

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY AFTER THE
AWARD OF TENURE**

Agenda item E4: Dated November 24, 2014

Adopted by the PSU Faculty Senate *pending*

- I. Preamble**
- II. Principles to Guide the Post Tenure Review Process**
- III. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility**
- IV. Departmental Authority and Responsibility**
- V. Procedures for Post Tenure Review**
- VI. Administrative Roles and Procedure with a Committee finding of Satisfactory**
- VII. The Professional Development Plan (PDP)**
- VIII. Post Tenure review of Tenured Faculty with Administrative Appointments**

I. Preamble

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay. By awarding tenure, Portland State University has already recognized its obligation to invest in and support the lifelong careers of its faculty and their academic portfolio. The goal of post-tenure review is to reward and motivate faculty engagement in their scholarly agendas, not to monitor and sanction, with the understanding that an individual's academic portfolio will evolve over the course of a career. The purpose of post-tenure review is to support and maintain a vibrant and committed faculty who contribute, in their individual ways, to the mission of the university and the excellence of the institution.

Society entrusts individual professors in its institutions of higher education with tasks of immense importance: the education of its people; the search for knowledge, wherever that search may lead; and the use of knowledge to help individuals and institutions in society progress and improve. To perform these tasks well requires a lifetime commitment to the profession of the scholar. To persuade the best scholars to devote their lives to this profession, the University guarantees them a healthy measure of freedom in their professional lives. The protection of that freedom -- which is called academic freedom -- is both the precondition to excellence in the professoriate and the precondition to the education of continuing generations of free citizens, in a free society. Therefore, academic freedom is guaranteed not primarily to benefit the professors, but to ensure benefits to society as a whole. The primary method by which academic freedom is guaranteed is through a conditional grant of tenure with indefinite term.

The focus of a faculty member's professional activities may shift over time. The nationally recognized criteria for obtaining indefinite tenure place approximately equal emphasis on demonstrated excellence in teaching and research, and considerably less emphasis on outreach and service. As tenured faculty progress through their careers, however, some may redirect their energies. Tenured faculty may, for example, devote proportionately more time to teaching, advising, administration, and university service than they did as assistant professors. Consequently, expectations for -- and the goals of -- individual faculty members may also change, as reflected in the individual's scholarly agenda. If, for example, it is in the faculty member's, department's and University's best interests to have a tenured faculty member focus more on teaching and service than upon research, post-tenure review for that faculty member should emphasize, acknowledge, and reward those areas. Furthermore, individual faculty members have a responsibility to work with their unit to ensure that the unit functions as a whole, that all faculty members have the opportunity for professional development in areas of importance to them, and that the burden of service is distributed consciously within the unit. A key aspect of this program is therefore the collaborative establishment of a scholarly agenda for each faculty member under review.

II. Principles to Guide the Post Tenure Review Process

The Faculty adopts the following principles to guide the post tenure review process and any policies created by school/colleges and departments from its mandate. These principles are included to satisfy the requirements of the accrediting bodies and authorities cited in the Post Tenure Review Implementation document (*forthcoming*).

The process shall:

- A. Be developed by faculty
- B. Uphold academic freedom
- C. Promote excellence of the institution*
- D. Not be a re-evaluation of tenure
- E. Apply equally to all faculty who have been awarded tenure
- F. Motivate and acknowledge faculty contributions to the University, help with faculty retention and mitigate salary compression for senior tenured faculty
- G. Support faculty development and provide institutional resources for faculty development
- H. Involve the faculty member being evaluated in the process
- I. Provide the opportunity for faculty to respond to evaluations orally and in writing as well as to appeal such evaluations
- J. Not be onerous for the faculty member being reviewed, the committee, the chair, or the administration
- K. Provide raises based on satisfactory review
- L. Not penalize faculty for unsatisfactory review
- M. Not supplant or serve as a supplemental to any merit pay, cost of living or compression adjustment salary increases negotiated through collective bargaining with AAUP-PSU+
- N. Not be used as cause for sanctions against a faculty member.
- O. Not intrude on an individual faculty member's proper sphere of professional self-direction nor be used for programmatic change

III. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility

Tenured faculty members shall undergo post tenure review every five years after the award of tenure. Promotions in rank shall be considered as reviews and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post tenure review.

