

# DRAFT

## Post-Tenure Review Policy Changes

### [Introduction](#)

### [Board Policy Revisions: Post-Tenure and Annual Review \(8.3\)](#)

[Summary of Changes](#)

[Summary of Elements Not Changed](#)

[New Policy Language](#)

### [Academic Affairs Handbook](#)

### [Implementation Process and Timeline](#)

### [Institutional Policy Requirements](#)

### [Frequently Asked Questions](#)

### Introduction

The University System of Georgia's (USG) post-tenure review (or PTR) policy was adopted in 1996 and has since included minimal changes. As our public system of higher education has evolved over the last 25 years, it is important that our policies are in alignment with the mission and the work of the USG. In fall 2020, then-Chancellor Wrigley convened a group of faculty, administrators, and Regents to review the post-tenure policies of the USG.

Work began in September 2020 to review the Board of Regents' policy on post-tenure review with the charge to support career development for all USG faculty and ensure accountability and continued strong performance from the system's tenured faculty members. Over the course of the next ten months, the working group, which included faculty representatives from around the USG, engaged in extensive work to review the existing USG post-tenure review policy and practice; the post-tenure review of other institutions and systems; and survey feedback regarding post-tenure review from over 900 participants. In June 2021 the final report from the working group was submitted and subsequently distributed to presidents and provosts in July 2021. The recommendations were presented to the Board of Regents (BOR) during their August 2021 meeting.

In September 2021, the policy language reflective of the working group's recommendations was presented as an information item during the BOR meeting. Throughout September and October, the University System Office (USO) received extensive feedback and comment from faculty concerning the proposals, including several campus resolutions. Feedback was also received from institution presidents and provosts, including a discussion about the proposed changes at the annual fall Presidents' retreat. To further these discussions and input, USG's Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, held virtual town-hall meetings with the full USG Faculty Council as well as with faculty on several campuses across the system. Those discussions and comments resulted in important revisions to the proposed policy changes in order to address concerns expressed by faculty and more clearly articulate its intention.

On October 13, 2021, the Board of Regents approved revisions to the post-tenure review policy as noted below. Following BOR approval, the USG Chief Academic Officer and other University System Office staff continued to meet with faculty to present the adopted policy changes and gather additional feedback. Now

begins the work of operationalizing the new policy at each tenure-granting institution within the University System of Georgia. To that end, this document can serve as a resource for campuses as they review and revise their campus policies related to post-tenure review and annual review.

DRAFT

## Board Policy Revisions: Post-Tenure and Annual Review (8.3)

### Summary of Changes

Change	Explanation
Addition of Student Success as a key element of faculty evaluation	Over the past decade, USG institutions have been actively engaged in initiatives and efforts to promote student success. These activities occur both inside and outside of the classroom and are grounded in best practices in quality teaching and learning, as well as in curriculum development, mentoring, and advising. The addition of student success is an acknowledgement of the work faculty are currently putting into these efforts. Note that some institutions may elect to create a new category of review for student success, while some may embed the review in the existing elements of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.
Expansion of the use of Annual Evaluations for Tenured Faculty	All USG institutions were already required to conduct annual reviews for all employees (See Policy 8.3.5.1). An unsatisfactory annual review for two consecutive years for tenured faculty will now require a Corrective Post-Tenure Review.
Addition of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review	A Corrective-Post Tenure Review is a Post-Tenure Review that is initiated early in the faculty member's typical post-tenure review timeline based on two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews.
Articulation of Actions Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review	Institutions may take action regarding faculty who have had two unsatisfactory annual reviews followed by an unsuccessful Corrective-Post Tenure Review in turn followed by an unsuccessful performance improvement plan. Remedial actions may include, but are not necessarily limited to, reassignment of duties, suspension of pay, salary reduction, demotion in rank, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment. If separation and/or revocation is the recommendation, it will follow clearly-defined due process mechanisms.
Annual Reporting on PTR to the Board of Regents	Annually, each institution must submit information regarding faculty review outcomes that allow annual reporting to be provided to the Board of Regents for each institution. The reporting guidelines, structure, and timelines will be disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer.
Delegation of Authority for awarding tenure	While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is not carrying out its faculty review process in a sufficiently rigorous manner the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure back to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated. Historically the Board of Regents held the authority to award tenure. This would represent a restoration of the authority it has previously delegated.

