

Date: 30 June 2022
To: University Council Executive Committee
From: Janette R. Hill, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee ✱
Re: Proposed Revisions to 1.06-4 Post-Tenure Review Policy

On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), I am sending proposed revisions to 1.06-4 Post-Tenure Review Policy for your consideration and hopefully to send to the University Council for consideration during the September meeting. The proposed revisions were fully approved by the FAC last spring, but not in time for the Executive Committee's agenda deadline for its last meeting of the 2021-2022 Academic Year on 30 March 2022.

I discuss the development of the Post-Tenure Review policy revisions below.

Proposed Revisions to 1.06-4 Post-Tenure Review Policy

The FAC unanimously approved this revised policy on 15 April. The FAC met throughout fall and spring semesters to discuss the implications of the Board of Regents (BOR) revised policy and University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook (USG Handbook) on post-tenure review for UGA AAPM 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review. On 1 April 2022, the committee met to discuss a draft of the proposed revisions to the 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy that was passed unanimously by the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation Policies and Practices (FEPP). Feedback on the draft of the proposed revisions to 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review, gathered by a survey open to the entire university community, was shared with the FAC to inform the discussion. FAC members were also encouraged to share the document with their constituents for any additional feedback prior to the meeting on 1 April.

During the 1 April meeting, the FAC made several updates and suggestions to the draft policy, with further action pending the distribution of the updated document to the FAC. The FAC met again on 15 April to discuss the suggested revisions to 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy. After discussion, including additional revisions, the FAC unanimously approved the proposed revisions to 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy.

I have provided a clean and marked up version of the proposed revisions to 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy. The following indicates the sources of the proposed revisions:

- Black text: the original text in 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy
- Red text: Incorporation of new language into the proposed revisions to 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy based on USG policy and guidelines.
- Blue text: Updates by the FEPP and FAC into the proposed revisions to 1.06.4 Post-Tenure Review Policy to further clarify the revisions based on the updated USG policy and guidelines.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

1.06-4 Post Tenure Review

(note: black text=current UGA policy, **dark red text**=USG policy update, **blue text**=FEPP subgroup and FEPP updates)

Each tenured faculty member must be reviewed every five years in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the promotion/tenure unit. These criteria and procedures must follow **University System of Georgia and** University **of Georgia policies** as well as any policies at the college/school level.

Sources:

- [Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5.4](#)
- [University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, 4.7 Post-tenure Review](#)
- [UGA's Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty](#)
- [Post-tenure Review Committee Operating Policy](#)

Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty

Each promotion/tenure unit shall establish written criteria and procedures governing the periodic review of each tenured faculty member.

I. Purpose

The purpose of the review will be to examine, recognize, develop, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members at the University of Georgia. **The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.**

II. Criteria

- A. The evaluation must address the faculty member's accomplishments related to teaching; research, scholarship, or creative works; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission**

of the institution through their teaching; scholarship, research, or creative activities; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate.

- F. The criteria should reflect the overall mission of the promotion **and** tenure unit and should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities and particular strengths who contribute to the mission of the institution in distinct ways. The promotion **and** tenure unit, as defined in the **UGA** Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure **of Academic Rank Faculty**, shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry. The review shall be carried out free of bias or prejudice by factors such as race, religion, sex, color, national origin, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, disability, political affiliation, or veteran status.

III. Procedures

- A. Reviews shall occur once every five years after tenure or promotion has been granted unless the five-year time period is interrupted because the faculty member
1. is on leave, in which case the post-tenure review should occur when the faculty member returns from leave;
 2. **was promoted to a higher academic rank (i.e., Professor), which promotion resets the five-year clock**
 3. **was promoted to an academic leadership position (e.g., Department Head, Dean, Associate Provost), in which case the academic leader will be reviewed as specified in [University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.16, Review of Administrators while serving in that role](#);**
 4. **elects early, voluntary post-tenure review, as described in Section III.C below, in which case the review will occur sooner than five years; or**
 5. **is referred for corrective post-tenure review, as described in Section III.D below, in which case the review will occur sooner than five years.**

In addition to the list above, the documentation prepared in support of post-tenure reviews may be combined with other reviews, including (but not limited to) nominations for chaired professorships, major teaching awards, graduate faculty appointments, national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the Post-Tenure Review Committee may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the below criteria in item B for review procedures.

