

**NUMBER:** 1414

**TITLE:** Policies and Procedures on Post-Tenure Review

**APPROVED:** April 12, 2001; Revised April 12, 2002; Revised April 22, 2022

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** April 2027

## I. Scope of policy

The faculty and administrators of Old Dominion University are dedicated to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, service, and clinical care. It is the role of the department chair and the dean to conduct annual evaluations of tenured faculty members, and to identify the areas in which a tenured faculty member has not met expectations. If deficiencies are identified, the chair must explain the rationale for that assessment and 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.

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

A tenured faculty member may receive an annual review from the chair and dean stating that their performance in teaching, research, service, and/or clinical care (if applicable) is seriously deficient relative to the written criteria of the department or college/school. In such cases, the faculty member should be made aware that a second annual evaluation from the chair and dean which states that a faculty member's performance is seriously deficient in one or more of the areas of responsibility could activate the post-tenure review process. It is the responsibility of the department chair to meet with the faculty member who has received such an evaluation within 30 days of posting the evaluation letter to discuss 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 for the faculty member to correct identified deficiencies and thus meet expectations in subsequent annual reviews. Following this meeting and discussion, the proposed plan for improvement should be communicated in writing to the faculty member.

## II. Confidentiality

All individuals involved in the plan must agree to respect the confidentiality of the post-tenure review process.

Commented [A1]: Deans Policy Review complete  
AALT review complete  
ready for faculty senate review

Deleted: Board of Visitors Policy

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Deleted: and ...service, and ...clinical care. It is the role of the department chair and the dean to conduct annual evaluations of tenured faculty members, and to identify the area or any ...he areas in which a particular ...enured faculty member has not met expectations. i...f found...efficiencies are identified, the chair must, to...explain the rationale for that assessment, ...nd (... [1])

Commented [A2]: Faculty are assessed on multiple criteria. What constitutes 'deficiency'? Is it enough to be deficient in service two years running?

Commented [A3R2]: post tenure review can be activated based on serious deficiency in one category. In practice it is very unlikely that a deficiency only in service would result in a post tenure review

Deleted: paragraph II.B.5. ...of (... [2])

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Deleted: A ...tenured faculty member who receives...ay receive an annual review from the chair and dean stating that their performance or she has a serious deficiency...in teaching, research, and/or ...service, and and/or clinical care (if applicable) is seriously deficient relative to isce (... [3])

Commented [A5]: something seems to be missing here

Commented [A6]: "seriously deficient relative to the (... [4])

Deleted: ...epartment or college/school. In such ca (... [5])

Deleted: three

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: within 30 days ...ith the faculty member w (... [6])

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: (... [7])

Deleted: in order

Formatted: (... [8])

Commented [A8]: Is this (highlighted portion) the act (... [9])

Commented [A9R8]: This is after the first instance (... [10])

Deleted: ...

Deleted: ...

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: Post-tenure review cannot be activated u (... [11])

Deleted: The confidentiality of the post-tenure rev (... [12])

Commented [A11]: Can it just say more directly "A (... [13])

### III. Procedures

The chair must recommend initiation of post-tenure review no later than May 17, and the recommendation of the dean must be made no later than June 30. The decision of the appropriate Executive Vice President on whether to support the post-tenure review process for the faculty member must be made no later than July 25.

The procedures for post-tenure review as outlined in this section shall apply unless the college/school has established a different written process for post-tenure review that has been approved by the appropriate Executive Vice President.

When the post-tenure review process has been activated, the chair and the dean will conduct an in-depth evaluation. In addition to examining the teaching, research, service, and, if appropriate, the faculty member's clinical care performance, from previous evaluations, the chair and dean should evaluate the overall contribution of the faculty member to the university. Consideration and assessment of faculty performance in a post-tenure review process must include all areas of evaluation. With respect to teaching, the comprehensive evaluation of teaching must include student opinion survey feedback, teaching portfolio reviews, and at least one other method (e.g., peer observation). If requested by the faculty member, the chair, or the dean, one or more external evaluators may be consulted with the approval of the appropriate Executive Vice President.

In addition to a thorough assessment of faculty performance, a major outcome of this process is a development plan indicating a clear expectation of sustained performance. Where deficiencies or areas for improvement are noted, the development plan should address ways of dealing with these problems, measures of expected outcomes, and a timetable for accomplishing these outcomes. The development plan will be written by the faculty member under review in consultation with the chair and/or dean. The development plan, including measures of expected outcomes, if appropriate, will be detailed in the agreement signed by the faculty member, the chair, and the dean by August 15. The full text of this agreement is submitted to the appropriate Executive Vice President. The implementation of the development plan is expected to take place by September 1.

If the dean and the chair are unable to solicit the cooperation of the faculty member in the preparation of the development plan, the dean and the chair will prepare a plan to which the faculty member will be expected to agree by September 1. If the individuals involved (dean, chair, faculty member) are unable to reach an agreement on a development plan by September 1, the dean will report to the appropriate Executive Vice President that an agreement has not been reached. In such an instance, if the dean and appropriate Executive Vice President concur, a major sanction, as described in the section of this Handbook entitled Faculty Sanctions, may be initiated at this time. If the faculty member refuses to agree to or sign the development plan and elects instead to grieve the post-tenure process, the faculty member must file a formal grievance by October 15 and follow the approved timeline for grieving the post-tenure review process.

Deleted: -----Section Break (Next Page)-----

Formatted: Body Text, Justified, Indent: Left: 0.58", Right: 0.08", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single

Deleted: the ...ost-tenure review process ...o later than August ...ay 1...7, and the recommendation of the dean must be made no later than September 1...une 30. The decision of the provost and ...ppropriate executive vice president...xecutive Vice President for academic affairs on whether to support the post-tenure review process for the faculty member must be made no later than Oc... [14]

Commented [A12]: Am I reading this wrong, or is a "different" missing? These procedures should be followed - unless - "different" procedures have been approved by the appropriate EVP?