### Summary of Elements Not Changed

Due Process	The essential elements of due process remain in the new policy.
PTR – Faculty Led Process	The Post-tenure Review committee continues to be faculty-led.
Tenure	No elements of tenure procedures are changed.
Role of Faculty in the PTR process	The faculty-led PTR committee puts forward recommendations for PTR decisions.

Role of Administrators in the PTR process	With the recommendation from the Faculty PTR committee, administrators, up until the decision of the president, review and put forward recommendations for PTR decisions.
---	---

## New Policy Language

### **8.3.5.1 Faculty (Final Language)**

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Board of Regents’ policies, the Academic and Student Affairs Handbook and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The criteria shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service as is appropriate to the faculty member’s institution, school or college, and department, and responsibilities. The criteria shall be submitted to the USG Chief Academic Officer for review and approval.

Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness and student learning as the main focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member’s professional development across the scope of their responsibilities. In those cases, in which a faculty member’s primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration, and elements of student success) where the individual’s major responsibilities lie. While a faculty member’s performance evaluation may be deemed as “Not Meeting Expectations” for other reasons, they must be so assessed if a majority of their work responsibilities are assessed as “Not Meeting Expectations”.

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure with a focus on the criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions.

The result of the faculty member’s annual evaluations will be utilized as a part of subsequent pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews as well as retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.

### **8.3.5.4 Post Tenure Review (Final Language)**

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure.

Each tenured faculty member shall participate in a post-tenure review within five years following the award of tenure and again at least once every five years thereafter. 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.

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily choose to participate in a post-tenure review sooner than five years. If this voluntary review is successful, then the faculty member’s next scheduled post-tenure review will take place five years after this voluntary review. In addition, a tenured faculty member whose performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory or not meeting expectations – whether overall or in any particular area – in an annual review process will be provided with a remediation plan. If the faculty member’s performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory or not meeting expectations – overall or in a particular area – again the next year, the faculty member shall then undergo a corrective post-tenure review. That review will not alter the timing of the faculty member’s regularly scheduled five-year post-tenure review thereafter.

Each tenure-granting institution must create its own specific policies for implementing this post-tenure review policy. Each institution's policies shall be developed in consultation with the institution's faculty and shall include appropriate due-process mechanisms. Institutions will have flexibility in their implementation to create a process appropriate to the campus context. Prior to implementation, institutions must submit policies and evaluation criteria to the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) for approval. The Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) will provide institutions with more specific guidelines for their post-tenure review policies and procedures.

Consistent with those guidelines and institutional policies, post-tenure review shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service as is appropriate to the faculty member's institution, school or college, and department. The post-tenure review will also incorporate findings from the faculty member's annual reviews from the years since the last post-tenure review. The faculty member shall provide review materials and additional information, as provided for in the institution's guidelines, to aid the review process.

The post-tenure review will include, at a minimum, feedback from the faculty member's department chair and a committee of faculty colleagues. The results of the post-tenure review shall be conveyed to the faculty member. The results of the post-tenure review shall be considered in subsequent decisions on promotion, merit pay, and other rewards.

If the results of the post-tenure review are unfavorable, then a performance improvement plan shall be created by the applicable department chair and dean in consultation with the faculty member. The necessary elements of such performance improvement plans will be described in the guidelines provided by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) as well as in each institution's post-tenure review policies.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or refuses to engage reasonably in the process) as determined by the department chair and dean after considering feedback from the committee of faculty colleagues, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Remedial actions may include, but are not necessarily limited to, suspension of pay, salary reduction, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment. The institution must give the faculty member notice of the possibility of such remedial actions when the performance improvement plan begins. The determined remedial action will be imposed in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) as well as the institution's post-tenure review policies. The institution's imposition of such remedial action will not be governed by or subject to the Board Policy on Grounds for Removal or Procedures for Dismissal.

