



Post-Tenure Review Procedures

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide rules and procedures regarding post-tenure review for tenured faculty within the College of Sciences and Mathematics.

Persons Affected

This procedure affects all full-time faculty members in tenured positions.

Policy

The post-tenure review process in the College of Sciences and Mathematics includes a comprehensive performance evaluation of all tenured faculty with less than a 0.5 FTE administrative appointment. This review process will occur in every sixth year, in the Spring term, after receiving tenure, returning to a faculty position following an administrative assignment, or after a previous comprehensive performance evaluation, including promotion or successful completion of a plan for assisted faculty development. This evaluation will be based on rigorous and verifiable standards that meet requirements of SFA HOP [02-316](#) Performance Evaluation of Faculty and are in keeping with mission and goals of the college and unit.

Each unit's standards are developed by faculty members holding rank (i.e., tenure/tenure-track) within the unit and will describe what constitutes appropriate minimum performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship/research/creative activity, and service and will include criteria addressing professional collegiality and professionalism within each of these areas. Unit standards should describe expectations of sustained performance commensurate with the mission and goals of the college and academic unit, acknowledging that the weighting within each category may vary depending on particular roles and responsibilities of the faculty member being reviewed during the evaluation period. The evaluation process within each unit must include a rating of each separate critical area and an overall rating. A copy of these standards will be forwarded to the college dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs for review and approval.

Each tenured faculty member will be reviewed by the tenured faculty in his/her academic unit, the academic unit head and the dean. Academic unit review committees must be comprised of a minimum of three tenured faculty members. In academic units with three or fewer tenured faculty, the dean of the college, in consultation with the academic unit head, will appoint tenured faculty members from other academic units. The chair of the review committee will be selected by its membership annually. The chair's responsibility will be to set the agenda, moderate discussion, conduct balloting, and prepare the summary of the deliberations and concluding recommendation. The review committee, through the chair, will write a separate recommendation letter and provide a summary report of review of the faculty member. If the recommendation of a committee is not unanimous, the summary report should reflect both the majority and minority opinions. A simple



majority of the voting faculty within an academic unit will determine the tenured faculty committee recommendation that the faculty member meets or does not meet the unit standards. Each member of the committee must sign the recommendation letter acknowledging that the document and summary form are accurate representations of the conclusions of the committee, regardless of whether they personally agree with the recommendation. The chair of the review committee is to submit its summary report using the form titled *Post-Tenure - CoSM Department Committee Summary Form*. The review committee may use the *Post-Tenure – CoSM Department Recommendation Letter Template* for their recommendation letter.

The comprehensive performance evaluation will be conducted in accordance with processes outlined in SFA HOP [02-316](#) Performance Evaluation of Faculty and the procedures of the College of Sciences and Mathematics. In addition to other documentation that may be required by academic units, the performance review will make use of annual administrative evaluations of the faculty activities and performance for the five most recent academic years. Academic unit heads and the dean may consider other pertinent information during the review process.

In the College of Sciences and Mathematics the rating system for each critical area and the overall evaluation will include four levels—exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, and unsatisfactory. Each of these critical areas must be evaluated and rated separately and must include criteria addressing collegiality and professionalism. Documentation of collegiality and professionalism must adhere to the *CoSM Collegiality & Professionalism Review Process*. Should the reviewed faculty member be deemed as not meeting or exceeding expectations standards at the academic unit or dean's level, then he/she will be subject to the procedures outlined in the plan for assisted development (PAD) as described in SFA HOP [02-316](#) Performance Evaluation of Faculty.

I. Portfolio

Faculty subject to post-tenure review are required to submit a portfolio that documents they have satisfied all requirements of the comprehensive performance evaluation.

The portfolio for post-tenure review must follow the guidelines in SFA HOP [02-316](#) Performance Evaluation of Faculty as well as the College of Sciences and Mathematics Post-Tenure Review Procedures. The portfolio must contain a succinct, relevant, substantive and cumulative record of a candidate's performance for the evaluation period that demonstrates how the candidate meets or exceeds the established standards in each of the critical areas – teaching, research/scholarly/creative accomplishment, and service. Each of these critical areas must be evaluated and rated separately and must include criteria addressing collegiality and professionalism; an overall comprehensive performance evaluation rating must also be provided.



