

August 1998

To: Tenured Faculty Members in the University System

From: Mary E. Dempsey
Tenure Subcommittee
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Re: Implementing Post-Tenure Reviews; Responsibilities of Faculty and Administrators; Timelines

The following comments are intended to assist tenured faculty in departments that have not yet developed policies and procedures for post-tenure review, as required by the current Tenure Code. These comments respond to many questions raised by faculty and administrators. The duties and responsibilities of both groups in the post-tenure review process are outlined here. In addition, a table showing timelines for carrying out these duties and responsibilities is presented.

1. Read carefully the documents entitled -- "Rules and Procedures for Post- Tenure Review" [available on the University Senate web site -- http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/guidelines.html] and "Faculty Compensation Policy" [<http://www.umn.edu/usenate/policies/faccomp.html>] and also the information provided in Table I, entitled "Duties, Responsibilities, and Timeline for the Post- Tenure Review Process".
2. Understand the following background points:
 - o There are three interrelated University policies or procedures affecting faculty life --Promotion and Tenure Procedures, the Compensation Policy, and Post-Tenure Review Process. All of these procedures or policies are derivatives of the Tenure Code. Faculty are familiar with the Promotion and Tenure Procedures; however, some faculty are not familiar with the Compensation Policy and the new Post-Tenure Review Process. Both the Compensation Policy and the Post-Tenure Review Process call for faculty in each department to develop and formally approve criteria and procedures for: 1) merit review and annual salary increases, in the case of the Compensation Policy, -- and 2) annual post-tenure review, in the case of the Post-Tenure Review Process. As discussed below under section 3, you have the option to combine both processes.
 - o I wish to stress that both the Compensation Policy and the Post-Tenure Review Process are peer driven. You have the opportunity to shape your own destiny and that of your department. You also have a number of choices regarding these processes; -- choose and adopt ones that are best for your department. Understand that you can vote to change your policies and procedures, if you find some aspects no longer appropriate.
 - o The purpose of the Post-Tenure Review Process is to affirm and maintain faculty members vitality through review and recognition of their contributions by peers and administrators. The secondary purpose is to improve, if necessary, the performance of each tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and service. This review process and its policies are intended for tenured faculty only. Probationary and term faculty are also reviewed annually -- but not under this process.
 - o Development of the policies and procedures to be used in each department for the post-tenure review process [and the parallel compensation and merit review process] is the responsibility of the tenured faculty of each department. Faculty are also responsible for participation in the peer review committees called for by this process; see Table I.
 - o The Post-Tenure Review Process will not itself result in dismissal or suspension of a tenured faculty member. The latter events can only occur as a result of proceedings initiated by a dean under Sections 10 and 14 of the Tenure Code. Such proceedings may be initiated by a dean whenever a faculty member

engages "in sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately" or other conduct forbidden by Section 10.21 of the Tenure Code. As described in the "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review", a Special Post-Tenure Review Panel may also recommend to the dean that dismissal or suspension proceedings be initiated -- but the Special Review Panel cannot initiate these proceedings.

3. Responsibilities of Faculty Members --Further Details

You and the other tenured faculty in your department are required to meet and formally adopt two policy statements [i.e., 1) your goals and expectations for tenured faculty members and, 2) the procedures you plan to use for post-tenure annual reviews]. At this meeting you also are to elect an Annual Post-Tenure Review Committee and decide on the mechanism for the turnover of this committee, e.g., for a committee of 5 members, one or two would be replaced each year by vote of the faculty. You also have the option to vote to designate an existing committee [e.g. a previously elected Promotion and Tenure Committee or a previously elected Compensation and Merit Review Committee] as the Annual Review Committee for your department. Another possibility is that you and your colleagues could meet to elect the Annual Review Committee and charge it to bring the two post-tenure review policies to the departmental faculty at their next meeting for formal adoption. Also, the faculty of a small department could decide that the full faculty of their department will be the Annual Review Committee. On the other hand, the faculty of a large department with divisions could decide to conduct this process in each division. In the latter case, each division head would function as a department head for the initial stages [i.e. Annual Review] of this process. Similarly, the faculty of a school or college that is organized into divisions could vote to have each division head function as a department head for the Post-Tenure Annual Reviews.

With regard to the two policies --

Policy 1. The goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.

- o The "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review" advise you to adopt goals and expectations that are sufficiently flexible to allow for changing career patterns and are simple, i.e. not filled with extensive detail. You have the option of modifying the indices you have adopted for promotion and tenure [Tenure Code - Section 7.12- Statements] and using the same or similar guidelines for Post-Tenure Review. Alternatively, your department may already have a goals and expectations policy for merit review and compensation decisions. You may wish to modify, if necessary, and then adopt this policy for use as your annual review goals and expectations policy.
- o Specific details [e.g. courses to be taught, grant applications, service activities, etc.] for the following year's goals and expectations of an individual faculty member should be agreed upon at the annual review meeting between the department head and faculty member.