Each institution shall also develop and implement procedures to conduct post-tenure reviews with tenured faculty members who hold administrative positions. These procedures shall address the distinctive nature of administrators' work and leadership roles, include constituent feedback, and reflect that tenure is held in faculty positions not in administrative positions.

Each institution shall compile and submit an annual report on post-tenure review activity to the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s).

### **8.3.6 Criteria for Promotion (Final Language)**

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall establish clearly-stated promotion criteria and procedures that emphasize excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities for all teaching faculty, which shall be submitted to the USG Chief Academic Officer for review and approval.

#### **8.3.6.1 Minimum for All Institutions in All Professorial Ranks (Final Language)**

The minimum criteria are:

1. Excellent teaching and effectiveness in instruction;
2. Noteworthy involvement in student success activities;
3. Noteworthy professional service to the institution or the community;
4. Noteworthy research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement; and,
5. Continuous professional growth and development.

Noteworthy achievement in all of the above areas is not required, but should be demonstrated in at least three areas. A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the department concerned setting forth the reasons for promotion. The faculty member's length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be promoted.

#### **8.3.7.1 Faculty (Final Language)**

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution, with the exception of GGC, shall establish clearly-stated tenure criteria and procedures that emphasize excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities for all teaching faculty, conform to the requirements listed below, are approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer. The requirements listed below are the minimum standard for award of tenure, but shall be sufficiently flexible to permit an institution to make individual adjustments appropriate to its mission. While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is not carrying out its faculty review process in a sufficiently rigorous manner the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated.

#### **8.3.7.2 Tenure Requirements (Final Language)**

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured individual is to the extent of continued employment on a 100 percent workload basis for two out of every three consecutive academic terms until retirement, resignation, separation as remedial action related to post-tenure review, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency or program modification as determined by the Board of Regents.

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Normally, only faculty who are employed full-time, defined as service on a 100 percent workload basis for at least two out of three consecutive academic terms, by an institution are eligible for tenure. Faculty members holding these professorial ranks who are employed by a USG institution on less than a full-time basis and who are assigned by the USG institution to or hold an appointment at a non-USG corporate or governmental entity shall, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, be eligible for promotion and the award of tenure by the institution President.

The award of tenure is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments such as adjunct appointments. Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall not acquire tenure.

#### **8.3.7.3 Criteria for Tenure (Final Language)**

### **Minimum for All Institutions in All Professorial Ranks**

The minimum criteria for tenure are demonstrating:

1. Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and instruction;
2. Outstanding involvement in student success activities;
3. Academic achievement, as appropriate to the institution's mission;
4. Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community; and,
5. Professional growth and development.

Noteworthy achievement is required in at least two of the above categories, but is not required in all categories. A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the department concerned setting forth the reasons for tenure. The faculty member's length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be tenured, but neither the possession of a doctorate degree nor longevity of service is a guarantee of tenure.

### ***Research and Comprehensive Universities***

In addition to the minimum criteria above, tenure at the rank of associate or full professor requires the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline or its equivalent in training, ability, or experience

### ***State Universities***

In addition to the minimum criteria above, tenure requires the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline or its equivalent in training, ability, or experience.

### ***State Colleges***

In addition to the minimum criteria above, tenure requires a Master's Degree in the teaching discipline or, in rare cases, at least the equivalent of two years of full-time study beyond the bachelor's degree.

### **8.3.9 Discipline and Removal of Faculty Members (Final Language)**

The President of a University System of Georgia (USG) institution or his or her designee may at any time remove any faculty member or other employee of an institution for cause. Cause shall include willful or intentional violation of the Board of Regents' policies or the approved statutes or bylaws of an institution or as otherwise set forth in the Board of Regents' policies and the approved statutes or bylaws of an institution. Such removals for cause shall be governed by the following policies on Grounds for Removal and Procedures for Dismissal. Remedial actions taken as part of the post tenure review process shall not be governed by these policies on Grounds for Removal and Procedures for Dismissal, but rather shall be governed by the Board Policy on Post Tenure Review.

