

Final Report April 24, 1998

Note: This document was adopted by the Faculty Senate on May 7, 1998.

1. Introduction

Post-tenure review is the subject of wide discussion in the academic community. This discussion has been motivated in part by the natural process of self-assessment and peer evaluation that is the hallmark of every successful academic institution. From outside and from within the academy, its members, managers, and critics are sounding common themes of greater accountability and increased productivity in times of limited resources. An effective and collegial system of post-tenure review is regarded by many as the key to recognizing the performance of exceptional faculty and enhancing the contributions of all faculty to the institution. A representative bibliography of recent publications on the subject of post-tenure review is appended to this report. Copies of these articles are available for review among a much larger collection in the Faculty Senate Office and on reserve at the Valley Library.

As mandated by the State of Oregon, Oregon State University already has in place a system for Periodic Review of Faculty (PROF). In effect, this system provides for post-tenure review. However, the OSU system is inconsistently applied and its goals (apart from satisfying the requirements of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education) are not clearly specified. Peer involvement occurs in some units, but is not mandated by the PROF system. There is no institutional policy for dealing either developmentally or punitively with individuals whose reviews may be consistently unsatisfactory.

To evaluate OSU's PROF system and to suggest improvements, the Faculty Senate appointed a Task Force on Post-Tenure Review and charged it as follows:

Recognizing that the tenure system is essential to protect academic freedom and support the pursuit of scholarship that leads to advancement in knowledge, we seek to maintain and strengthen the tenure system both as protection of individual faculty members and as visible evidence that uninhibited scholarship and instruction are our highest priority. Periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty can protect the tenure system by providing the incentive for faculty development and enhancement of professional skills, as well as by offering evidence of accountability to the University, the State Board of Higher Education, and the State of Oregon.

The Task Force on Post-Tenure Review is charged with the following mission:
**to compare OSU's Periodic Review of Faculty with review processes in place at other institutions;*
**to assess the current status of the relationship between tenure and academic freedom;*
**to provide guidance to OSU administrators in conducting faculty reviews, especially the use of the position description and/or other performance expectations as the basis of the review;*
**to strengthen our Periodic Review system by incorporating opportunities for faculty development and enhancement of professional skills in scholarship, instruction, and service.*

Members of the Task Force are:

John Block, Pharmacy	Ken Krane, Physics (chair)
Linda Blythe, Vet. Med. Engineering	Jim Lundy, Civil, Constr., & Env.
Brooke Collison, Education	Michael Oriard, English
Carroll DeKock, Chemistry Mgmt.	Mary Alice Seville, Acctg., Finance & Info.
Steve Esbensen, Oc. & Atmos. Sciences	Susan Stafford, Forest Science
Erik Fritzell, Fisheries and Wildlife	Becky Warner, Sociology
Kinsey Green, Home Ec. & Education	Tim White, Health & Human Performance

This report summarizes the findings and recommendations of the Task Force.

2. OSU's PROF System

The current OSU PROF system for tenured faculty is based on the following policy of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (as specified in Oregon Administrative Rules 580-21-140):

- (1) Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated periodically and systematically in accordance with plans developed by the institutions.*
- (2) Institutional plans for post-tenure reviews shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:*
- (a) A statement of the objectives of faculty post-tenure review and evaluation;*
 - (b) A statement of criteria to be used in evaluations, the nature and kinds of data that will be accumulated, and the method of data collecting;*
 - (c) A designation of persons making the evaluation;*
 - (d) A designation of the frequency and regularity of evaluations;*
 - (e) A description of the institutional plan for relating post-tenure reviews to the faculty reward system, such that, appropriate recognition for excellence can be provided;*
 - (f) A description of the institutional plan to deal firmly but humanely with situations in which the competence or the vitality and drive of a particular faculty member have diminished to such an extent that the resources of the faculty career support program are unable to provide the stimulation or help necessary to return the faculty member to a fully effective state.*

This policy allows considerable latitude to the institutions in specifying both the frequency and mechanism for the reviews. The basis for faculty evaluation is described in OAR 580-21-135, which specifies that:

Criteria for faculty evaluation, developed with the participation of appropriate faculty and institutional councils, shall be established in each institution....as a basis for assessing those aspects of the faculty member's performance in which improvement is desirable, whether the faculty member is tenured or non-tenured, with a view to stimulating and assisting the faculty member toward improvement through the resources available under the institution's staff career support plan.

