

Augusta University

Policy Library

Post Tenure Review Policy

Policy Manager: Office of Faculty Affairs

POLICY STATEMENT

Augusta University seeks to secure and maintain a faculty of the highest quality. This goal requires that Augusta University provide periodic assessment of faculty performance that is useful for faculty review and development. The purposes of the post-tenure review process are to 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. Furthermore, the post-tenure review process assists faculty members with identifying opportunities for professional development 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.

Criteria

- a. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution through meeting expectations for their scholarship, teaching, service, professional development and student success activities, and clinical practice across those areas of effort, as appropriate.
- b. For the purposes of the AU Faculty Evaluation System, student success activities (SSA) is a comprehensive term for those faculty activities whose purpose is to 1) enhance student learning and engagement for the learner through continuous improvement of the learning environment, and/or 2) position the learner to be successful in achieving their short-term and long-term academic, career, and personal growth goals. Faculty support student success through in and out of class efforts. Involvement in SSA is either included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in the workload categories of teaching, research / scholarship / creative work, service, and administration, as applicable, or reported in its own effort category. The inclusion of SSA is appropriate for learners at all levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees). [NOTE: Definitions for the workload categories are found in the [Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload](#)]. The standalone student success activities metrics is referenced in AU ASA Guidance 2022.04.18.
- c. Student Evaluations are required for all faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching. For faculty whose primary responsibility is not teaching, the evaluation will focus on excellence in those area where the individual's major responsibilities lie.
- d. All tenured faculty members will be reviewed unless they possess an administrative appointment consisting of .5 FTE's or higher tenured faculty members will be reviewed regardless of administrative appointment.
- e. All evaluations will appropriately reflect the assigned workload and effort assignments.

Office of Legal Affairs Use Only

Executive Sponsor: Executive VP for Faculty Affairs and Provost

Next Review: 3/2028

AFFECTED STAKEHOLDERS

Indicate all entities and persons within the Enterprise that are affected by this policy:

- Alumni Faculty Graduate Students Health Professional Students
 Staff Undergraduate Students Vendors/Contractors Visitors
 Other:

DEFINITIONS

Intentionally left blank.

PROCESS & PROCEDURES

- a. All academic units are required to conduct a periodic, regularly scheduled, post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty to provide ongoing assessment of all categories for which the individual faculty member has ongoing work effort assigned. Each academic unit shall establish written criteria and procedures governing these periodic reviews to ensure transparency in the review process and that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the review in a consistent manner, in accordance with the following process.
- b. The review process for an individual shall be conducted five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. It shall be completed no later than the end of the 5th academic year. If an individual is on leave at the time of review, he/she will be reviewed during the first academic year after his/her return. Faculty may volunteer to undergo the review process prior to the five-year timeline.
 - i. Faculty will have the opportunity to pause the post-tenure review timeline for up to two years at the discretion of the President due to the following circumstances:
 1. the faculty member was on approved extended leave during the five- year period (e.g. birth or adoption of a child, or disability, professional development leave, or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member); therefore, the clock is paused and not reset;
 2. the faculty member is currently on leave at the planned time of review, in which case the post-tenure review may occur when the faculty member returns from leave; therefore, the clock is paused and not reset;
 3. the faculty member was promoted to a higher academic rank (i.e., Professor), which resets the five-year clock;
 4. the faculty member was promoted to an academic leadership position (e.g., Department Head, Dean, Associate Provost), which resets the five- year clock;
 5. in the case of interruption due to circumstances outside of faculty control (e.g. pandemic, natural disaster, etc.) the clock is paused and not reset.

- ii. Faculty members may elect early, voluntary post-tenure review, in which case the review will occur sooner than five years; the clock will reset if the early, voluntary post-tenure review is successful.

- c. As academic units develop a rating scale and rubric for rank and tenure status, each of the faculty workload areas should be addressed as they pertain to the unit. Each area to be reviewed should include, as appropriate, information related to the student success as previously identified. In addition, the expectations associated with each category (teaching, research, service, clinical practice, and administration) should be appropriately scaled to reflect differences in assigned workload allocation. See Faculty Affairs: Faculty Effort Definitions for specific guidance.
- d. Augusta University is committed to ensuring that community engagement is recognized and rewarded within the institution's tenure, promotion, pre/post tenure, and annual evaluation processes. To that end, community engagement activities shall be recognized as appropriate to each of the following evaluation categories: Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Professional Development and Student Success. Community engagement activities should be reported within the category that best fits the nature of the individual activity.
- e. Portfolio requirements will be based upon the faculty member's current job description and assigned faculty effort. Documentation required for post-tenure review will be the post-tenure review portfolio, other reports/forms as determined by the college, and a Curriculum Vitae consistent with Augusta University format (curriculum vitae).
- f. The portfolio should include, as appropriate, evidence of research, scholarship, teaching, and student success, encompassing the five-year review period or since the last promotion or tenure milestone.
 - i. Academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at Augusta University and aligned with an academic unit will undergo a post-tenure review, and a 360° feedback assessment at least every five years.
 - Appendix 1 consists of a chart that outlines the required review processes for administrators based on their percentage of administrative effort and the impact of those requirements on the need for post-tenure review.
 - ii. For areas in which the faculty member has 0% effort, the portfolio should include a brief statement indicating the category is not applicable to the review. Portfolio guidelines for post-tenure review, when required, should include additional documentation of administrative efforts.
- g. The college level Promotion and Tenure committee, or a sub-committee thereof, will serve as the Post Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. The committee shall contain no less than three-tenured faculty members with at least one member from the individual's department or college. In the event there is only one representative from the individual's department serving on the