All tenured faculty members, including faculty members holding administrative positions with administrative appointments of 0.65 FTE or less shall undergo post tenure review.

OAA shall be responsible for creating a list of tenured faculty who are eligible for review with the year of the review scheduled with regard to the year of the last review. [ADD deferral ?] Faculty members subject to post tenure review in an academic year shall be notified in accordance with the timelines in Article VI.

IV. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

- A. The primary responsibility for documenting and assessing an individual faculty member's contributions rests with the faculty of the department or unit. Therefore, each department or unit shall establish in its departmental/unit Promotion & Tenure Guidelines the procedures and criteria for the post tenure review to be used for recommendation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on the review. Departments/ units must ensure that their guidelines are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Post Tenure Review Guidelines, which have priority. In addition, the criteria used for post tenure review must be consistent with college or school policies which must be consistent with the PSU Promotion & Tenure Guidelines.
- B. Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of departmental procedures and criteria, then he/she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his/her objections ~~or~~ and recommendations to the Provost for resolution.
- C. After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the Dean. Department chairs shall distribute these guidelines to new tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.
- D. In cases where a faculty member's appointment is equally divided between two or more departments or involves interdisciplinary teaching, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is responsible for post tenure review and how the other department(s) are to contribute to that review, and the faculty member is to be so informed.
- E. In schools that do not have departments, the faculty in the academic discipline will establish its post tenure review guidelines: 1) to ensure that the criteria to be used for recommendations of satisfactory or unsatisfactory fit the scholarly agenda for members being reviewed, 2) establish criteria that are consistent with the criteria set forth in the University's post tenure review guidelines, which have priority, and 3) provide for faculty members the ability to choose committee members for the review from academic disciplines closely aligned with their scholarly agenda.

V. Procedures for Post Tenure Review

- A. OAA shall forward the list of faculty members eligible for review in any given year to the Dean of the School/College where they have their principal appointment.
- B. The Dean of the School/College shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the chair of their respective departments.
- C. The department chair notifies the faculty in their department who are eligible for the review. In schools without department chairs, the Dean shall notify the faculty members directly.
- D. Faculty Member Role

1. Upon notification that he or she is subject to post tenure review the faculty member shall compile a dossier that contains the following materials:
 - i. Current curriculum vitae.
 - ii. Narrative/documentation of work done since last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) with regard to his or her scholarly agenda.
 - iii. Scholarly Agenda. If the scholarly agenda has changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain the revised scholarly agenda.
 - iv. Quantitative summaries of student evaluations (where available).
 - v. Names of faculty that the faculty member being reviewed has asked and who have agreed to serve on his/her post tenure review committee.
 - vi. Any additional materials required by the guidelines of the department/unit.
 - vii. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that-he/she feels are relevant for the review.
- E. The Post Tenure Review Committee
1. Composition
 - i. The committee shall be comprised of three people; two selected by the faculty member being reviewed and one by the department chair. The three members shall select a chair.
 - ii. Committee members shall be selected from tenured faculty (including emeritus or retired faculty), whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's scholarly agenda.
 - iii. Faculty members whose work is multi-disciplinary may select one committee member from outside the university whose work aligns with the faculty member's scholarly agenda.
 - iv. Should any faculty member selected to serve on a post tenure committee be unavailable to serve, the faculty member under review shall propose a new committee member.
 - v. The department chair's nominee should be mutually acceptable to the faculty member being reviewed and the chair of the department.
 2. Committee Responsibility and Review Criteria
 - i. The committee shall review the faculty member's dossier and all submitted materials in preparation for its meeting with the faculty member.
 - ii. At the meeting, the committee and the faculty member shall discuss the faculty member's past work and future plans in the dimensions of research, teaching, outreach, and service with regard to the scholarly agenda. Prior to the committee meeting, committee members may contact the faculty member and seek clarification about submitted materials. Any clarification provided by the faculty