If a faculty member has received an evaluation of “meets expectations or above” on each category of their annual evaluation for five consecutive years, the compiled annual reviews shall serve as their PTR materials; the faculty member may choose to provide additional materials in alignment with their unit PTR policies and procedures.

- B. Each promotion **and** tenure unit shall develop the policy by which the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be selected. Such procedures to establish the committee may include election, lottery, or a committee of the whole but cannot include appointment by the promotion **and** tenure unit head. The committee shall consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members, including, **to the extent possible**, at least one member from the individual's home promotion and tenure unit, and should include faculty from other promotion **and** tenure units, contingent upon their willingness and availability to serve. The faculty member under review may formally object to the service of another faculty member in a review capacity. Up to **three** such objections will be honored if made to the promotion **and** tenure unit head. Every effort will be made to keep these formal objections confidential, and the formal objections will not be released by the University, except as required by law.
- C. **A tenured faculty member may voluntarily choose to participate in a post-tenure review sooner than five years. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure reviews should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most recent. If this voluntary review is successful, then the faculty member's next scheduled post-tenure review will take place five years after this voluntary review. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year PTR review date remains in place.**
- D. **A faculty member evaluated under University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.06-1, Written Annual Evaluation, as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the elements of teaching; research, scholarship, or creative works; or service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review. The 1 or 2 Annual Evaluation score does not have to be in the same area but could be a different area from one year to the next.**
- Corrective post-tenure review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. If the outcome of the corrective post-tenure review is successful, the faculty member's five-year post-tenure review clock will be reset. If the outcome of a corrective post-tenure review is unsuccessful in a majority of areas, as determined by the faculty member's allocation of effort, the same performance improvement process for an unsuccessful post-tenure review, described below in Section V below, will be followed.**
- E. Review **documentation** shall include:
1. A review of qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's performance over the previous five-year period. **The post-tenure review shall**

include evaluation of teaching; research, scholarship, or creative works; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate. At minimum, the evidence shall incorporate findings from the faculty member's annual reviews from the years since the approval of tenure or the last post-tenure review and a current curriculum vitae; additional materials may be specified by the promotion and tenure unit's post-tenure review process.

2. The faculty member's concise summary of accomplishments and future plans, **including, as the faculty member desires, possibilities for new areas of emphasis or focus**, not to exceed two pages in length.
 3. **Appropriate consideration of the faculty member's** contributions to the promotion and tenure unit and the University, if either the Post-Tenure Review Committee or the faculty member so desire.
 4. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions to interdisciplinary programs, governance, administration, and other programs outside the promotion and tenure unit, **if either the Post-Tenure Review Committee or the faculty member so desire.**
 5. **In the case of an intervening corrective post-tenure review that was unsuccessful, all of the review documentation, along with the Post-tenure Review Committee's report and any written response from the faculty member, from the intervening corrective-post tenure review should be included in the review documentation.**
- F. The post-tenure review committee shall provide the faculty member with a concise, written summary of the review and a conclusion as to whether **their** performance is deemed **meets expectations**. if the faculty member's performance is deemed **does not meet expectations**, the post-tenure review committee shall provide a report identifying the areas of weakness and suggest actions that might strengthen the faculty member's performance.
1. **The promotion and tenure unit head must meet with the faculty member within 10 working days of receipt of the report from the post-tenure review committee. the unit head must then provide a letter within 5 working days after the meeting documenting the summary of the findings of the post-tenure review, including the report from the post-tenure review committee. The letter also must describe next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the area(s) identified as unsuccessful.**

2. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to **submit** a written response **within 10 working days** to the **report from the post-tenure review committee and letter from the promotion and tenure unit head**. a copy of the summary, **letter**, and any written response **from the faculty member** shall be given to the promotion **and** tenure unit head and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member; **however, no direct response to that rebuttal is required by the promotion and tenure unit head.**
3. The promotion **and** tenure unit head shall also maintain in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review.
4. **The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements, such as, but not limited to, formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, and educational leave.**

IV. Accountability

- A. The promotion **and** tenure unit's post-tenure review policies and procedures shall be **approved by the faculty in the promotion and tenure unit and** filed with the appropriate Dean.
- B. Promotion **and** tenure unit heads shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
- C. At the end of each academic year, the appropriate Dean shall receive a report from the promotion/tenure unit head, listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews.
- D. Any exceptions to this review process must be approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council.
- E. The periodic review of each promotion and tenure unit shall include review of the post-tenure process of the unit.

V. Performance Improvement

- A. **If the result of the post-tenure review is unsatisfactory, then a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) shall be created by the promotion and tenure unit head, and Dean in consultation with the faculty member and the Post-tenure Review Committee. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.**

1. Consistent with the developmental intent of post-tenure review, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the areas of weakness identified in the Post-tenure Review.
 2. The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. Remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of their contract period.
 3. The promotion and tenure unit head, the Dean, and the appropriate vice president are jointly responsible for arranging suitable resources for the PIP, if required.
 4. The promotion and tenure unit head and Dean must give the faculty member notice of the possibility of remedial actions, as listed in Section V.E below, when the PIP begins.
- B. The faculty member and promotion and tenure unit head must meet twice during both the fall and spring semesters to review progress, document additional needs or resources, and planned accomplishments for the upcoming time-period. After each meeting, the promotion and tenure unit head should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP.
- C. At the conclusion of the assessment cycle, the faculty member's progress will be assessed by the department head and/or Dean after taking into account written input from the Post-tenure Review Committee. The assessment of the PIP will take the place of the next year's annual review in the focus areas of the PIP.
- D. If the faculty member successfully completes the PIP, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.
- E. If the faculty member fails to remediate the identified weaknesses, fails to demonstrate sufficient progress on the PIP, or refuses to engage reasonably in the process, within one year, as determined by the promotion and tenure unit head and Dean, after considering written input from the Post-tenure Review Committee, then the institution shall take appropriate and proportional remedial action. The faculty member may appeal the PIP assessment and recommended remedial action(s) to the Faculty Post-tenure Review Appeals Committee (FPTRAC). Appropriate and proportional remedial actions may include but are not limited to, mentoring or coaching, reassignment, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, suspension of pay, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment.

- F. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.**

VI. Implementation

- A. The promotion/tenure unit shall prepare a plan for scheduling reviews of tenured faculty. The five-year cycle of reviews should begin during the 2023-2024 academic year.
- B. In all cases in which the unit head is the person being reviewed under this policy, an administrative officer one level above the unit head shall assume the unit head's function in this review.

DRAFT

1.06-4 Post Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member must be reviewed every five years in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the promotion/tenure unit. These criteria and procedures must follow University System of Georgia and University of Georgia policies as well as any policies at the college/school level.

Sources:

- Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5.4
- University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, 4.7 Post-tenure Review
- UGA's Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty
- Post-tenure Review Committee Operating Policy

Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty

Each promotion/tenure unit shall establish written criteria and procedures governing the periodic review of each tenured faculty member.

I. Purpose

The purpose of the review will be to examine, recognize, develop, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members at the University of Georgia. The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.

II. Criteria

- F. The evaluation must address the faculty member's accomplishments related to teaching; research, scholarship, or creative works; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution through their teaching; scholarship, research, or creative activities; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate.

