

Appendix A: Overview of 2025 Revisions to Post-Tenure Review Policy (changes from FSH 23-24-6)

- Revised 2.8.6 Dismissal for Cause to align with changes to KRS 164.360 made by HB 424 (i.e., faculty can be removed for failure to meet performance and productivity requirements). Added a specific protection that “Dismissal proceedings for failure to meet performance and productivity requirements shall be based on evaluations conducted under the annual evaluation policy (2.5). For tenured faculty, such proceedings shall only be initiated following the procedures outlined in the post-tenure review policy (2.19).”
 - Rationale: This language ensures that any dismissal action for performance or productivity concerns is based on the annual evaluation process, which includes expanded language to protect academic freedom. Further, this revision specifies that any dismissal action for tenured faculty based on performance and productivity concerns must follow the post-tenure review process, which includes additional safeguards and time for faculty development and remediation.
- Revised 2.5 Annual Evaluation Policy to provide university-wide standards for annual faculty evaluation and guidance as to how the policy applies to faculty of different classifications.
 - Rationale: The earlier draft provided expanded guidance only for tenured faculty evaluations, which created an unbalanced application. This revision clarifies that all faculty are subject to the annual evaluation policy, with tenured faculty given additional procedural safeguards and development opportunities outlined in the post-tenure review policy (2.19).
- Removed the “exceeds standards” rating and section on special university recognition. Reallocated and increased the annual budget request for faculty recognition in a separate Faculty Senate resolution asking for \$35,000 (FSR-24-25-10).
 - Rationale: Adding an “Exceeds standards” rating could add a considerable new administrative burden to department chairs and college evaluation committees. It could also negatively impact department morale and undermine existing recognition structures (e.g., annual awards). Faculty Senate is requesting an additional \$35,000 per year focused on faculty recognition and development but is no longer mandating a specific system for how these funds will be allocated.
- Introduced a departmental development process that occurs after the first instance of a tenured faculty member receiving a “does not meet standards” rating. This process expands the professional development goals set by the chair to include annual assessment of “sufficient” or “insufficient” progress. Faculty receiving a rating of “insufficient progress” undergo an additional year of goal setting with the department chair and tenured faculty review committee (TFRC). A subsequent rating of “insufficient

progress” by the chair and TFRC within an evaluation cycle leads to the activation of intensive development.

- Rationale: To provide increased support for faculty improvement prior to activation of intensive development by providing a mechanism for TFRC involvement. In addition, this process enables earlier activation of intensive development when a faculty member is not making progress in a less formal development process.
- Allowed more flexibility in the length of intensive development plans and revised the development plan ratings to include assessment of insufficient and sufficient progress in addition to all goals met. Faculty making sufficient progress may extend the development plan duration for a maximum of three years to meet all development goals.
 - Rationale: To allow faculty who are making a good-faith effort towards improvement additional time to achieve all intensive development plan goals. In addition, this allows department chairs and faculty committees more flexibility in evaluating development plans in the first or second year by removing a binary “all or nothing” evaluation framework.
- Clarified that sanctions can only be imposed after review of the intensive development plan, provided guidance matching severity of sanctions to the degree of ongoing performance concerns and engagement in the development process, and provided a mechanism to review imposed sanctions for ongoing applicability.
 - Rationale: To ensure that sanctions are applied fairly, proportionately, and to prevent indefinite penalties by default for sanctions other than dismissal for cause.
- Aligned the initial four-year evaluation cycles based on year granted tenure instead of a random assignment method. Extended the pilot period of the evaluation system to four years up from three.
 - Rationale: To prevent recently tenured faculty from experiencing a comprehensive evaluation prior to four years of service as a tenured faculty member. The pilot period was extended to align with the implementation date specified in HB 424 (i.e., to ensure that the required performance evaluation process only applies to faculty performance after the law’s implementation date).
- Removed the brief review (years one, two, and three) requirement that the department chair meet with each tenured faculty member to discuss annual performance. The revised policy only requires a meeting if the chair raises performance concerns.
 - Rationale: To reduce unnecessary administrative burden on chairs and streamline the brief annual evaluation process.
- Added clarification that tenured administrative faculty who are removed from an administrative position are subject to the requirements and protections of the post-

tenure review policy. Specified that administrative faculty enter the evaluation cycle at year one.

- Rationale: To make a clear distinction between removal from an administrative position and removal of a tenured faculty member. This change ensures that administrative faculty returning to full-time faculty roles have sufficient time to reengage in regular faculty duties before undergoing a comprehensive evaluation.
- Eliminated the University Post-Tenure Review Committee (UPTRC) and shifted its responsibilities to the newly renamed University Tenure and Post-Tenure Review Committee (UTC). Added a charge to monitor implementation of post-tenure review and obligated the Provost office to provide de-identified data. Added a policy review every four years in keeping with AAUP guidance and added the president of Faculty Senate or their designee as a non-voting member of the UTC.
 - Rationale: To avoid creating an additional university standing committee and to simplify all faculty shared governance responsibilities regarding tenure and post-tenure review by locating them all on one committee. To ensure access to data to effectively monitor post-tenure review. To enhance communication between the faculty senate and UTC and to allow for timely identification and resolution of challenges with the post-tenure review and intensive development policies during implementation.