- member before or at the meeting shall be provided to all committee members and will become part of the faculty member's dossier.
- iii. The committee shall meet and discuss the faculty member's dossier with the faculty member. After the meeting, the committee shall discuss the faculty member's materials, and the information provided by the faculty member at the meeting. The committee's review shall focus on the faculty member's teaching, research, outreach, and service while considering the factors that the faculty member has identified that contributed to his or her record of contributions (see iv below). The committee's overarching review shall focus on whether the faculty member performed in a manner consistent with his or her scholarly agenda. The committee shall use the criteria below for their review:
 - a. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements, as applicable (Research)
 - b. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching)
 - c. Community Outreach (Outreach)
 - d. Service to the department, school, university and profession/academic community with attention to the leadership roles and accomplishments in administration, governance, or for the academic community (Service)
 - iv. The committee shall consider situational and circumstantial factors that affect a tenured faculty member's contributions if the faculty member in his/her narrative explains their significance during the review period. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career:
 - a. The faculty member's teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation required for forms of instruction such as online teaching.
 - b. Time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of teaching, research, outreach or service.
 - c. The level of resources and number of assistants provided to the faculty member in support of his/her teaching, research, outreach or service.
 - d. Increased departmental service as a consequence of the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty whose assignment to service cannot exceed 10% of their workload.
 - e. Departmental circumstances such as deaths, injuries or illnesses, crises, or transitions, or other circumstances that had impact on the member's work situation.

- f. Personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances in the faculty member's life or the faculty member's family; that had impact on the member's work.
3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee's findings shall be determined by the majority. The committee chair shall report the findings of the committee in writing, unless the chair of the committee was the minority vote in the decision, in which case the report shall be written by one of the majority votes, as selected by the committee. The committee may find that:
 - i. the faculty member's contributions are satisfactory if they meet the standards of quality set forth above;
 - ii. the faculty member's contributions are unsatisfactory if they are less than consistent with the standards of quality. If the Committee finds the faculty member's contributions to be unsatisfactory, the committee report shall provide the elements of the committee's criteria the committee felt were not met and provide evidence.
4. The committee's report shall be provided to the faculty member directly prior to the report being forwarded to the Chair or the Dean. If the faculty member questions the committee's recommendation, he/she may appeal that recommendation as in Section H below.

F. Role of the Department Chair

1. The department chair must assure that the faculty member's post tenure review committee has followed departmental, school/college, and university post tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member's scholarly agenda, and that the committee's appraisals are complete and in proper form.
2. Department chair shall review materials submitted by the faculty member and the post tenure review committee.
3. Department chair shall write a letter finding the faculty member's contributions satisfactory or unsatisfactory based upon the criteria in the Departmental Post Tenure Review Guidelines, considering the situational and circumstantial factors above and the faculty member's scholarly agenda. If the department chair finds the faculty member's contributions to be unsatisfactory, the chair must explain and document which criteria the chair feels were not being met.
4. The department chair's letter must be sent to faculty member within 10 working days from the transmittal of the committee's report.
5. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the department chair's letter before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost and should indicate s/he has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1.

6. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the Post Tenure Review committee and the department chair. If a faculty member questions the department chair's recommendation, he/she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendation prior to the recommendations being sent to the Dean/Provost as described below.
7. Department chairs must make a separate recommendation for each member of the department being reviewed.
8. In units where there are no departments, the department chair role may be filled by an area director or other person who is charged with the leadership role for the academic discipline.

G. Procedures for Reconsideration of the Committee's Decision

1. Within 10 working days of receipt of the committee's report, the faculty member must write a request for reconsideration to the committee chair.
2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair within 10 working days of a request for reconsideration.
3. In their reconsideration, committee members must consider all materials presented by the faculty member for the reconsideration.
4. The committee chair must report in writing the results of the committee's reconsideration. The report may include additional documentation or statements that bear on its recommendation.
5. Should the committee reverse its original decision and find the faculty member's contributions satisfactory, the committee shall write a report with their new finding and attach it with the original report with the faculty member's request for reconsideration, and forward all materials to the department chair.
6. Should the committee reaffirm its finding of unsatisfactory, the chair of the committee shall notify the faculty member and request they propose a Professional Development Plan to remediate the unsatisfactory review in accordance with Article VI below.