- F. The criteria should reflect the overall mission of the promotion and tenure unit and should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities and particular strengths who contribute to the mission of the institution in distinct ways. The promotion and tenure unit, as defined in the UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty, shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry. The review shall be carried out free of bias or prejudice by factors such as race, religion, sex, color, national origin, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, disability, political affiliation, or veteran status.

III. Procedures

- A. Reviews shall occur once every five years after tenure or promotion has been granted unless the five-year time period is interrupted because the faculty member
1. is on leave, in which case the post-tenure review should occur when the faculty member returns from leave;
 2. was promoted to a higher academic rank (i.e., Professor), which promotion resets the five-year clock;
 3. was promoted to an academic leadership position (e.g., Department Head, Dean, Associate Provost), in which case the academic leader will be reviewed as specified in University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.16, Review of Administrators while serving in that role;
 4. elects early, voluntary post-tenure review, as described in Section III.C below, in which case the review will occur sooner than five years; or
 5. is referred for corrective post-tenure review, as described in Section III.D below, in which case the review will occur sooner than five years.

In addition to the list above, the documentation prepared in support of post-tenure reviews may be combined with other reviews, including (but not limited to) nominations for chaired professorships, major teaching awards, graduate faculty appointments, national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the Post-Tenure Review Committee may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the below criteria in item B for review procedures.

If a faculty member has received an evaluation of “meets expectations or above” on each category of their annual evaluation for five consecutive years, the compiled annual reviews shall serve as their PTR materials; the faculty member may choose to provide additional materials in alignment with their unit PTR policies and procedures.

- B. Each promotion and tenure unit shall develop the policy by which the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be selected. Such procedures to establish the committee may include election, lottery, or a committee of the whole but cannot include appointment

by the promotion and tenure unit head. The committee shall consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members, including, to the extent possible, at least one member from the individual's home promotion and tenure unit, and should include faculty from other promotion and tenure units, contingent upon their willingness and availability to serve. The faculty member under review may formally object to the service of another faculty member in a review capacity. Up to three such objections will be honored if made to the promotion and tenure unit head. Every effort will be made to keep these formal objections confidential, and the formal objections will not be released by the University, except as required by law.

- C. A tenured faculty member may voluntarily choose to participate in a post-tenure review sooner than five years. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure reviews should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most recent. If this voluntary review is successful, then the faculty member's next scheduled post-tenure review will take place five years after this voluntary review. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year PTR review date remains in place.
- D. A faculty member evaluated under University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.06-1, Written Annual Evaluation, as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the elements of teaching; research, scholarship, or creative works; or service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review. The 1 or 2 Annual Evaluation score does not have to be in the same area but could be a different area from one year to the next.

Corrective post-tenure review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. If the outcome of the corrective post-tenure review is successful, the faculty member's five-year post-tenure review clock will be reset. If the outcome of a corrective post-tenure review is unsuccessful in a majority of areas, as determined by the faculty member's allocation of effort, the same performance improvement process for an unsuccessful post-tenure review, described below in Section V below, will be followed.

- E. Review documentation shall include:
 - 1. A review of qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's performance over the previous five-year period. The post-tenure review shall include evaluation of teaching; research, scholarship, or creative works; and service, including student success activities across those areas of effort, as appropriate. At minimum, the evidence shall incorporate findings from the faculty member's annual reviews from the years since the approval of tenure or

the last post-tenure review and a current curriculum vitae; additional materials may be specified by the promotion and tenure unit's post-tenure review process.