PTR, a second tenured representative of the individual's department or college may be included as a non-voting member of the review committee at the request of the individual subject to review. The additional departmental representative does not need to be a member of the college Promotion and Tenure committee. In addition, academic units may develop a policy to allow the faculty member under review to request that one member of the review committee be replaced for any reason, and then establish a process to appoint an alternate member from the college level Promotion and Tenure Committee. Any such academic unit policy must be approved by the college dean and the Provost prior to being implemented.

- i. The review will encompass, as appropriate, scholarship, teaching, service, professional development, student success, and clinical practice, over the five-year period or since the last tenure and promotion milestone. (Note: While Administrative effort is not a part of post-tenure review, the committee should take note of the amount of administrative effort assigned to the individual as an administrative effort is likely to result in a reduction in work product for all other categories.)
 - ii. The faculty member is responsible for providing review materials.
 - iii. The committee will ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the review in a consistent manner.
 - iv. The committee will ensure that review of annual evaluations since the last award of tenure or PTR is performed.
 - v. The committee will come to an agreement on the conclusions of the review. If they cannot come to an agreement, they may choose to consult with the Department Chair (or unit head) or Dean for guidance.
 - vi. Results and recommendations of the review committee will be communicated in writing to both the individual faculty member and the Department Chair.
 - vii. The Department Chair will then conduct an independent review of the faculty member considering the recommendations of the PTR Committee. The Department Chair will then review the findings with the individual faculty member. The individual faculty member will be provided with a written copy of the chair's report at least 5 business days prior to the meeting. The faculty member and the Department Chair will sign the document acknowledging that the review has been completed. This signature does not indicate agreement with the outcome of the review.
 - viii. The Department Chair will then transmit the report and any response to the Dean of the school.
 - ix. For colleges without departments, the Dean shall take on the role of Department Chair and will review the findings with the individual faculty member, as well as communicate the results to the Provost.
- h. 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. The results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.

- i. In the case of a negative post-tenure review, the faculty member will be subject to a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP, previously known as Post-Tenure Development Plan in AU policy)

- a. In instances where an area of deficiency is noted, the faculty member's appropriate supervisor will work together with the faculty member to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), in consultation with the PTR committee, based around the deficiencies identified by the committee. The PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the review. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the designated timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of the Provost.
- b. The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will:
 - i. specify goals or outcomes that are required for the faculty member to overcome identified deficiencies;
 - ii. outline specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes;
 - iii. specify available resources and supports;
 - iv. set appropriate deadlines which the goals or outcomes will be accomplished (which should not exceed three years);
 - v. indicate the criteria by which progress will be monitored;
 - vi. include a plan to monitor progress, reassess the plan, and provide feedback at least twice per semester in the fall and spring including the faculty member's annual evaluation;
 - vii. and specify possible remedial actions if progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory.
- c. Financial Support for Performance Improvement Plan
The Dean will be responsible for financial arrangements associated with the PIP. If the nature or scope of the PIP is such that the individual cannot carry out other duties, the Department Chair and the Dean shall make other arrangements for these duties to be completed.
- d. Review of the Performance Improvement Plan Progress
At the end of the PIP, the individual shall be reviewed by the Department Chair and Dean. Results of the PIP review will be communicated in writing by the Department Chair.
- e. Completion of the PIP:
 - i. The Department Chair and Dean will make a determination as to the sufficiency of the faculty member's progress towards the established PIP.

- ii. In the case of a satisfactory completion of the PIP, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the outcome and that the five-year review PTR window will commence with the start of the upcoming academic year.
- iii. If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials, the Department Chair and Dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the PIP (or has refused to reasonably engage 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. Disciplinary actions include, but are not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, tenure revocation and dismissal. The faculty member must be informed in writing of the determination and proposed sanction along with their right to appeal and the associated appeal process.
- iv. Upon request by the faculty member, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and proposed remedial action and make their recommendation to the Provost. The Provost may accept the committee's recommendation or move forward with a different remedial action.
- v. If, and only if, the remedial action to be taken is separation from employment the tenured faculty member has the right to request a final faculty hearing for the purpose of confirming that due process was followed in reaching the decision of separation of employment. If the request is made within 5 calendar days of receiving the Provost's official letter, the Provost will grant that request.
- vi. The following procedures will be followed for the final faculty hearing:
 1. A Final Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee should be formed within 5 calendar days of receiving the faculty member's request and consist of not fewer than three, but not more than five, impartial faculty members appointed by the executive committee (or its equivalent) of the University Faculty Senate, from among the members of the entire faculty of the institution. Members of the hearing committee may serve concurrently on other committees of the faculty.
 2. The members of the Final Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee shall elect a chair from its membership.
 3. The entire process of the hearing and written recommendation from the Final Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee to the President must be completed within 30 calendar days from the date of the faculty member's request for a hearing.
 4. The hearing committee will notify the faculty member in writing at least 15 calendar days prior to the hearing.
 5. Prior to the hearing, the hearing committee will review all documentation relevant to the post-tenure review of the faculty member.
 6. During the hearing, the faculty member should have the opportunity to make a statement to the committee, respond to the documentation reviewed by the committee, and answer any questions from the committee.
 7. The President and the faculty member shall be notified in writing of the recommendation of the Final Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee within 10