OAR 580-21-135 continues by listing instruction, research and other scholarly achievements, and professional and institutional service as the main criteria that the academic unit should apply in its review, and it concludes by requiring that the institution's criteria provide guidelines for the sources and kinds of data to be used as the basis for the review and that the process provide the opportunity for student input.

OSU's implementation of these policies has been incorporated into the PROF system as described in the Faculty Handbook. The process mandates review of tenured faculty at least once every three years, or upon the faculty member's request. The evaluation shall include:

*(a) a statement of the current responsibilities of the faculty member; and
(b) signed comments on the faculty member's progress in teaching, research or other scholarly pursuits, extension, librarianship, professionally related service, and University service from those persons designated by the department, school, or University to make the evaluations.*

The policy calls for the inclusion of the sources of information used in the evaluation: current and former students, OSU or external peers, and the public. The faculty member under review must be provided with a written copy of the evaluation and must be allowed the opportunity to attach written comments, explanations, or rebuttal for placement in the personnel file. Normal University appeal procedures are to be used to resolve disagreements on the contents of the file. The academic unit must annually submit a list of those members of the faculty reviewed to the file:///C:/WebRoot/Associate Vice President (now Associate Provost) for Academic Affairs.

3. Implementation of the OSU PROF System

To develop a better understanding of how the mandated processes are actually implemented at OSU, the Task Force conducted a detailed study of our procedures. A questionnaire was developed to achieve a uniform approach, and members of the Task Force conducted personal

interviews and e-mail exchanges with various individuals on campus: the Provost, 7 Deans, 2 Associate Deans, 27 Department Chairs, and 11 tenured faculty.

Overall, we find that the PROF system reflects the philosophy of the Provost's Office, namely, to decentralize the PROF process to the greatest extent possible. The responsibility for implementing the procedures in the Faculty Handbook rests with the unit head (Dean, Director, Department Head or Chair). Provost Arnold regards achieving consistency across the University as a major challenge of the current system.

There is a high degree of variability among departments and colleges in the structure and mechanics of the review process, as evidenced by the variety of forms and guidelines collected from various academic units. Often these forms consist of a slightly expanded c.v. or a portfolio of the faculty member's activities. After receiving the portfolio, the unit head meets with the faculty member and prepares a written evaluation, which is then reviewed by the faculty member and signed as an acknowledgment of receipt of the evaluation. Generally these reviews are kept in the unit's personnel files; occasionally copies are sent to a higher administrator (usually the Dean of the college). There is little systematic evidence of peer involvement in the review process.

The extent to which faculty are asked to specify their goals for the upcoming review period is also highly variable. Some units do not request such statements, while others ask for tabulations of papers to be written and grant applications to be submitted. In subsequent years, faculty who specified such goals were expected to explain why any had not been achieved.

It was also found that the PROF process was heterogeneous with respect to the frequency of the review. All units appear to follow the minimum University requirement to review tenured faculty at least once every three years. But there appears to be a bimodal distribution in the frequency of the reviews, either annually or every three years.

Respondents to the survey were asked to discuss the consequences of positive and negative reviews. Merit pay was the consequence most frequently mentioned as directly connected to performance evaluations. However, most of the interviewees felt that, due to the low dollar amounts and infrequency of merit increases, merit pay did not serve as an effective motivator in recent years. Other positive consequences mentioned by unit heads included travel funds, laboratory space, seed

money for research projects, improvement of teaching and service assignments, recommendation for promotion, award nominations, and approval of sabbatical or other leaves. However, it was not clearly understood by faculty members that these rewards were directly related to their PROF evaluations.

Consequences of a negative review were less well specified, other than simply lack of the rewards for a positive review. A few units report remediation programs, especially with regard to poor teaching evaluations. In most cases there appears to be no formal remediation or career development plan.

At least among the administrators who responded to our survey, there was strong sentiment for more serious consequences for persistently negative reviews. Dismissal for cause was viewed by many as too extreme and as applicable only in cases of the most extreme unsatisfactory performance; other less draconian consequences mentioned included reduction in rank or in salary or gentle pressure for early retirement. Replacing tenure with a long-term (3-5 years) rolling contract was often mentioned. Nearly all who discussed the consequences of a negative review also supported the use of remedial or developmental plans to improve performance so that dismissal for cause would be unnecessary.