2. The faculty member's concise summary of accomplishments and future plans, including, as the faculty member desires, possibilities for new areas of emphasis or focus, not to exceed two pages in length.
 3. Appropriate consideration of the faculty member's contributions to the promotion and tenure unit and the University, if either the Post-Tenure Review Committee or the faculty member so desire.
 4. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions to interdisciplinary programs, governance, administration, and other programs outside the promotion and tenure unit, if either the Post-Tenure Review Committee or the faculty member so desire.
 5. In the case of an intervening corrective post-tenure review that was unsuccessful, all of the review documentation, along with the Post-tenure Review Committee's report and any written response from the faculty member, from the intervening corrective-post tenure review should be included in the review documentation.
- F. The post-tenure review committee shall provide the faculty member with a concise, written summary of the review and a conclusion as to whether their performance is deemed meets expectations. if the faculty member's performance is deemed does not meet expectations, the post-tenure review committee shall provide a report identifying the areas of weakness and suggest actions that might strengthen the faculty member's performance.
1. the promotion and tenure unit head must meet with the faculty member within 10 working days of receipt of the report from the post-tenure review committee. the unit head must then provide a letter within 5 working days after the meeting documenting the summary of the findings of the post-tenure review, including the report from the post-tenure review committee. the letter also must describe next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the area(s) identified as unsuccessful.
 2. the faculty member shall have the opportunity to submit a written response within 10 working days to the report from the post-tenure review committee and letter from the promotion and tenure unit head. a copy of the summary, letter, and any written response from the faculty member shall be given to the promotion and tenure unit head and shall be placed in the personnel file of the

faculty member; however, no direct response to that rebuttal is required by the promotion and tenure unit head.

3. The promotion and tenure unit head shall also maintain in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review.
4. The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements, such as, but not limited to, formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, and educational leave.

IV. Accountability

- A. The promotion and tenure unit's post-tenure review policies and procedures shall be approved by the faculty in the promotion and tenure unit and filed with the appropriate Dean.
- B. Promotion and tenure unit heads shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
- C. At the end of each academic year, the appropriate Dean shall receive a report from the promotion/tenure unit head, listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews.
- D. Any exceptions to this review process must be approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council.
- E. The periodic review of each promotion and tenure unit shall include review of the post-tenure process of the unit.

V. Performance Improvement

- A. If the result of the post-tenure review is unsatisfactory, then a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) shall be created by the promotion and tenure unit head, and Dean in consultation with the faculty member and the Post-tenure Review Committee. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.
 1. Consistent with the developmental intent of post-tenure review, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the areas of weakness identified in the Post-tenure Review.

2. The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. Remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of their contract period.
 3. The promotion and tenure unit head, the Dean, and the appropriate vice president are jointly responsible for arranging suitable resources for the PIP, if required.
 4. The promotion and tenure unit head and Dean must give the faculty member notice of the possibility of remedial actions, as listed in Section V.E below, when the PIP begins.
- B. The faculty member and promotion and tenure unit head must meet twice during both the fall and spring semesters to review progress, document additional needs or resources, and planned accomplishments for the upcoming time-period. After each meeting, the promotion and tenure unit head should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP.
 - C. At the conclusion of the assessment cycle, the faculty member's progress will be assessed by the department head and/or Dean after taking into account written input from the Post-tenure Review Committee. The assessment of the PIP will take the place of the next year's annual review in the focus areas of the PIP.
 - D. If the faculty member successfully completes the PIP, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.
 - E. If the faculty member fails to remediate the identified weaknesses, fails to demonstrate sufficient progress on the PIP, or refuses to engage reasonably in the process, within one year, as determined by the promotion and tenure unit head and Dean, after considering written input from the Post-tenure Review Committee, then the institution shall take appropriate and proportional remedial action. The faculty member may appeal the PIP assessment and recommended remedial action(s) to the Faculty Post-tenure Review Appeals Committee (FPTRAC). Appropriate and proportional remedial actions may include but are not limited to, mentoring or coaching, reassignment, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, suspension of pay, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment.
 - F. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

VI. Implementation

- A. The promotion/tenure unit shall prepare a plan for scheduling reviews of tenured faculty. The five-year cycle of reviews should begin during the 2023-2024 academic year.
- B. In all cases in which the unit head is the person being reviewed under this policy, an administrative officer one level above the unit head shall assume the unit head's function in this review.

DRAFT