## Academic Affairs Handbook

The following represents the new language in the Academic Affairs Handbook that is reflective of the new policy language related to post-tenure review and annual evaluations. These modifications will require some renumbering of existing handbook sections.

### 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems

#### BOR Policies:

- 3.2.1 Faculty Membership
  - 3.2.1.1 Corps of Instruction
  - 3.2.1.2 Administrative Officers
- 8.3.5.1 Annual Evaluation
- 8.3.5.1 Pre-tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.7 Tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.6 Promotion Evaluation
- 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.8 Non-Tenure Track Personnel

The USG faculty evaluation system is comprised of annual evaluation, three-year pre-tenure evaluation, tenure evaluation, promotion evaluation and post-tenure evaluation. For faculty hired as a lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, or as an academic professional, the evaluation system is comprised of annual evaluations and promotion evaluation.

Each institution is responsible for establishing definitive policies, processes, and stated criteria for faculty evaluation that are aligned with the mission, statutes, and academic organization of the institution and are consistent with Regents' policies. These policies, processes, and stated criteria must incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom. Institutional performance criteria must be identified and defined at each level of evaluation and must be stated in writing and available in the institution's faculty handbook posted on an institution's website. All changes to performance criteria must be updated in the faculty handbook in a timely fashion. These updates must be done in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents (e.g. pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post tenure).

#### Policies, Processes, and Reporting

Each institution must have written and published faculty evaluation review policies, processes, and criteria for faculty that are consistent with Board of Regents policy and USG guidelines and approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution should develop templates for annual review, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure applications. These templates should provide clear guidance to what the faculty members need to submit. Tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and faculty outside of the tenure process should be evaluated based upon their academic discipline-specific criteria, and the institutional evaluation rubric, consistent with the system level review policies and guidelines detailed in this handbook. All USG annual faculty evaluations should utilize the following Likert scale:

- 1 - Not Successful / Not Satisfactory
- 2 - Partially Successful / Emerging
- 3 - Successful
- 4 - Superior
- 5 - Exemplary

Annually, each institution must submit information regarding faculty annual reviews and PTR review outcomes that allow annual reporting to be provided to the Board for each institution. The reporting guidelines, structure, and timelines will be disseminated by the USG Academic Chief Officer.



## Training

The USG will develop and deliver system-wide professional development trainings and resources for academic administrators who supervise faculty. Professional development training sessions and resources will be posted on MomentumU@USG, the USG virtual professional development platform. Each institution is responsible for ensuring that academic administrators are properly trained for all levels of evaluation as outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution must develop a robust annual professional development plan for academic administrators and faculty to ensure adherence to Board Policy procedures outlined in this handbook. In addition, the institution is responsible to provide professional development to faculty who serve on tenure and post tenure review committees.

## Auditing Institutional Plans and Processes

Periodically, the USG Division of Internal Audits will perform institutional audits of annual, pre-tenure, tenure, promotional and post tenure (PTR) policies and procedures, for compliance with Board of Regents policies. The institutional audit reports and identified issues will be shared with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, and the Board of Regents Committees on Internal Audit, Risk, and Compliance, and Academic Affairs.

While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is adjudged to be carrying out its faculty review process in an insufficiently rigorous manner the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated. (BOR 8.3.7.1 Faculty)

## Review Principles and Guidelines

Each institution should use the following Review Principles and Guidelines to develop their institution-specific evaluation systems. The institutional evaluation system must be approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer.