Policy 2. Procedures for Conduct of Annual Post-Tenure Reviews

You and your colleagues need to decide the following --

- o When the annual review of each faculty member will occur [e.g. Spring];
- o Will the annual review serve as both a post-tenure review and merit review for compensation purposes or will there be separate reviews for each process; it appears simpler to conduct these reviews simultaneously, as long as the purposes of both reviews are met.
- o Who will conduct the reviews [e.g. the department head, or an existing elected committee designated by the faculty for this purpose, or a newly elected Annual Post-Tenure Review Committee or both the department head and an elected committee] -- [Note: If the department head conducts the reviews, the Annual Review Committee will not function until the department head consults with the Committee regarding possible substandard performance by a faculty member; see section 4, below];

- What will occur during the review [e.g. review of year's accomplishments, expectations for coming year];
- How will brief records of the decisions made during the review be maintained; see Responsibilities of Department Heads in the section 5, below.
- What will happen if it is determined that a faculty member's performance is substantially below the goals and expectations agreed upon in the previous year's review; [see "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review" for details of the Special Review Process];
- The composition, number of members and rank , turnover, and manner of election of the Annual Post-Tenure Review Committee;

4. Responsibilities of Annual Post-Tenure Review Committees

- The Annual Post-Tenure Review Committee may or may not be involved in the annual post-tenure reviews of faculty members; see Table I and section 3, above.
- The Annual Post-Tenure Review Committee is required to review the possible substandard performance of a faculty member detected during an annual review by a department head; to concur in that observation; and to participate in planning the steps necessary to improve the performance of the faculty member. If the Annual Review Committee does not concur with the department head's observation, no further action is warranted regarding the faculty member's performance.
- The Annual Post-Tenure Review Committee is also required to review the performance of the possible substandard faculty member the following year and, if necessary, to concur with the department head in requesting the Dean for a Special Review.

5. Responsibilities of Department Heads

- Each department head is responsible for submitting the Post-Tenure Goals and Expectations and Procedures policies to the dean by a deadline to be set by each dean. A reasonable deadline is November 16, 1998.
- If a department has not previously submitted its Merit Review and Compensation Policy, this document should accompany the Annual Review Policy documents.
- In this packet sample cover letters are provided for use by a department head in the submission of the required review documents.
- Faculty may wish to review the Section 7.12 -- Statements that they use for promotion and tenure in their departments and revise these statements to reflect their current goals. Revised Section 7.12 Statements should also be submitted to the dean with the newly adopted Goals and Expectations and Procedures Statements for Post Tenure Annual Review, as well as new or previously adopted Merit Review and Compensation Statements.
- Department heads are responsible for maintaining brief records in their departments of the decisions made during each Post-Tenure Annual Review. Department heads may use a simple form for this purpose. The Procedures for Annual Review Statement should include mention of how the brief records of Annual Review decisions will be maintained [a form, a dictated note, etc.] and whether or not the faculty member and department head are required to sign the brief record.
- Department heads also have additional responsibilities if there is a need for a "Special Post-Tenure Review" of a faculty member; see "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review" and Table I.

6. Responsibilities of Deans

- Each dean is responsible for review and approval of the Annual Post-Tenure Review documents, i.e., the Goals and Expectations for Tenured Faculty and the Procedures for the Conduct of Post-Tenure Reviews [and the Merit Review and Compensation documents, if not previously submitted]. These documents are prepared and approved by the faculty of each department and submitted by the head of each department; see sections 3 and 5, above.
 - Each dean has the responsibility to see that the Post-Tenure Annual Reviews [and Merit and Compensation Reviews] are conducted in each department.
 - Deans also have additional responsibilities if there is a need for a "Special Post-Tenure Review" of a faculty member; for details, see "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review" and Table I.
7. Timelines: The first Post-Tenure Review Annual Reviews of tenured faculty members should occur in Spring, 1999. "Special Post-Tenure Reviews" [for details see "Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review"], if necessary, would occur after the Annual Review Process in Spring, 2001 [see Table I].

EXAMPLES OF LETTERS FROM SEVERAL DEPARTMENT HEADS TO THEIR DEANS REGARDING POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES

Date

To: Dean
College or School of

From: Professor
Head, Department of
College or School of

Re: Post-Tenure Review Goals and Expectations and Procedures;
Revised Merit Review and Compensation Policy;
Revised Promotion and Tenure Statement

I am enclosing with this memo three documents recently approved by a vote of the tenured faculty of my department. These documents are submitted to you for your review and approval.

- The first document contains our new Post-Tenure Review Goals and Expectations statement and the Procedures we plan to use for post-tenure review of faculty members.
- We also voted to approve revisions, reflecting our current goals and practices, in two related documents --
 1. Our Merit Review and Compensation policy and --
 2. Our statement [in accord with Section 7.12 of the Tenure Code] used for Promotion and Tenure of faculty.