H. Procedures for Reconsideration of Decisions by the Department Chair

1. Within 10 working days of receipt of department chair's report, the faculty member must write a request for reconsideration to the Department chair.
2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair within 10 working days of the request for reconsideration.
3. In his or her reconsideration, the chair committee must consider all materials presented by the faculty member for the reconsideration.

4. The chair must report in writing the results of his or her reconsideration. The report may include additional documentation or statements that bear on his/her recommendation.
 5. Should the department chair reverse his or her original decision and find the faculty member's contributions satisfactory, the department chair shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with the original report and the faculty member's submission, and forward all materials to the Dean.
 6. Should the department chair reaffirm his/her finding of unsatisfactory, the chair shall notify the faculty member and request they propose a Professional Development Plan to remediate the unsatisfactory review in accordance with Article VI below
- I. Procedure if the department chair and the post tenure review committee disagree after reconsideration.
 1. The faculty member requesting reconsideration is notified of the disagreement between the Post Tenure Review Committee and/or the department chair by the chair
 2. The faculty member's materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her decision prior to the faculty member's development of a PDP.
 - J. Procedure in the event of an unsatisfactory post tenure review that is not challenged.
 1. Within 10 days of notification of an unsatisfactory review, the faculty member shall propose a Professional Development Plan to remediate unsatisfactory review in accordance with Article VI below.

VI. Administrative Roles and Procedures

A. Chair's Report to the Dean

1. The department chair must submit to the Dean
 - i. A completed and signed recommendation form for each faculty member reviewed,
 - ii. the Post Tenure Review committee's and the department chair's written reports for all faculty members who have received satisfactory or unsatisfactory reviews
 - iii. If a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member's request, the materials submitted and the reconsideration reviews done by department chair and/or the committee.
 - iv. A list of faculty members who were asked to propose a Professional Development Plan (PDP) by the department chair after the committee and/or department chair determined contributions unsatisfactory
 - v. The chair must inform the Dean when the committee and the department chair do not agree and provide an explanation to the

Dean regarding the reasons for the disagreement and the need for a PDP for all such faculty.

B. Role of Dean or Equivalent Administrator

1. The Dean shall provide to the Provost a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed.
2. The Dean may create an advisory group for review and evaluation of the recommendations from the department chairs and post tenure review committees. The size and composition of this group shall be at the discretion of the Dean.
3. The Dean's review shall include a review of all materials submitted to the committee and the department chair including the department's post tenure review guidelines.
4. The Dean shall affirm the recommendation of the post tenure committee and the chair that the faculty member's contributions are either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
5. The Dean must report his or her finding in writing. If the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the post tenure committee and/or the chair, he or she must explain and document which criteria in the department's post-tenure guidelines were not being met.
6. The Dean's review shall be reported within 5 working days to the appropriate department chair, the chair of the post tenure review committee, and the faculty member. In addition to his/her report, the Dean shall provide the faculty member with a copy of any material added to the file.
7. If the Dean finds that the faculty member's contributions unsatisfactory, the department chair, chair of the committee, and/or the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the Dean's recommendation. The conference must be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost.
8. If upon reconsideration the Dean reverses his or her original decision and find the faculty member's contributions satisfactory, the Dean shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with ~~attach~~ the original report ~~with~~ and the request and forward all materials to the Provost.
9. The Dean shall reconsider his/her review and either find the review satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The Dean shall provide the faculty member with any new material added to the file within 5 working days. The faculty member shall have 5 days to attach a statement to the Dean's final letter. The faculty member's request for reconsideration and final statement shall be attached to the Dean's report when the entire packet of materials is submitted to the Provost.
10. If the Dean's recommendation follows a committee finding of satisfactory and a department chair's finding of unsatisfactory, the Dean's decision of

satisfactory shall move the review materials to the Provost. The Dean's decision of unsatisfactory will refer the faculty member to the PDP.