The overall sentiment of the faculty and administrators was that the PROF system is effective in providing administrative accountability within the University and to the public, and that the system encourages productivity in motivated faculty. The system is not regarded as working effectively in cases of unsatisfactory performance, other than to create a paper trail. Ultimately the value of the system depends on the effectiveness of the unit head in writing careful, thoughtful, and humane reviews that motivate faculty to improve their performance. In the case of negative reviews, faculty and administrators strongly favor consequences that include a more intensive review and the initiation of attempts at remediation, with full peer participation and full consideration of due process. Only if remediation attempts fail should more serious consequences be considered.

Other issues raised in these discussions include:

- *the balance between decentralization of the review process and the need for a fair and consistent application across the campus;

- *the balance between the need for accountability and the effort required for a more extensive review of the majority of faculty who are already performing at a high level;

- *the need for better training of unit heads in dealing with faculty who receive negative reviews;
- *the availability of institutional resources to motivate and support tenured faculty;
- *the need for consequences of persistent negative reviews that are less catastrophic to the faculty member and less stressful for the unit head.

Finally, it must be realized within and outside the institution that faculty already are subject to repeated and periodic evaluations by supervisors, students, and peers, not only through the current PROF system, but also through such means as the Student Assessment of Teaching (every course, every term), peer evaluations of teaching, reviews for merit raises, reviews of articles or books submitted for publication, artistic exhibits or musical performances, grant applications (internal and external), conference papers, and intensive institutional and external reviews for promotion.

4. Post-Tenure Review at Other Institutions

It was not the goal of the Task Force to produce a comprehensive survey of post-tenure review systems throughout the U.S. Such a survey would perhaps be of academic interest but would not advance the mission of the Task Force. Instead, we gathered limited information on the review systems in place at other OUS institutions as well as at a few institutions comparable to OSU in mission or status.

University of Oregon. Reviews are conducted every five years by an elected standing committee in the unit consisting of three or more tenured faculty, but a proposal is under discussion to change to a three-year cycle. Copies of the written review are sent to the faculty member and the appropriate administrators, and the faculty member is permitted to submit a written response within 30 days. Consequences of a negative review include: reallocation of departmental assignments to facilitate improvement in teaching or research, access to a center for improvement of instruction or scholarship, and personal counseling. Action for dismissal for cause may be taken only after adequate opportunities for improvement and a second negative review. Alternatives include altered career plan counseling or early retirement opportunities.

Portland State University. Because the PSU faculty are covered by a collective bargaining agreement, the post-tenure review procedures are more strictly specified than at other institutions that do not have a faculty union. At PSU, the reviews are conducted by a committee of three faculty selected by appropriate procedures in the academic unit. Reviews are conducted at least every five

years. The faculty member submits a c.v. and narrative review of past accomplishments and future plans, and then meets with the review committee for an informal and confidential discussion. Prior to the meeting the faculty member may notify the committee of the need for additional institutional support for continued professional growth, in which case the committee and the individual determine a formal professional development plan.

University of Washington, Washington State University. There is at present no post-tenure review, but committees have been formed and the process is under discussion.

University of Kentucky. The rationale and purpose of the evaluation process are clearly and eloquently described. Each department is expected to develop performance expectations for its faculty. After these performance expectations are reviewed by the Dean to assure conformity with the mission of the College, they are used as the basis for evaluating faculty performance. Reviews are conducted biennially, alternating with years in which regular merit reviews are conducted. Faculty may request a professional review or may be selected for a review if their merit reviews are below a pre-determined level. The review is conducted by an ad hoc three- member faculty panel appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair and the faculty member. The faculty member may avoid the review by changing the position description to reduce the deficient area to no more than 25% of the professional duties. If the review reveals chronic and substantial deficiencies, a professional development plan is created to address the deficiencies. Progress in satisfying the plan is reviewed annually for three years.

