### 3-XX Continuing Status / Post-Tenure Review

**I. Purpose:** Post-tenure review is intended to monitor, evaluate, and facilitate continued faculty development consistent with fulfillment of the College mission and goals. In a supportive environment of assessment, accountability is ensured and enhanced by regular, comprehensive evaluation of each faculty member’s performance in all aspects of his/her role.

**II. Continuing Status / Post-Tenure Review:** Tenured and continuing status faculty shall undergo a review at least once every five (5) years. Faculty members who have not applied for rank advancement within the previous five (5) years, or who received terminal rank five (5) years previous, shall undergo a continuing review. The basic standard for appraisal shall be the competent and conscientious discharge of duties as specified by the faculty member’s assignment.

A. Based on the principle of peer review, and incorporating and building on other regular reviews such as student, administrator, peer, and self, the continuing review process is intended to assess the expectation that faculty exhibit continued achievement of professional goals, maximum contributions to the College, and ongoing professional development.

B. Upon implementation of this policy, reviews for faculty will be scheduled on a staggered basis until all faculty can be placed on a five-year rotation, beginning with faculty with the longest interim since a previous review.

C. Reviews can be delayed for a year for various reasons, but such delays require the agreement of the department chair, dean/associate dean, and Vice President of Academic Services.

D. The continuing status / post-tenure review process is not the same as the process of applying for tenure or promotion. Nothing in this process should construe jeopardy to the faculty member under review. The standard for dismissal from a tenured or continuing status position remains just cause. While evidence used in the continuing status / post-tenure review might also be used in construction of cause for dismissal, in no case does the burden of proving cause for dismissal shift to the faculty member having to show cause for retention.

E. The academic freedom of the faculty member being reviewed shall be protected throughout the review process, and all information regarding the review shall remain confidential throughout and after the review process.
III. Review Portfolio: Each member of the faculty is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date and complete professional portfolio based on current institutional guidelines formulated by the College Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. The portfolio is the primary source of information for the College Post-Tenure Review Committee. Standards may differ considerably based on appointment, discipline, rank, etc. However, all portfolios should contain thorough documentation covering at least the five years immediately prior to the review, and typically including at least the following:

A. Report(s) from previous continuing status/post-tenure review, or, if the faculty member is undergoing the first review after tenure award and/or promotion, documentation from Division and College Promotion and Tenure committees, Dean, and Vice-President of Academic Services regarding that application.

B. Current position description and vita.

C. Evaluations from administrative supervisors, peers, and one’s self.

D. Recommendations from supervisors (chair, dean/associate dean).

E. Evidence of teaching competence, pedagogical innovation and improvement, curriculum development, and student evaluations of instruction.

F. Evidence of continued professional development.

G. Evidence of service to the institution, including student advising, faculty governance, and academic planning and administration, often typified by active committee work.

H. Evidence of service to outside organizations within the profession or service to the community designed to advance the mission of the College.

I. As desired, evidence of scholarship, research, and creative accomplishments complementary to the individual’s disciplinary assignment.

IV. Review and Report Process: The College Post-Tenure Review Committee, consisting of tenured faculty, shall perform continuing reviews. No supervisor of a faculty member under review may participate in the committee’s review, other than in the form of administrative evaluations included in the faculty member’s file and letters written at the faculty member’s request. No faculty member being reviewed by the College Post-Tenure Review Committee may serve on the committee.

A. The faculty member under review shall submit his or her file to the chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee by February 1 in the fifth year since the previous review or advancement in rank, or sooner if required by a Faculty Development Plan.
B. Not later than March 1, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall respond with a written report to the faculty member being reviewed, to the department chair, and to the dean/associate dean.

C. The written report shall include the conclusion of the committee as to whether the faculty member being reviewed is meeting or exceeding standards and therefore receives a favorable review, or whether there are substantive concerns or deficiencies which the faculty member must correct and therefore receives an unfavorable review, as well as the bases for conclusions. The committee should note specific areas of notable success and must note any specific areas needing improvement.

D. The faculty member under review has the opportunity to send a response with comments and/or challenges regarding the report to the Vice President of Academic Services not more than 10 days after the report was sent.

E. Not later than April 15, the Vice President of Academic Services shall prepare a final recommendation to the President with respect to the continuing status/post-tenure review, including his/her recommendation regarding a salary increase, and a copy shall be sent to the faculty member.

   i. Typically, and based on available funding, faculty receiving favorable reviews receive a 2% increase in base salary to begin July 1.

   iii. An individual faculty member may receive only one continuing review increase in any five (5) year period of time.

   iv. An individual faculty member may not receive more than a total of 10% in continuing status/post-tenure review and rank advancement increases within a five (5) year period of time.

      1. If a faculty member receives a rank advancement increase, s/he may not receive a continuing status increase for five (5) years.

      2. If a faculty member receives a continuing status increase, any rank advancement increase s/he receives within the following five (5) years will be decreased by 2%.

      3. Such limits exclude equity increases and COLA adjustments.

   v. If the review is unfavorable, the faculty member, working with the appropriate department chair and dean/associate dean, shall develop a written Professional Development Plan, addressing strategies and actions for correcting noted deficiencies during the next year.

      1. The Professional Development Plan must be submitted to the Vice President of Academic Services by April 30 and approved by May 30.
2. In no case shall a Professional Development Plan limit the institution’s 
ability to implement the Faculty Termination policy.
### ADDENDA - Continuing Review Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member delivers portfolio to chair of College Post-Tenure Review Committee.</td>
<td>February 1 of fifth year since previous review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of College Post-Tenure Review Committee sends written report to faculty member under review</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member being reviewed responds as desired</td>
<td>10 days after report was sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Academic Services report including salary increase recommendations to President</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Faculty Development Plans will be described in 3-8 Faculty Evaluation.*