C. Role of the Provost

1. The Provost shall review for each faculty member reviewed the materials forwarded by the Deans. In so doing, the Provost shall determine whether recommendations are consistent with the PSU post tenure guidelines. If she or he has questions arise concerning a recommendation, the Provost shall consult with the Dean and may consult with other appropriate persons.
2. The Provost shall notify each faculty member, the chair, and the Dean in writing of his or her decision affirming the recommendation of the Dean.
3. If the Provost finds a faculty member's review unsatisfactory after the Dean has found the faculty member's review satisfactory, the Provost must provide in her letter an explanation for the disagreement with evidence, and the faculty member shall be referred to the PDP.
4. A faculty member who requests a reconsideration of the Provost's decision must do so in writing within ten days of the notification and may add additional evidence to the file. If requested, the faculty member shall have a conference with the Provost. Only after the requested conference is held shall the Provost make a final recommendation to the president.
5. If after the post tenure review committee, department chair, or the Dean found the faculty member's review unsatisfactory and Provost finds the faculty member's review was satisfactory, the Provost shall advise the department chair that the PDP should be suspended.

D. Role of the President

1. After receiving a report of the outcome of a reconsideration requested by a faculty member of the Provost's decision, the president shall make a final decision of the review as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
2. Appeals of the president's final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OAR 577-42-005).

VII. **The Professional Development Plan (PDP)**

A. Purpose and Objective:

1. A Professional Development Plan (PDP) is a plan of investment and mentoring for the purpose of career development. It is available to a faculty member whose post tenure review is unsatisfactory. It is developed by the faculty member in collaboration with the post tenure review committee.
2. The PDP can be from one year to five years in duration as deemed appropriate.
3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member's scholarly agenda.

4. PDPs that have been developed consistent with this process will be funded. If funding for the PDP is not available, the PDP shall be deemed completed and the faculty member shall be deemed to have had a satisfactory review.
- B. Role of the Department Chair in approving the PDP
1. Once the Faculty member and the post tenure review committee finalize the PDP, the plan shall be forwarded to the department chair for review. The department chair shall discuss the PDP with the faculty member. If the Department Chair agrees with the PDP as proposed, the he/she shall sign a form accompanying the PDP (Appendix B), and the PDP along with the form will be sent to the Dean. Should the Department Chair call for modification of the PDP, he/she shall discuss the requested changes with the faculty member. If the faculty member agrees, a revised PDP shall be drafted and a form (Appendix B) will be signed by both the faculty member and the Department Chair, and the PDP will be forwarded to the Dean.
 2. If the faculty member does not agree to the requested modifications, then the chair of post tenure review committee or designee shall mediate a compromise so that a PDP can be effectuated.
- C. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP
1. The Dean and the faculty member shall discuss the PDP. If the Dean agrees with the PDP, the Dean shall sign the PDP in a signature line provided on the PDP. Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the faculty member. If the faculty member agrees, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the Dean, whereupon PDP funds will be allocated.
 2. If the faculty member does not agree to the requested modifications, it is expected that both the Dean and the faculty member will compromise to find a solution but the compromise shall not compromise the faculty member's academic freedom for research and teaching, nor shall it require the faculty member to change their scholarly agenda. The PDP shall be forwarded to the Provost.
- D. Role of the Provost in approving the PDP
1. The Provost shall determine whether the PDP is in conformity with the Administrative Rules, consistent with the institutional guidelines, reasonably uniform with regard to University standards, and in accordance with required procedures.
 2. If questions arise concerning a recommendation, the Provost shall consult with the Dean and may consult with other appropriate persons. If the Provost approves the PDP, they shall forward it to the President. If the Provost does not approve the PDP, it shall be returned to the Dean with reasons for the decision and request modification. Any requested modifications shall remain consistent with the faculty member's scholarly agenda and uphold the faculty member's academic freedom. The Dean and

faculty member shall meet and reach a compromise and the revisions and submit the revision to the Provost. The Provost shall then approve the PDP.