University of Texas - Austin. Faculty are reviewed annually, and a comprehensive review is conducted every five years by a faculty committee at the departmental level. Upon request, the faculty member is provided with an opportunity to meet with the review committee. The findings of the review committee are communicated in writing to the faculty member and the Dean by the Department Chair. If the result of the review is unsatisfactory, the Dean may appoint a peer committee to conduct a more intensive review, or the faculty member may request a more intensive review. If the review identifies areas in which additional support would benefit the faculty member's performance, the evaluation may be used to provide the motivation for such support. If the evaluation reveals unsatisfactory performance, review for termination for cause may be considered. The procedure lacks specificity on the source of the support for improvement of performance and on the monitoring procedure to evaluate improvement.

Arizona State University. Annual reviews of faculty are conducted by the unit head and/or a peer committee based on performance during the preceding three years. The review is conducted at the departmental level, but the Dean and a committee of two faculty from other units in the college review the performance ratings of 20% of the faculty each year as a monitor of the effectiveness of the process. A more intensive review may be requested by the faculty member or is mandatory if the annual performance evaluation is unsatisfactory. Deficient performance in one area triggers a faculty development plan to be completed in one year. Deficient performance in several areas or failure to complete the development plan results in a performance improvement plan, under which deficient teaching must be remedied in one year and deficient research in no more than three years. If the faculty member refuses to enter the performance improvement process, or if the goals of the performance improvement plan are not satisfied within the allotted time, the unit head may initiate dismissal for cause.

Kansas State University. Faculty in each department develop a set of minimum acceptable performance criteria. Faculty whose performance falls below these criteria are notified in writing by the unit head, who suggests a course of action for improvement. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member reports on specific evidence of improvement and progress toward fulfilling the improvement plan. As an alternative, the unit head and the faculty member may mutually agree to a reassignment of duties to eliminate the area of deficient performance from the faculty member's responsibility. If a faculty member fails to meet the minimum standards in two successive years, or in three years out of any five-year period, then dismissal for cause will be considered.

University of Illinois. Faculty members are reviewed every seven years. The reviews are based on annual reports submitted by the faculty member and are conducted by faculty committees selected within each academic unit. Faculty under review may submit additional documentation and will be given the opportunity to meet with the review committee. The review committee submits a written report to the unit head, which draws attention to insufficiently recognized merit, to changes in interests or activities that may call for adjustments in duties, or to other areas of concern. The unit head communicates the substance of the report to the faculty member. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, the unit head meets with the faculty member to determine whether additional institutional support is necessary to remedy the deficiencies. A written plan, signed by both parties,

is developed with explicit expectations and timely benchmarks. The plan is monitored as a part of future annual and periodic reviews. If a plan cannot be agreed upon, or if the agreed upon plan has been ineffective, the unit head or other appropriate administrators will consider more severe remedies, including mediation, reassignment of duties, or the initiation of sanction proceedings.

5. Post-Tenure Review and Academic Freedom

It is no coincidence that the resurgence of national interest in post-tenure review has been accompanied by investigations of and outright attacks on faculty tenure by the governing boards and state legislatures responsible for managing institutions of higher education. Therefore it is appropriate that any study of post-tenure review consider the effect of the review process on academic freedom and the extent to which the process affects the granting of and preservation of tenure itself.

Post-tenure review is not a recently developed process. The National Commission on Higher Education Issues in 1982 argued for a peer review system as a means of protecting tenure. However, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors approved and the AAUP Council adopted the following statement on post-tenure review in 1983:

The Association believes that periodic formal institutional evaluation of each postprobationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom.

The Association emphasizes that no procedure for evaluation of faculty should be used to weaken or undermine the principles of academic freedom and tenure. The Association cautions particularly against allowing any general system of evaluation to be used as grounds for dismissal or other disciplinary sanctions.

Given this statement's lack of enthusiasm for post-tenure review, it is no surprise that a 1989 survey of members of the prestigious American Association of Universities revealed only 3% with specific post-tenure review policies in place. However, by 1996 a wider national survey of public and private institutions showed 61% with post-tenure review programs.

What is responsible for this turnaround? The actual causes may be varied, but a significant share must be allocated to the widespread and persistent challenges to tenure itself, many of which come from elected or appointed officials charged with the management of higher education institutions, such as state legislators or members of boards of regents. Reports in the popular media of challenges to tenure in the public higher education systems of Minnesota, Texas, and Kansas have alarmed many faculty while encouraging officials in other states to pursue similar adventures.