- Campuses will create clear and transparent assessment criteria and rubrics for faculty performance in each assessed campus category. Evaluation and assessment criteria must align to the mission and values of the institution.
- Criteria should be developed for each stage of a faculty member's career from untenured Assistant Professor, through various levels of promotion, to stages of tenured Full Professor. Analogous criteria should also be developed for faculty who serve outside the tenure structure. These criteria will provide sufficient guidance to assess whether a faculty member's performance is appropriate to their stage of professional career development at their institution, college/school, and in their department.
- The development of these criteria should reflect the involvement of the institution through its academic affairs organization, colleges, departments, faculties, and should be approved through the institution's faculty governance processes and procedures.
- Both qualitative and quantitative assessments are acceptable; however, all methods of evaluation should strive for objectivity and reduce subjectivity as much as possible.
- The measure of "Effectiveness in Academic Assigned Duties" should include assessments of both instructional quality and quality learning. Criteria should include measures such as an assessment of student perception, evidence of effective student learning, the use of continuous improvement methodologies, peer assessment of pedagogy, an evaluation of curricular design, quality of assessment and course construction, and the use of established learning science methodologies.
- Evaluation of the Student Success component will involve an assessment of the faculty member's involvement in activities inside and outside the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement for all learners, together with a growing awareness of, and involvement in, established strategies to improve student completion rates regardless of race, gender, age, or socioeconomic status. These aspects may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; and involvement in faculty development activities.

Examples include Centers for Teaching and Learning, Chancellor's Learning Scholars, Faculty Learning Communities and MomentumU@USG.

- Evaluation of Research and Scholarship will take place within the context and mission of their department at that institution, whether within the faculty member's discipline area, or as part of their scholarship of teaching and learning.
- The institution will adjudge the Professional Service component by considering activities that include Institutional Service – such as various forms of active engagement, committee work, faculty senate activities, and major institution and/or system initiatives; Service to the Discipline – discipline-related service in local, regional, national, and international organizations; and community involvement.

### Annual Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually by their appropriate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria listed in the BOR Policy 8.3.5.1 and BOR Policy 8.3.7.3. The annual evaluation will encompass teaching, undergraduate/graduate student success activities, research/scholarship/creative activity or academic achievement, professional service to the institution or community and continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, college or school and department. Institutions must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage.

- The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the annual evaluation. The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and his/her progression towards achieving future milestones.
- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the official personnel records.
- If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory/, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year. The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. This will become part of the official personnel records.

### Third Year Pre-Tenure Review (On Track Not Tenured)

Faculty who are employed on an annual tenure track contract will undergo a third-year pre-tenure review. This review may serve in lieu of the annual evaluation. The purpose of the third-year pre-tenure review is to provide a rigorous analysis and detailed feedback of the faculty member's body of work in the areas of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service towards tenure. The institution is responsible for clearly identifying the policies and procedures for third year pre-tenure reviews. This process should at least include a review from the department chair, peers, college/school wide tenure committee (if used) and the Dean. The previous annual evaluations must be part of the review. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion (BOR 8.3.5.1).

- The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the third-year pre-tenure review, as outline in the institutional guidelines.
- The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's third year pre-tenure review. A written report of the faculty member's progression towards achieving future milestones of tenure will be provided to the faculty member after the conference.

- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the third-year pre-tenure evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the third year written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the official records.
- If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member with feedback from any committee that participated in the third-year review. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of the academic unit. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

Renumber **Award of Tenure** as 4.5 (Keep Current Language)

Renumber **Award of Promotion** as 4.6 (Keep Current Language)

#### 4.7 Post-Tenure Review

##### **Post-Tenure Review**

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.

*Timeline:* All tenured faculty and tenured academic administrators who have rank and tenure with an academic unit must undergo post-tenure review five years after the award of tenure and subsequently every five years unless it is interrupted by a further review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership promotion (e.g. department chair, Dean, Associate Provost).

A tenured faculty member/academic administrator may voluntarily elect to go up for a post-tenure review before the five-year time limit. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the voluntary PTR post-tenure review date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year PTR review date remains in place.

*Areas of Evaluation:* The evaluation must address the faculty's accomplishments related to teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service. Annual reviews encompassing the previous five years for the 5-year span must be incorporated in the post-tenure review processes. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution, teaching, student success activities, scholarship/research, and service. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous 5-year period.

### *Outcomes & Consequences of Post Tenure Review*

The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the review results will be related to rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave etc.

In the event of a not successful/not satisfactory post-tenure review, the faculty member's appropriate supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the PTR committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee. The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be scheduled no less than quarterly. The institution should create appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal an unfavorable post-tenure review as outlined below.

The final assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year's annual review. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The institution will follow appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal the final assessment of their PIP and the resulting remedial actions as outlined below.

The appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of PTR. Each faculty member must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the PTR. In the event of an unsuccessful PTR the letter must also include next steps and due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document however no action is required by the appropriate supervisor.

### **Corrective Post Tenure Review**

A faculty member evaluated as deficient in any one of the areas of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and/or service for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The faculty member will follow the institution's guidelines and procedures for post tenure review. If the outcome of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review is successful, the faculty member will reset the post-tenure review clock. If the outcome of a corrective post tenure review is not successful/not satisfactory, the same process for an unsuccessful PTR will be followed. The institution should create appropriate due-process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal a corrective post-tenure review as outlined below.

### **Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or an Unsuccessful Corrective Post-Tenure Review**

If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the performance improvement plan, the department chair and dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has refused to engage reasonably in the process), the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. Upon request by the faculty member, the PTR committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and the proposed remedial action and make their recommendation.

The faculty member has 10 business days from receiving the recommendation of the dean/dept. chair to request the PTR committee review. Upon request to review the recommended action by the faculty member, further due process will include the following:

1. The PTR committee will review the recommendation of the department chair and dean. The PTR committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the hearing committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The PTR committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
2. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the PTR committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.
3. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision shall be made within 10 business days and should notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.
4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.
5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26).

### **Academic Administrators**

This section refers to academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at the institution aligned with an academic unit. Academic administrators will be reviewed on 5-year cycles for post tenure review. As part of the PTR academic administrator's portfolio a review of academic administrator one level below should be included (BOR Policy 8.3.5.3). Each institution should specify the process and procedures for a post-tenure review of academic administrators that best meets their organization and mission. The review of an academic administrator should reflect the expectations of their role and ability to engage in typical faculty activities.

#### *Timeline*

The PTR review is based on a 5-year calendar from the last promotion. It occurs every 5 years unless it is interrupted by a promotion.

#### *Areas of Evaluation*

Academic administrators with faculty rank are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution through teaching, student success, scholarship/research, and service. Institutions must define components and criteria for PTR for academic administrators in the absence of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and/or service requirements due to their roles and responsibilities as an administrator. Depending on the academic administrative roles and responsibilities, leadership in, engagement in and promotion of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service may be considered. Contributions should be dated from previous milestones such as tenure and promotion) and encompass the previous 5-year period.

#### *Outcomes & Consequences of Post Tenure Review for Academic Administrators*

The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition/ rewards. Academic administrators who are performing at a note-worthy level should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the review results will be related to rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave etc.

In the event of an unfavorable post-tenure review, the academic administrator's supervisor will work with the academic administrator to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The plan must be approved by the next higher administrative level and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs/Office of Human Resources. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be scheduled no

less than quarterly. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies within one year subjects the academic administrator to disciplinary actions up to and including tenure revocation.

The academic administrator will meet with the appropriate supervisor to review the findings of the PTR. The academic administrator must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the PTR. In the event of an unsuccessful PTR the letter must also include the consequences of the PTR, next steps, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not improve in the areas cited as not meeting expectations. The academic administrator can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document however no action is required by the appropriate supervisor.

#### *Corrective Post Tenure Review*

An academic administrator evaluated as deficient within one or more of the areas aligned to their roles and responsibilities, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The academic administrator will follow the institution's guidelines and procedures for post tenure review. The outcomes and consequences of a corrective post tenure review are the same as above.

#### **Elements of the Professional Remediation Plan (PRP) and the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)**

There are two different plans for addressing faculty performance: a **professional remediation plan** and a **performance improvement plan**. For faculty who do not meet annual performance expectations a *professional remediation plan* is put in place. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development, strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The second, a *professional improvement plan*, is developed subsequent to an unfavorable PTR or corrective PTR. The components of the PIP and the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and supports,
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

#### *Professional Remediation Plan (PRP)*

The Professional Remediation Plan is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources wherever the permanent faculty files are housed. Quarterly meetings must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each quarterly meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each quarterly meeting. Each institution should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