E. Progress and Resolution of the PDP

1. The department chair (or the Post Tenure Review committee chair in units where there is no department chair) shall meet with the faculty member annually to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions needed. Revisions will be consistent with the faculty member's scholarly agenda and shall respect the faculty member's academic freedom. Significant revisions may be discussed with the faculty member's post tenure review committee and shall be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.
2. If the faculty member wishes to obtain an extension of the PDP timeframe and/or requires additional funding, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination in favor or against the faculty member's request in a timely manner. If the department chair supports the faculty member's request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean. If the Department Chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination. The Dean and the faculty member shall meet and discuss the revision and reach a compromise that satisfies the need for revision and the need for being consistent with the faculty member's scholarly agenda and their academic freedom.
3. After the PDP is complete, the faculty member shall submit a narrative report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to determine if there is agreement that the objectives of the PDP have been reached. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the department chair shall sign (on a form designated for PDP completion) and forward the form and the faculty member's report to the Dean. If the department chair does not agree that the objectives have been reached, the faculty member, the department chair, and the chair of the post tenure committee (or designee for the PDP) shall meet to discuss the plan. Each shall vote. If the majority votes that the objectives have been reached, the department chair will sign the form and forward. If the majority vote that the plan's objectives have not been reached, the group shall decide the further work needed to complete the PDP and the revised timetable for completion.
4. The Dean and the faculty member shall meet and review the report and the objectives reached. If satisfied, the Dean will sign the form and forward to the Provost.

5. The Provost shall review the form and the faculty member's narrative. If the Provost approves, he or she will sign the form and the faculty member's post tenure review shall be deemed satisfactory.
6. At any point during the PDP should institutional resources designated in the PDP be withheld, the PDP shall be suspended, and the faculty member's post tenure review shall be deemed satisfactory.
7. Should a faculty member not complete the PDP successfully they shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

VIII. Post Tenure review of Tenured Faculty with Administrative Appointments

Tenured faculty with administrative appointments who are eligible for Post Tenure Review as described below, shall follow the same process as all other tenured faculty.

- A. Eligibility: Faculty members holding administrative positions with administrative appointments of 0.65 FTE or less shall undergo post tenure review.
- B. Frequency: The frequency of reviews for faculty with administrative appointments of less than 0.65 FTE shall be every five years after the award of tenure (the same as for all other faculty).
 1. Faculty who have held administrative appointments with greater than 0.65 FTE and have recently become eligible for Post Tenure Review must be reviewed no later than five years after they become eligible for review. These faculty may choose to be reviewed earlier.
- C. Post Tenure Review Committee: Faculty with administrative appointments.
 1. Cannot select as committee members faculty who are in their upward reporting chain
 2. Cannot select as committee members faculty who report directly to them.
- D. In cases where the Department Chair review is not appropriate, the process in Article IV shall be followed as if the faculty member were part of a unit that does not have departments

[Appendix B]. APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET AND RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR
 POST-TENURE REVIEW PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

For implementation in the forthcoming Academic Year, 20_____

Name _____
 Last First Middle

College or School/Department _____

Date of First Appointment at PSU _____ Current Rank _____

Date of most recent Post-Tenure Review _____

Each voting member of the Departmental Committee and each reviewing Administrator is required to sign and indicate his or her vote or recommendation. Please use **Y** to indicate approval and **N** to indicate disapproval of the Professional Development Plan (PDP).

NAMES	SIGNATURES	PDP APPROVE	DATE
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:		D	
COMMITTEE MEMBERS*:			
COMMITTEE CHAIR:			
DEPARTMENT CHAIR:			
DEAN:			
PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT:			
PRESIDENT:			

*If more space is needed for committee membership, please attach an additional page.
I have been apprised of the recommendations indicated on this form and have been given the opportunity to review my file before its submittal to the Dean's Office.

Faculty Signature *Date*