Related attacks on the tenure system have come from those who urge the adoption by higher education institutions of a more "business-like" operating system, which demands greater flexibility in re-assigning or terminating professional staff. Criticisms of tenure have even come from within higher education itself, including such authorities as the president of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and a leading member of the faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Finally, many faculty who are best served by the tenure system may fail to appreciate its benefits--a 1989 survey of 5000 faculty by the Carnegie Association for the Advancement of Teaching revealed that 32% of all faculty and 39% of younger faculty agreed with the statement: "Abolition of tenure would, on the whole, improve the quality of higher education."

It is of course self-serving for a faculty document to offer a strong defense of tenure. Nevertheless, any enhanced system of post-tenure review must be based on a reaffirmation of tenure as essential to the institution. Tenure serves both the individual and the institution, and by serving the institution it especially serves the citizens of the State of Oregon. With the award of tenure, the University commits itself to a faculty member in a unique way, and the faculty member acquires a vested interest in the well-being of the institution. Tenure is awarded only after an extensive probationary period, during which the highest standards of scholarship, teaching, and service must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of local peers as well as internationally recognized experts. The granting of tenure is not a license for lifetime employment but an acknowledgment of the likelihood of continued excellence, and post-tenure review can assure that this high level of performance is sustained.

Alternatives to tenure have been proposed, but none has yet been implemented or evaluated in an institution similar to OSU, with the complex mission of teaching that characterizes a land-grant and Carnegie I institution. For instance, under a system of extended contracts, faculty would likely be more concerned with pleasing administrators than with freely pursuing self-determined research and teaching goals. Such an arrangement might serve short-term and short-sighted objectives but would be destructive in the long term, both to students and to the University's mission to serve regional, national, and international communities.

Tenure serves faculty, students, the institution, and the State of Oregon in vital ways:
*Tenure is crucial as the principal guarantor of faculty excellence, fostered by mutual commitment

and collegially determined standards.

- *Tenure enhances shared governance and faculty participation in institutional committees and councils.

- *Tenure provides the continuity that enables curriculum development and research programs of long duration.

- *Tenure enables the unfettered pursuit of research that enhances our quality of life, such as through more efficient agriculture, wiser stewardship of natural resources, improved technology for

business and consumers, or a better understanding of human behavior and motivations.

- *The tenure review is rigorous and occurs early in the faculty member's career, when it is still possible to pursue alternative careers if necessary.

- *Tenure is awarded based on demonstrated and sustained excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service that is recognized and praised by internationally acknowledged experts.

- *Students and citizens of the State are the principal beneficiaries of the committed, highly motivated, and intellectually free faculty that tenure helps to create.

A perusal of the higher-education literature reveals no evidence that systems of post-tenure review have interfered with academic freedom. The movement toward more highly formalized post-tenure review is too recent for its influence to have become fully realized. Nevertheless, advocates and opponents of tenure in general have made claims that are relevant to the relationship of post-tenure review to academic freedom: some argue that first-amendment guarantees of free speech protect academic freedom regardless of tenure, while others respond that the first amendment is inadequate to protect academic freedom and that there are many activities in which faculty engage (such as curriculum development and choice of research projects) that fall outside the protections of "free speech."

In the absence of certainty about the effect of post-tenure review on academic freedom, it remains clear that faculty on campuses where post-tenure review is being adopted are concerned about the potential threat to academic freedom, and this concern can be as dampening on free expression as an actual threat. It is essential, therefore, that new guidelines for post-tenure review at OSU include explicit guarantees that academic freedom will be protected. Included in this guarantee must be procedures for grievances and assurance of due process.

In the process of rethinking post-tenure review, we should also reaffirm basic principles of academic freedom:

- *Academic freedom entails not only the ability to say certain kinds of things, but also an environment in which free inquiry and expression are assumed and encouraged.

- *Faculty must continue to have the freedom (and encouragement) to take risks, both in research and teaching, without the fear of failure.

*Faculty must continue to have the freedom to ask inconvenient questions and to challenge prevailing values.

*Academic freedom is a right of all faculty, tenured or untenured.

*One of the responsibilities of senior and tenured faculty is to guarantee the academic freedom of junior and untenured colleagues.