[As described in the attached memo, faculty have several options to chose from regarding the means they use to develop their departmental Post-Tenure Goals and Expectations -- one option follows--]

With regard to our Post-Tenure Review Goals and Expectations: My faculty voted to use our criteria for promotion and tenure [our revised Tenure Code Section 7.12 Statement] with a modification that allows for changing career patterns of tenured faculty, e.g. increased emphasis on teaching with less emphasis on research.

[Faculty members also have several options to chose from regarding their Procedures for Post-Tenure review {see attached memo} -- two possible options follow]

[Option #1 -- Faculty Votes to Have Department Head Conduct Reviews]

With regard to the Procedures we will use for post-tenure review: My faculty voted to conduct the review process as follows--

1. In April, faculty members will submit to me a summary of their activities in research, teaching and service for the past year and their proposed plans for work during the coming year and future plans.
2. I will meet with each tenured faculty member to discuss past performance and future plans. This meeting will constitute the faculty member's annual review for merit and compensation and post-tenure review. I will follow the requirements and criteria for each of these processes as approved by my faculty. Plans for the next year may involve a redistribution of effort agreed upon by the faculty member and myself. I will keep a brief note of our agreement and send a copy to the faculty member. This agreement will then serve as a basis for the faculty member's post-tenure and merit review the following year.
3. If I determine during a subsequent annual review that a faculty member's performance may be substantially below the goals and expectations of our department, I will refer the case to our elected Post-Tenure Review Committee. If this Committee and I agree that the faculty member's performance is substantially below our goals and expectations, we will follow the steps outlined in the Tenure Code and "The Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review".
4. The elected Post-Tenure Review Committee consists of 5 members and an alternate. Three members are from the rank of Professor with tenure and two are from the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. None of the members hold an administrative appointment. The alternate is from the rank of professor with tenure and will serve on the Committee in case a Committee member is the subject of a review by the Committee. One member [rank of professor] serves a two-year term, the others hold one-year terms.

[Option #2 -- Faculty Votes to have a committee conduct the reviews]

With regard to the Procedures we will use for post-tenure review: My faculty voted to conduct the review process in our department as follows --

1. In April, faculty members will submit to me a summary of their activities in research, teaching and service for the past year and their proposed plans for work during the coming year and future plans. I will then refer this material to the elected Merit and Post-Tenure Review Committee for their recommendations.
2. The Committee will review each faculty member's activities and future proposals. This review will constitute the faculty member's annual review for merit and compensation and post-tenure review. The Committee will follow the requirements and criteria for merit and compensation and post-tenure review as approved by the departmental faculty. The Committee will send me their conclusions and recommendations. I will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the Committee's recommendations and make plans for the faculty member's activities during the coming year. Plans for the next year may involve a redistribution of effort agreed upon by the faculty member and me. I will keep a brief record of the agreement and send a copy to the faculty member and the Committee. This agreement will then serve as a basis for the faculty member's merit and post-tenure review for the following year. I will also make every effort to implement the compensation recommended by the merit review of the faculty member by the Committee.
3. If the Committee determines during a subsequent merit and post-tenure annual review that a faculty member's performance may be substantially below the goals and expectations of our department, they will refer the case to me. If I agree with the Committee that the faculty member's performance is substantially below our goals and expectations, we will follow the steps outlined in the Tenure Code and "The Rules and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review".
4. The elected Merit and Post-Tenure Review Committee consists of ---[for example, see item 4 in the first option presented above]

TABLE 1

DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TIMELINE FOR THE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS						
	Department					
Timeline	Tenured Faculty	Head	Peer Annual Review Committee	Peer Review Special Committee	Dean	College Assembly
Fall 1998	Vote to: 1. Adopt goals & expectations 2. Adopt review procedures 3. Elect Peer Annual Review Committee	Submits policies 1 and 2 to Dean for review	Elected		Reviews & approves goals & expectations & review procedures	Ensures each department adopts goals and review procedures
Spring 1999 and 2000	Each provides relevant information for review	Reviews each faculty member	May participate in reviews			
Spring 2000	Possible substandard performance by a faculty member	Head and Review Committee concur that a faculty member falls substantially below goals and expectations; notify faculty member & make plans for improvement; assist faculty member to improve				
Spring 2001	Each provides relevant information for review	Review each faculty member	May participate in reviews			
Spring 2001	Possible substandard performance by a faculty member	Review performance of the faculty member-If still substantially below goals & expectations, request Dean for special review			Reviews file & agrees to special review	
	Elect Special Review			Elected		

	Committee					
Fall 2001	Possible substandard performance by a faculty member	Consults with Dean; implements decision		Complete review & recommend action	Consider recommen- dation and takes action	

June 23, 1998