

NUMBER: 1414
TITLE: Policies and Procedures on Post-Tenure Review
APPROVED: April 12, 2001; Revised April 12, 2002

I. Board of Visitors Policy

The faculty and administrators of Old Dominion University are dedicated to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and service. It is the role of the department chair and the dean to conduct annual evaluations of tenured faculty members, to identify the area or areas in which a particular tenured faculty member has not met expectations, to explain the rationale for that assessment, and to facilitate faculty development as needed to improve faculty performance. To this end, the post-tenure review process is intended to be developmental rather than punitive.

A tenured faculty who receives an annual review from the chair and dean stating that he or she has a serious deficiency in teaching, research, and/or service should be aware that a second annual evaluation from the chair and dean which states that he or she has not met expectations in terms of overall performance in the three areas of responsibility could activate the post-tenure review process. It is the responsibility of the department chair to meet within 30 days with the faculty member who has received such an evaluation to present in writing and clarify through discussion the deficiencies identified in the evaluation. The chair and dean should also outline in writing the steps to be taken, the required outcomes, and the points in time at which progress will be assessed in order for the faculty member to correct identified deficiencies and thus meet expectations in subsequent annual reviews. The chair will also notify the faculty member in question that his or her subsequent annual evaluation will be issued no later than January 15 of the following year.

If the post-tenure review policy is activated, the faculty member must be notified in writing by the chair and dean. Post-tenure review cannot be activated unless the pattern of deficiency has been noted in two annual reviews. (See paragraph II.K. of the Policy and Procedures on Evaluation of Faculty.)

II. Confidentiality

The confidentiality of the post-tenure review process must be maintained. When the decision is made to place a faculty member under post-tenure review, discussion of the post-tenure review candidate and the process should be limited to the chair, the dean, the provost and vice president for academic affairs, the president, and the tenured faculty member placed under post-tenure review. With the approval of the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review, other individuals may be involved in various aspects of the strategic development plan for the purpose of mentoring the faculty member under review. Care should be taken, however, to involve in the plan only those individuals who agree to respect the essential confidentiality of the post-tenure review process.

III. Procedures

The chair must recommend initiation of the post-tenure review process no later than January 15, and the dean's recommendation must be made no later than February 8. The decision of the provost and vice president for academic affairs on whether to support the post-tenure review process for the faculty member must be made no later than March 1.

When the post-tenure review process has been activated, the chair and the dean will conduct an in-depth evaluation. In addition to examination of the teaching, research, and service record of the faculty member from previous evaluations, the chair and dean should evaluate the overall contribution of the faculty member to the university. Consideration and assessment of a faculty member's performance in post-tenure review must include all aspects of the faculty member's performance and cannot be limited to teaching. With respect to teaching, the total evaluation of teaching must include evaluation by student questionnaires and at least one other method. If requested by the faculty member, the chair, or the dean, one or more external evaluators may be brought into the process.

In addition to a thorough assessment of faculty performance, a major outcome of this process is a strategic development plan indicating the faculty member's expected long-range contributions to the university in specific terms. Where deficiencies or areas for possible improvement are noted, the strategic development plan should address ways of dealing with these problems, measures of expected outcomes, and a timetable for accomplishing these outcomes. The strategic development plan will be written by the faculty member under review in consultation with the chair and/or dean. The strategic development plan, including measures of expected outcomes, if appropriate, will be detailed in a signed agreement among the faculty member, the chair, and the dean by March 1. The full text of this agreement is submitted to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. The provost and vice president for academic affairs may approve, modify or reject the strategic development plan. The implementation of the strategic development plan is expected to take place by March 10.

If the dean and the chair are unable to solicit the cooperation of the faculty member in the development of the strategic plan, the dean and the chair will prepare a plan to which the faculty member will be expected to agree by March 1. In the event that the individuals involved (dean, chair, faculty member) are unable to reach an agreement on a strategic development plan by March 1, the dean will report to the provost and vice president for academic affairs that an agreement has not been found. In such an instance, if the dean and provost and vice president for academic affairs concur, a major sanction may be issued to the faculty member at this time. If the faculty member refuses to agree to or sign the strategic development plan and elects instead to grieve the post-tenure process, the faculty member must file a formal grievance by March 10 and follow the approved time line for grieving the post-tenure review process.

Annual evaluations in succeeding years will specifically address progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the agreement on the strategic development plan. A faculty member who fails to achieve the outcomes identified in the in-depth evaluation within the agreed-upon timetable may be subject to disciplinary actions up to and including a major sanction as described in the section of this Handbook entitled *AFaculty Sanctions*.@

IV. Appeals and Grievance

- A. Appeal of Post-Tenure Review: A faculty member who disagrees with the administrative decision to initiate a post-tenure review and develop a strategic plan with a timetable may file a grievance (see the section of this Handbook on AFaculty Grievance Policy, @ III.A.6.
1. To appeal the initial decision of the chair recommending post-tenure review, the faculty member must provide supporting documentation to rebut the evaluation to the dean by February 1.
 2. The dean reviews all available information, makes a decision and notifies the provost and vice president for academic affairs and the faculty member by February 8.
 3. If the faculty member objects to the dean=s decision, he or she may appeal to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. This appeal must be made by February 15.
 4. The provost and vice president for academic affairs must act on the faculty member=s appeal and approve or reject the strategic development plan by March 1.
- B. Grievance of Post-Tenure Review: If a faculty member is placed on post-tenure review, then he or she must combine and respond to in one grievance all issues related to the dispute over post-tenure review: the annual evaluation, the decision to place the faculty member on post-tenure review, the requirements of the strategic plan, and the imposition of a major sanction, if issued. Regardless of the provisions of the AFaculty Grievance Policy, @ III.A.6. and A. 7., the faculty member must file this grievance by March 10.

V. Annual Report on Post-Tenure Review

The provost and vice president for academic affairs will present an annual report to the deans and the Faculty Senate on the number of new and continuing post-tenure review cases and on their general outcome.