*It is also the responsibility of all faculty to insure the academic freedom of their students.

The growth in implementation of post-tenure review programs throughout the U.S. and the corresponding need to verify that such programs protect the academic freedom that has so well

erved American higher education have led the AAUP to revisit its 1983 statement. Committee A

has once again undertaken a study of post-tenure review and has issued a report that was approved

by the AAUP Council in 1997 (and published in the September-October 1997 issue of *Academe*).

The report offers a dialogue of contrasting views on post-tenure review and academic freedom. After

suggesting that perhaps the best review procedure may be the one that is already in place in the

academy, it continues as follows:

If a more formal system of post-tenure review is to be added, we believe that it should have a predominant if not exclusive emphasis upon faculty development rather than upon disciplinary sanctions. Such an emphasis, if properly buttressed by institutional resources without adversely affecting other aspects of the academic program, can in many instances result in discernible improvement in faculty performance across all quality and seniority levels, with a resulting enhancement of collegiality and institutional strength--with little or no real or perceived dilution of academic freedom or tenure.

The report suggests certain benefits of a strong review system to the institution, especially if adequate safeguards are in place. This paragraph clearly differs from the first paragraph of the

1983 document quoted above. The philosophy of the second paragraph of the 1983 policy is (and

should be) preserved: the system of post-tenure review should not weaken academic freedom, and

the outcome of the evaluation must not be used exclusively as grounds for dismissal. The 1997

AAUP report concludes with a description of the standards for an effective post-tenure review system.

To its credit, the Task Force independently developed a similar set of standards more than six months before the AAUP document was issued.

6. Characteristics of an Effective Post-Tenure Review System

It is in the faculty's interest to establish and direct an effective post-tenure review system to foster

excellence, maintain accountability, and continue the tradition of shared governance. Our system

should preserve the familiar and workable aspects of the PROF system while taking advantage of the outcomes of the national debate on post-tenure review and the experiences of other institutions.

To this end, we offer the following standards and characteristics of an ideal post-tenure review system:

(1) A system of post-tenure review is based on the general agreement that tenure is essential to institutional quality in teaching, research, and service.

(2) The post-tenure review process must serve to protect and enhance academic freedom. To ensure that enhanced review procedures do not lead to self-censorship, avoidance of risk-taking, and inhibition of free inquiry, it is essential that OSU's process be adopted by the faculty after widespread discussion throughout the institution. The success of the PROF system depends on the participation and acceptance by the faculty at large.

(3) Post-tenure review should not be a "retenuing" process--its primary goal should be formative, rather than summative or punitive. That is, it should focus more on development than on evaluation.

There must be options for early intervention for career redirection and institutionally supported opportunities for professional development in teaching and scholarship.

(4) Post-tenure review should in no way be linked to fiscal policy or budgetary management. Independent procedures for financial exigency already exist. There should be no connection between post-tenure review and "re-engineering" or "downsizing" the institution.

(5) There must be a clearly written and widely circulated statement describing the motivation for the process, the review procedure, and the possible outcomes.

(6) The purpose should be to recognize and foster excellence, to help good faculty become better, and to identify and help underachieving faculty fulfill the potential that was recognized upon hiring and reaffirmed upon the award of tenure.

(7) The system should seek to identify and reward meritorious performance as well as to correct deficient performance.

(8) Review criteria must be established at the unit level, and the review of individuals must be based on the distribution of effort detailed in their position descriptions. Reference should be made to the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for descriptions of faculty responsibilities in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, and service.

(9) There must be clearly described appeal and grievance procedures at each stage of the review and remediation process.

(10) The process must be implemented with greater faculty involvement than the present PROF

system. Just as faculty committees at the unit level are involved in hiring decisions and in promotion

and tenure reviews, so they should be central to the process of post-tenure review.

(11) As a corollary to the above, the process must involve minimal time commitment by the faculty

under review as well as by the members of the review committee.

(12) There must be training for faculty and unit heads in administering the process, fostering constructive formative evaluations, and writing appropriate reviews for documentation.

(13) A review that reveals deficient performance should trigger the creation of a professional development plan by mutual agreement of the peer committee, unit head, and faculty member under

review. This plan should include realistic goals and expectations, specific activities to be undertaken,

a timeline, an understanding of the resources to be provided to facilitate the achievement of the goals,

a process for follow-up and mentoring, and a statement of the consequences of inadequate progress. A reasonable time interval must be allowed for the goals to be achieved, with annual

reviews of progress.

