committee. In choosing such members or alternates, consideration shall be given to teaching faculty in related departments.

3. The members of the P-TR committee will meet as soon as is practical to elect a chair. Should the P-TR process be initiated within the department, the chair will convene the P-TR committee to begin the review process. If one of the members of the committee is the faculty member to be reviewed, the alternate will serve on the committee in place of that faculty member.

4. A college may choose to establish a college-wide P-TR committee to replace the departmental committees previously specified if such action is approved by a majority of the tenured faculty in each department that belongs to the college.

   a. At the beginning of every academic year the tenured faculty in each department of the college(s) choosing this option will elect one member and one alternate to serve on the college-wide P-TR committee. These departmental representatives must be tenured faculty, excluding the department chair, who belong to the department and who are willing and able to carry out the responsibilities of the P-TR committee specified
in this policy. If a department has fewer than two tenured faculty members who meet these requirements, then tenured faculty from the college who are willing and able to carry out the responsibilities of the P-TR committee may be elected to represent the department.

b. The members of the college-wide P-TR committee will meet as soon as is practical to elect a chair. Should the P-TR process be initiated within the college, the chair will convene the P-TR committee to begin the review process. If the member from a particular department is the faculty member to be reviewed, the alternate for that department will serve on the committee in place of the faculty member. The college-wide committee will then elect a subcommittee of three members to carry out the responsibilities of the P-TR committee with respect to the case before it.

5. Once a P-TR committee begins consideration of a particular case, it is expected that members will serve on that case until it is resolved.

F. THE REVIEW PROCESS

1. The department chairperson will send a letter to the faculty member and to the chair of the appropriate P-TR committee. This letter must be delivered within one week (5 working days) of the completion of the individual's performance review but no later than April 1. The letter will state that the faculty member has received a second annual evaluation of unsatisfactory overall performance and direct the P-TR committee chair to begin the post-tenure review process.

2. The department chairperson will provide the P-TR committee with the respondent's annual performance review materials from the two most recent reviews, including the chairperson's own evaluation letters. The respondent will have two weeks (10 working days) from the receipt of the chairperson's initiating letter to submit additional materials to the P-TR committee. The P-TR committee will normally have three weeks (15 working days) to review the materials. These periods may be extended in special circumstances (spring break, need to gather substantial supporting documents from abroad, etc.). However, the review should normally be completed by the end of the spring semester.

The P-TR committee will make judgments based on the department's written statement of expectations for adequate performance. However teaching effectiveness may not be excluded from consideration.
reaching its decision, the P-TR committee will notify the chairperson and the respondent in writing of its decision that either:

a. the respondent has, during the past two years, met the reasonable expectations for faculty performance as identified by the department; in this case, the post-tenure review process ends. Any new post-tenure review action by the department chairperson or the P-TR committee would need to be based on a non-overlapping two-year period.

b. the committee finds minor performance deficiencies and will meet with the respondent to discuss these difficulties and offer advice or assistance. Again, any future action would need to be based on a non-overlapping two-year period.

b. the committee finds major performance deficiencies based on the department's statement of expectations for satisfactory performance and will meet with the respondent and the department chairperson to create a professional development plan to assist the faculty member in achieving the standards for satisfactory performance.

3. In the case of (c) above, the P-TR committee will notify the college dean of its intention to create a development plan. The committee will then meet with the faculty member and the chairperson to formulate this plan.

The plan must identify specific deficiencies, define specific goals, outline activities to be undertaken to achieve the goals, set time lines for achieving these goals, indicate criteria and standards for annual progress reviews during the review period, and identify sources of funding necessary for the successful completion of the plan. This plan will be set forth in writing, with copies provided to the faculty member and department chairperson.

The P-TR committee will consult regularly with the faculty member during the implementation period, which will be determined by the committee but will normally be no more than two years. The development plan shall be flexible and may need adjustment during the implementation period.
Plan development will normally be completed by October 15. Plan implementation will begin no later than January 1 of the following calendar year.

4. In the event that the faculty member disagrees with the development plan established by the P-TR committee, he or she may appeal to the peer review committees using the procedures set forth in Section XV., Grievances, of this Handbook. In order to exercise this right, the appellant must make his or her written request to the Provost, with a copy to the P-TR committee, within ten (10) University working days of receipt of the plan from the committee. The appellant must follow all procedures set forth in Section XV. The appellant may withdraw such appeal at any time by request in writing; in such event, no further action may be taken concerning the appeal.

5. During the implementation period, the faculty member will continue to undergo regular annual performance evaluation by the department chairperson, who will apprise the P-TR committee of his or her assessment of the individual's progress. The faculty member's progress in achieving the goals of the plan may be used in her or his annual performance statement.

6. At the end of the implementation period, the faculty member will prepare and submit a written report documenting his or her progress in completing the development plan.

The P-TR committee will then meet formally to determine whether the faculty member has satisfactorily completed the development plan. The decision of the committee will be in writing, with the reason(s) for its decision clearly stated. The committee's decision and justification will be delivered to the faculty member, who will have up to two weeks (10 working days) to prepare and submit a written response to the committee if he or she chooses to do so. The committee will then deliver copies of the decision, justification, and the faculty member's response (if submitted) to the department chairperson and college dean.

If the P-TR committee determines that the faculty member has successfully completed the development plan, the post-tenure review process ends. Any new post-tenure review action by the department chairperson or the P-TR
committee would need to be based on a non-overlapping two-year period.

If the P-TR committee determines that the plan has not been satisfactorily carried out, the University normally will pursue termination for cause as set forth in Section XI.J. of this Handbook.

G. PROCESS REVIEW

Upon completion of every post-tenure review process, a brief written commentary on the process will be submitted to the President of the Faculty Senate by (a) the individual being reviewed, (b) the P-TR committee for that case, and (c) the department chairperson. These comments shall address the policy itself and shall discuss how the policy did and did not work. The statements will be kept confidential by the Faculty Senate President for review by the Professional Concerns Committee.