Deleted: department/

Deleted: criteria and a

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.58", Right: 0.08"

Deleted: ation of ...he teaching, research, and ...ervice, and, if appropriate, the faculty member's clinical care records of the faculty member...erformance, ...rom previous evaluations, the chair and dean should evaluate the overall contribution of the faculty member to the university. Consideration and assessment of faculty performance in a post-tenure review process must include all areas of evaluation. With respect to teaching, the total comprehensive evaluation of teaching must include evaluation by student questionnaires [15]

Commented [A14]: ...at least one other method, such as?

Deleted: , ...ith the approval of the provost and...ppropriate e [16]

Deleted: xecutive vice president for academic affairs, may be consulted. [17]

Deleted: strategic ...development plan indicating a clear expectation of sustained performance. Where deficiencies or areas for possible ...improvement are noted, the [17]

Commented [A15]: Is the and/or here to indicate that, depending on which person (dean or chair) initiated t... [18]

Commented [A16R15]: Yes or the Dean may be helping with the development of the plan

Deleted: strategic ...development plan, including measures of expected outcomes, if appropriate, wit... [19]

Commented [A19]: should this be "in the preparation of the development plan"?

Deleted: of the strategic

Deleted: February ...eptember 1. If the individuals involved (dean, chair, faculty member) are unable [20]

Commented [A20]: I suggest using "reached" rather than "found."

Deleted: provost and...ppropriate executive vice president...xecutive Vice President for academic a... [21]

Deleted: strategic ...development plan and elects instead to grieve the post-tenure process, the faculty mem... [22]

Annual evaluations in succeeding years will specifically address progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the agreement on the 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 [Faculty 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 after the conclusion of the appeal process described below (see the section of this Handbook on [Faculty Grievance Policy](#),

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 [August 15](#).

2. The dean reviews all available information, makes a decision, and notifies the [appropriate Executive Vice President](#) and the faculty member by [September 1](#).

3. If the faculty member objects to the dean's decision, [they](#) may appeal to the [appropriate Executive Vice President](#). This appeal must be made by [September 15](#).

4. The [appropriate Executive Vice President](#) must act on the faculty member's appeal and approve or reject the initiation of post-tenure review by [October 1](#). The decision of the [appropriate Executive Vice President](#) is final.

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 [development plan](#), and the imposition of a major sanction, if issued. Regardless of the provisions of the [Faculty Grievance Policy](#), the faculty member must file this grievance by [October 15](#).

#### V. Annual Report on Post-Tenure Review

The [Provost](#) and [Executive 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.

Deleted: strategic

Deleted: Section Break (Next Page)

Commented [A21]: Is dismissal an option in addition to major sanction?

Commented [A22R21]: Dismissal is a major sanction.

Deleted: , III.A.6

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: executive vice president

Deleted: for academic affairs or executive vice president for health sciences, if appropriate,

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: he or she

Commented [A23]: I am confused whether it is the EVP or always the Provost who hears teh appeal? See pt 4 below

Commented [A24R23]: I think the intent was for the decision of the appropriate EVP to be final. I've amended item 4 accordingly

Commented [A25R23]: fixed

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: executive vice president

Deleted: for academic affairs or the executive vice president for health sciences, if appropriate.

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: executive vice president

Deleted: for academic affairs

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: provost and

Deleted: v

Deleted: president

Deleted: for academic affairs

Deleted: If the faculty member is tenured in one of the college/schools in the Virginia Health Science, the executive vice presidentExecutive Vice President for Hhealth Ssciences will be consulted prior to the rendering of the final decision.

Deleted: strategic

Commented [A26]: The revision of the Faculty Gri... [23]

Deleted: , III.A.6. and A. 7.

Deleted: March

Deleted: 0

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: p

Deleted: executive vice president

Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [1] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [2] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [2] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [3] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [3] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [3] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [3] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [3] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [3] Deleted	Author
▼	▲
Page 1: [4] Commented [A6]	Author

"seriously deficient relative to the written criteria..."

Page 1: [5] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [5] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [5] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [5] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [5] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [6] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [6] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [7] Formatted Highlight	Author
Page 1: [7] Formatted Highlight	Author
Page 1: [7] Formatted Highlight	Author
Page 1: [7] Formatted Highlight	Author
Page 1: [7] Formatted Highlight	Author
Page 1: [7] Formatted Highlight	Author
Page 1: [8] Formatted Condensed by 0.75 pt, Highlight	Author
Page 1: [8] Formatted Condensed by 0.75 pt, Highlight	Author
Page 1: [9] Commented [A8] Is this (highlighted portion) the action items for any time a faculty member rates a 'does not meet expectations' or only for post tenure review. Not clear and should also be in evaluation procedures if it is an annual expectation.	Author
Page 1: [10] Commented [A9R8] This is after the first instance of a seriously deficient rating. It is not for a "regular" below expectations review.	Author
Page 1: [11] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [12] Deleted	Author

Page 1: [12] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [12] Deleted	Author
Page 1: [13] Commented [A11]	Author
Can it just say more directly "All individuals involved in the plan must agree to respect the essential confidentiality of the post-tenure review process."	
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [14] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Author
Page 2: [15] Deleted	Author



▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [20] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [21] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [21] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [21] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [22] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 2: [22] Deleted

Author

▼  
▲  
Page 3: [23] Commented [A26]

Author

▲  
The revision of the Faculty Grievance Policy may require that these references be adjusted.