(14) Institutional resources must be available to assist faculty in meeting the goals of the development plan, with continued investment in individuals who respond positively to such intervention. Such resources might include support for scholarly professional activities

(travel, time

released from teaching, equipment, clerical or technical support, graduate assistants, laboratory or

other workspace, etc.) and a program for the improvement of teaching.

(15) The consequences of repeated unsatisfactory reviews and failure to conform to an agreed-upon

development plan must be described in the University's and the unit's guidelines, for example:

reduction in rank or salary, redistribution of effort, reassignment within the institution, early retirement,

or tenure buy-out. The additional procedure for invoking these consequences must be specified,

including provisions for mediation, due process, and rights of appeal. The ultimate sanction, dismissal

for cause, can be invoked only after appropriate due process following approved institutional and

system guidelines and with significant factual evidence to support this extreme step.

(16) A plan must be developed to monitor and evaluate the post-tenure review process at regular

intervals. The criteria for this evaluation should include the extent to which it serves individuals as

well as the institution.

7. Recommendations for Improving the PROF System

The basic procedural aspects of OSU's PROF system are generally viewed as workable but lacking the necessary formative structure that should characterize an effective post-tenure review

process. We believe that relatively minor modifications of the PROF system could substantially

increase the effectiveness of the process. To that end we offer the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The description of the PROF system in the Faculty Handbook should be expanded to include a stronger justification for the process and a detailed description of the consequences of satisfactory and unsatisfactory reviews.

Recommendation 2: The Provost should call for the development of written unit-level policies and procedures for implementing the PROF system. Faculty input must occur in the development of these policies and procedures.

Recommendation 3: The Provost's office should provide training for colleges and departments in conducting and administering the review process.

Recommendation 4: Heads of academic units (usually the department head or chair, but possibly the dean in colleges with no departments or the staff chair in off-campus Extension offices) shall be responsible for conducting an annual review of all faculty in their units. As in the present PROF system, the unit head will provide a written evaluation to the faculty member, who may attach a rebuttal or explanation. Peer involvement in this process is strongly encouraged; for example, a committee of peers could review the dossiers and written reviews with the unit head to ensure fairness, balance, and conformity with the unit's mission.

Recommendation 5: At intervals of no longer than five years, in addition to the annual review by the unit head each tenured faculty member will be reviewed by a peer committee of faculty from the academic unit. (A promotion or tenure review that leads to a full peer evaluation at the unit level will satisfy this requirement.) Where appropriate, faculty members from outside the unit may be included on the peer committee. Written evaluations from the peer committee and the unit head will be provided to the faculty member, who may attach comments, explanations, or rebuttal.

Recommendation 6: At any time during the five-year interval between regularly scheduled peer committee reviews, a faculty member or the unit head may request a peer committee review if either deems it beneficial to the professional development of the faculty member.

Recommendation 7: Copies of all reviews will be forwarded by the unit head to the Dean of the College or to the appropriate academic supervisor.

Recommendation 8: Should the peer committee conclude that a faculty member's record is less than satisfactory in teaching, scholarship, or service, a professional development plan will be drafted by the peer committee, the unit head, and the faculty member under review. This plan should include definite steps to be taken to remedy the specific perceived deficiencies. A timetable of no

longer than three years should be provided to accomplish the goals of the plan, with annual monitoring to measure progress. The plan must specify the resources to be made available to accomplish the goals. The institution's PROF guidelines will specify the consequences of repeated negative reviews or failure to complete the goals of the development plan.

Recommendation 9: The Faculty Senate will periodically review the effectiveness of the PROF process.

Selected References

"Can Post-Tenure Review Help Us Save the Tenure System?", Richard Edwards, *Academe*, May- June 1997, p. 26.

"On Post-Tenure Review," *Academe*, Sept-Oct 1997, p. 44.

"Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, Precautions," Christine M. Licata and Joseph C. Morreale, American Association for Higher Education, 1997.

<http://www2.ncsu.edu/ncsu/provost/info/uncga/ptr/REFLICA.HTM>

<http://www.case.org/flshfils/tenubib.htm>