Portfolio materials are to be submitted through the university's online portal and must comply with all format and size limitations given in these procedures. All files shall be in PDF format, unless specified otherwise. Candidates should avoid scanned copies of digital documents and seek to merge PDFs using appropriate software. Manual scans should be completely avoided, unless the candidate does not have a digital copy to render a PDF.

Candidates must include the following information as well as any additional materials required by their unit.

- Unit Criteria: A copy of the unit criteria governing post-tenure.
- College Procedures: A copy of the CoSM Post-Tenure Review Procedures.
- University Policies: Copies of the relevant university procedures governing post-tenure review.
- Complete Curriculum Vitae: This document covers the candidate's entire career, rather than just the review period.
- Annual Performance Reports (FARs): Include a single Faculty Activity Report that covers the period since the last comprehensive evaluation.
- Administrative Evaluations: Include all administrative evaluations since the last promotion. All evaluations should include appropriate signatures by the faculty member, unit head, and Dean, with the exception of the latest evaluation, which may only contain the faculty member and unit head signatures.
- Narrative Justification for Post-Tenure Review: The faculty member's narrative justification is a single pdf document highlighting the accomplishments of the faculty member during the review period relative to unit criteria in each of the three critical areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative accomplishment, and service. Note that references to specific grants and publications must include clarity regarding status and roles (e.g., dates, dollar amount, funding source/status, PI/Co-PI). Within each of these three critical areas, the faculty member's narrative must address collegiality and professionalism specific to the area. The faculty member must comply with all specified format and size limitations for the College of Sciences and Mathematics to clearly summarize the evidence and make his or her case for meeting post-tenure review expectations. The narrative is limited to a maximum of five pages in 12 pt. Times New Roman font or an equivalent size in similar font, and pages must have margins of at least one inch.
- Course Evaluations: Within the critical area of teaching, the faculty member will submit student evaluations as required by relevant university policies. These evaluations will be submitted as a single pdf document and must include a *candidate reflection* that answers how the faculty member uses course evaluations to inform and improve the quality and content of their teaching. The faculty member's reflection is limited to a maximum of one page **and shall be the first page of the single pdf document.**
- Documentation: This file is a collection of artifacts that validates claims in the Narrative Justification for Post-Tenure Review and should include documentation of



teaching effectiveness, research/scholarly/creative accomplishment, university related service, contributions to the profession, and general community service related to the profession. Documentation must include student evaluations as required by relevant university, college and unit policies as well as support for justification of collegiality and professionalism. These artifacts must be cross-referenced to the narrative; that is, there should be no artifact included as documentation that is not specifically and individually (not by category) referenced in the candidate's narrative. Documentation that is in addition to what is included in the CV or FAR will be submitted separately as a single pdf file. If information is sufficiently detailed in a faculty member's CV or FAR, the faculty member may reference that information in the narrative to avoid unnecessary duplication; however, faculty must cite specific locations within those documents rather than simply directing reviewers to the CV or FAR.

A table of contents is required. Each artifact will be labeled and enumerated using the system T.x, R.x, or S.x where T, R, S refer to teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service, respectively, and x is the number associated with the corresponding unit's post-tenure criteria for the relevant critical area (e.g., T.3 refers to an artifact related to the third teaching criterion within the unit.). Each artifact in the documentation shall include a title page and the corresponding label.

Related Statutes or Regulations, Rules, Policies, or Standards

[CoSM Collegiality & Professionalism Review Process](#)

[HOP 02-316 Performance Evaluation of Faculty](#)

FORMS

Post-Tenure - CoSM Department Committee Summary Form

Post-Tenure - CoSM Department Recommendation Letter Template

Revision History

September 1, 2023 (original)

August 6, 2024

August 7, 2025