#### *Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)*

The Professional Improvement Plan is used to document deficiencies based on an unfavorable Post Tenure Review. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources wherever the permanent faculty files are housed. Quarterly meetings must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each quarterly meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member's progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from a committee of faculty colleagues. Each institution should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

DRAFT

## Implementation Process and Timeline

Institutions are approaching the process to make changes to their institutional policies in a variety of ways. In order to support the various processes, the USG will have one submission deadline for all revisions with two status updates in April and in September:

<b>Submission Deadlines</b>	<b>Dates</b>
Status Report on Changes to PTR and Annual Review Policies	April 1, 2022
Status Report on Changes to PTR and Annual Review Policies	September 1, 2022
Institutions submit updated PTR and Annual Review policies to USG Chief Academic Officer for approval	No later than October 17, 2022*
USO staff review institutional submissions and provide feedback	No later than November 18, 2022
Institutions take final PTR policies through the formal shared governance process	November and December 2022
<b><i>Institutional Policy Implementation</i></b>	
Annual Reviews	AY2022-2023
Post-Tenure Review	No later than AY 2023-2024*
<b><i>Reporting to the Board of Regents</i></b>	
Preliminary Report	August 2022
Annual Review	August 2023
PTR	August 2024
<b><i>Training and Development</i></b>	
Opportunities for institution collaboration/Q & A	January 2022
Department Chairs, Deans, Academic leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using the new annual evaluation process for development</li> <li>Recognizing and eliminating bias in the annual review process</li> </ul>	February and March 2022 January every year following
*We encourage institutions to send forward annual review and PTR plans as they are ready for USG review.	
Note: Faculty who go up for post-tenure review during the first two years of implementation should be given flexibility based on the adoption of new expectations.	



## Institutional Policy Requirements

Every institution must draft policies that are in alignment with BOR Policy and the Academic Affairs Handbook. Careful attention should be given in the development of the following aspects of annual review and post-tenure review:

- Successful PTR Rewards
- Due Process
- HR Likert Scale
- Student Success Elements
- Policy timelines
- Minimum Criteria
- Roles and responsibilities
- Academic Freedom

DRAFT

## Frequently Asked Questions

### HOW WERE THE CHANGES DEVELOPED?

A working group of University System of Georgia (USG) faculty, campus leaders, Regents and system administrators was appointed by then Chancellor Steve Wrigley with the charge of revising Board of Regents policies to support career development for all faculty and ensure accountability and continued strong performance from USG's tenured faculty members.

The group began work in September 2020 to review what was then existing post-tenure review (PTR) policy and practice, which had received no significant updates since first established in 1996. After much consultation and work, including feedback from system faculty and more than 900 survey responses, the group provided its final recommendations in June, its report was distributed in the first week of July to Presidents, Provosts and the USG Faculty Council and then the recommendations were presented publicly to the Board of Regents in August. The recommended changes sought to support career development for all faculty and ensure accountability and continued strong performance from USG's tenured faculty members.

Draft policy language reflecting the recommendations was presented to the Board at its September meeting. USG received substantial feedback and comments based on that language, both from emails and in several large faculty town halls. Those discussions helped the system adjust the original proposal to more clearly articulate its intention.

The Board approved the updated language at its October meeting.

### WHAT ARE THE CHANGES TO FACULTY REVIEW?

The Board is enacting system-level guidelines and standards for all faculty reviews. This is happening along with an ongoing process of training and institutional review to ensure institutional assessment practices remain appropriately rigorous and aligned with system standards. These system-level standards introduce a new element of **student success** in addition to the existing expectations for teaching, research and service at all levels of faculty assessment.

### WHAT IS THE STUDENT SUCCESS ELEMENT?

Student success remains a top priority for the university system, and this process intends to strengthen that commitment among faculty throughout their career. Students enrolled at our institutions learn from some of the best faculty and researchers in the nation. The addition of **student success** recognizes ways in which faculty already deepen student learning and engagement through activities both inside and outside the classroom.

Each campus will develop its own methodology for evaluation of the student success component, and is expected to include encompassing activities such as effective advising and mentoring, undergraduate and graduate research and other forms of experiential learning, the development of student success tools and curricular materials, strategies to improve student career success and involvement in faculty development activities.

### WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?

With the changes now approved, USG moves into an implementation phase with each institution.

Critical to this is continuing to engage with faculty and campus leadership as they develop and refine standards that meet the unique needs on every campus for tenure, promotion, annual review and post-tenure review. **These new standards must be consistent with all Board policy, and so must build in appropriate due-process mechanisms as well as the promotion of academic freedom.**

While the policy as a whole ensures consistency, equity and accountability across the system, it remains a framework around which faculty and campus leadership build a post-tenure review process that works best for their individual institution. That work will span the remainder of this academic year and will engage each institution at all levels of faculty governance and the academic affairs organization.

#### WHAT IF I AM APPLYING FOR TENURE OR PROMOTION NOW?

If you are currently applying for tenure or promotion, then your application will be unaffected by these changes. Your application will continue to follow the current campus procedures and will be subject to the existing criteria.

#### WHAT IF I WILL BE APPLYING FOR TENURE OR PROMOTION SOON?

Each campus will be asked to create an implementation plan that explains how they intend to phase in the new review criteria that include student success.

If you are currently in your tenure probationary period, or have recently received tenure then your campus will make clear whether your eventual application for tenure or promotion will be considered under the existing standards or using those that will be developed this year.

#### WHAT ARE THE CHANGES TO POST TENURE REVIEW?

Each tenured faculty member will continue to participate in a PTR at least every five years. Post-tenure review will continue to be a process led by a committee of faculty colleagues, with built-in due-process mechanisms throughout. Each campus will be responsible for developing their policies and procedures to enact PTR after approval through the institution's faculty governance processes and procedures.

Tenured administrators will once again be subject to post-tenure review.

A faculty member must go through a **Corrective PTR** if they are evaluated as performing unsatisfactorily in any area for two consecutive annual reviews. An unfavorable PTR or Corrective PTR will result in a **Performance Improvement Plan** which must be satisfactorily completed within one year to avoid corresponding disciplinary action.

#### CAN INSTITUTIONS INCLUDE APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS? FOR THE PERFORMANCE REMEDIATION PLAN (PRP)? FOR THE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)?

Ordinarily, annual evaluations will not include the right to appeal; rather, all annual evaluations provide for the opportunity for an individual to include a response/rebuttal. The PRP is similar to the annual review in that sense. A faculty member may appeal the outcome of the PIP to the PTR committee as outlined in the new due process portion of the handbook. A campus may choose to include appeals for the annual evaluation and the PRP based on factual inaccuracies; however, any appeal process should be expedient so as not to disadvantage the faculty member in their time to make progress towards improvement. Any appeal for annual evaluation or PRP will reside at the institution and will not be subject to discretionary review at the Board of Regents.

#### ARE INSTITUTIONS EXPECTED TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR MERIT INCREASES CONNECTED WITH POSITIVE POST-TENURE REVIEWS, OR WILL ANY SYSTEM FUNDING BE PROVIDED?

Yes – institutions will need to provide. Merit increases are not expected to be the reward for a positive post-tenure review – if an institution can afford it, merit increases are possible but not expected. The institution will need to determine what is possible and appropriate. One-time incentives may be more appropriate for many institutions. Non-monetary incentives, such as a course release or preference in summer scheduling may be included as well.

## CAN AN INSTITUTION CREATE DUE PROCESS PROCEDURES BEYOND THOSE OUTLINED IN THE DUE PROCESS SECTION?

For the final action of a PTR or Corrective PTR, all institutions must follow the due process procedures outlined in the handbook.

## WHAT IF A FACULTY MEMBER AND APPROPRIATE SUPERVISOR CANNOT AGREE ON THE ANNUAL REVIEW OR PERFORMANCE REMEDIATION PLAN EVALUATION?

It is not required that the faculty member and appropriate supervisor agree on the assessment in the annual evaluation or the PRP. In fact, in an unsuccessful annual evaluation or PRP, it is likely the faculty member and supervisor may not agree. Resources such as mediation, ombudsperson, and faculty affairs may assist in moving the process forward but agreement is not required.

DRAFT