- calendar days of the hearing, whether that recommendation be dismissal or any penalty less than dismissal, providing supporting reasons.
- vii. The President may or may not follow the recommendation of the Final Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee, but, within 10 calendar days of receiving the recommendation, the President should notify the faculty member and the hearing committee regarding the decision and the supporting reasons. The President should also notify the faculty member of the discretionary review process as provided for in the Board of Regents Policy: [BoR Policy 6.26 Application for Discretionary Review](#).
 - viii. If the remedial action taken by the President is dismissal, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in the faculty member's current role, with the President outlining the faculty assignments to be completed prior to the dismissal date.
 - ix. A copy of the decision of the Department Chair and Dean shall be provided to the Office of the Provost (or designee).
- f. Appeals and Due Process:
- i. A faculty member may appeal the decision of the Department Chair and Dean with respect to a determination of an unsatisfactory post-tenure within 10 business days of receiving written notification of the decision and proposed sanction by requesting a review by the current PTR committee formed in accordance with section III e. above.
 - ii. The PTR committee will review the PIP, progress towards the PIP and the recommendation of the Department Chair and Dean. The PTR committee may base their review solely upon the record or exercise their judgment to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The PTR committee will issue its recommendation in writing to the Office of the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
 - iii. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation from the PTR committee, the Provost (or designee) shall send an official letter notifying the faculty of the decision.
 - iv. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost (or designee).
 - v. Upon receipt of the appeal, the President will charge the University Promotion and Tenure (UPT) committee with reviewing the record and making a recommendation. The committee should ensure that the candidate received due process and equitable disciplinary actions at a university level. Upon the conclusion of the review, the UPT shall make a recommendation to the President either supporting the recommended sanction or proposing an alternative outcome. The UPT review shall be completed within 10 business days during the fall or spring terms.

- vi. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action and shall notify the faculty member of the decision and the process for discretionary review application pursuant to [BoR Policy 6.26 Application for Discretionary Review](#) within 10 days of receiving the recommendation from the UPT committee.

Record Retention

All records of reviews will be retained by the Dean’s office. At the end of each academic year the college must forward to the Office of the Provost the names of the faculty members reviewed that year, the results, and the names of each member of the review committees.

Implementation

- a. The promotion/tenure unit shall prepare a plan for scheduling reviews of tenured faculty. The five-year cycle of reviews should begin during the 2023-2024 academic year with the initiation of PTR for administrative faculty, not subject to the review process under prior policy, being phased in over three review cycles beginning in 2025-2026.
- b. PTR evaluators should exercise prudent judgement and flexibility as new policies and procedures are implemented.

Exemption From Scheduled Review for Retiring Faculty Member:

In those instances where a tenured faculty member has submitted a letter of resignation with an effective resignation date that is within 18 months of the faculty members post-tenure review date, the faculty member may participate in the following modified post-tenure review process:

- a. The faculty member will submit a post-tenure review package that consists of the following information:
 - i. A letter formally stating the faculty member’s intention to retire that contains the following statement:

“After careful consideration and planning I [*faculty member name*] request an exemption from full post-tenure review in anticipation of retirement. I understand that a failure on my part to complete the retirement process by [*insert date of intended retirement*] will result in either (a) the initiation of an immediate post-tenure review process that shall not be further postponed or (b) the voluntary surrender of my tenure status.”
- b. A letter from the faculty member’s Department Chair and Dean accepting the notice of intent to retire.

Upon receipt of the request for a modified post-tenure review the Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the faculty members post-tenure review packet to ensure that the

documents comply with the provisions of this policy and recommend the creation of a **PIP for Retirement** that requires the faculty member to work with the appropriate Human Resources personnel to execute the needed paperwork to effect retirement by the date stated in the faculty member's request.

POLICY CONFLICT:

In the case of any divergence from our conflict with the official policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia found in these Statutes, the official policies of the Board of Regents shall prevail.

REFERENCES & SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

[BoR Policy 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Review](#)

[BoR Policy 6.26 Application for Discretionary Review](#)

RELATED POLICIES

Intentionally left blank

APPROVED BY:

Interim Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Augusta University

Date: 9/18/2024

President, Augusta University

Date: 9/23/2024