

Post-Tenure Review Implementation Preview

This document explains key aspects of Faculty Senate’s proposed post-tenure review policy (FSH-24-25-9) and offers a preview of how it might work if adopted. While the full policy would remain the final authority, this preview is meant to support ongoing policy consideration and help faculty and administrators begin thinking about how the policy could be put into practice.

1. Annual Review Standards (Policy Section 2.5)

Annual evaluations are already part of faculty life at Murray State, and that’s not changing. HB 424 requires that all faculty, regardless of rank or tenure status, be regularly evaluated for performance and productivity. This policy safeguards faculty by adding clearer guidance and faculty protections to what’s already in place.

What departments would do under the proposed policy:

During the 2025–2026 academic year, all departments would:

- **Review or create faculty-approved performance standards** for all faculty, including tenured faculty.
 - These standards would be distinct from tenure and promotion criteria.
 - They would need to be approved by the Dean and shared with the Provost.
- Comprise a departmental **Tenured Faculty Review Committee (TFRC)** by the end of 2026 to serve as peer reviewers for evaluations. All tenured faculty in a department will serve on the TFRC, and routine tasks may be delegated to a subcommittee.

Key annual evaluation protections added for all faculty (2.5.a–g):

- Faculty would be reviewed in all areas of responsibility—teaching, research/creative activity, and service—in **proportion to actual workload** using standardized ratings: “Meets Standards” or “Does Not Meet Standards.” (2.5.a & c)
- **Annual expectations would reflect ongoing responsibilities and not tenure or promotion standards.** Long-term projects, student-mentored research, and broader scholarship would count. No one would be expected to meet tenure standards throughout their career. (2.5.b & d)
- **Public complaints or viewpoint disagreements would not be grounds for negative evaluation.** Academic freedom is explicitly protected. (2.5.e)
- **Student evaluations would never be used alone.** Departments would include at least one other method for evaluating teaching. (2.5.f)
- **Collegiality** would only be considered when it clearly affects job performance and is documented at the time concerns arise. (2.5.g)

2. The Four-Year Review Cycle for Tenured Faculty (2.19.2)

Under the proposed policy, all tenured faculty would be assigned to a **four-year evaluation cycle** with the following structure:

Years 1-3: Brief Reviews (2.19.2.1)

Each spring, the faculty member would submit materials specified by the department/college and the chair would provide a short written summary of performance. No formal rating or meeting would be required unless concerns arise, in which case the chair would meet with the faculty member and offer feedback and informal development suggestions.

Year 4: Comprehensive Review (2.19.2.2)

In the spring after the fourth year of the cycle:

- Faculty would submit a 1-3 page reflection, an updated CV, and any other department/college required materials by **February 1**.
- The chair would complete a written evaluation by **March 1**.
- Any “Does Not Meet Standards” rating would be documented with specific reasons and shared with the faculty member, who could respond.
- The departmental Tenured Faculty Review Committee (TFRC) would review any “Does Not Meet Standards” ratings by **April 15**, and the Dean by **May 1**.

If concerns are confirmed by all reviewers, the faculty member would enter **Departmental Development (2.19.2.3)**.

How the cycle starts:

Tenured faculty would be placed in Year 1, 2, 3, or 4 in 2026 based on when tenure was granted to distribute the reviews evenly. Newly tenured faculty would begin the cycle in the year tenure is awarded.

Pilot period (2026-2030):

Beginning in spring of 2027, brief and comprehensive reviews would be conducted following the proposed cycle. Reviews during this period would be considered **pilot reviews**:

- They would follow the new process and departmental evaluation criteria.
- They would **not activate or serve as the future basis for intensive development or sanctions**.
- They would serve as an institutional learning phase and allow for departmental development, with no progression to intensive development during the pilot.
- Earlier performance may be assessed, but **only performance after July 1, 2026**, could be used when determining any intensive development action or sanctions.

3. What Happens if Tenured Faculty Don't Meet Standards?

Receiving a “Does Not Meet Standards” rating wouldn’t lead directly to sanctions—it would activate support and a sequenced development process.

Step 1: Departmental Development (2.19.2.3)

If a performance concern were confirmed by the chair, TFRC, and Dean, a tenured faculty member would enter a Departmental Development phase:

- **Goals would be set jointly** by the faculty member and chair by **September 15**.
- **Progress would be reviewed annually** during brief reviews using: “All Goals Met,” “Sufficient Progress,” or “Insufficient Progress.”
- The chair would offer feedback and support, and may connect the faculty member with the department TFRC, the Faculty Development Center, or other resources.
- If **insufficient progress** is noted by the chair, the department TFRC would provide additional support and oversight.

A Faculty member who makes sufficient progress or meet all goals would continue on the standard review cycle. If they receive **insufficient progress** ratings during any two brief annual reviews they would move to Intensive Development.

Step 2: Intensive Development (2.19.3)

Intensive Development is a formal, university-level development process supported by the University Tenure and Post-Tenure Review Committee (UTC). It would only be activated if:

- A tenured faculty member is unresponsive to departmental development,
- Performance concerns persist for multiple review cycles, or
- All levels of review (Chair, TFRC, Dean, UTC, Provost) agree that a formal intervention is necessary as an alternative to immediate dismissal for cause.

Even then, the process remains developmental, offering up to three years to complete development plan objectives and return to meeting performance standards. Faculty who are unsuccessful in intensive development may face sanctions, including dismissal for failure to meet performance and productivity requirements. Even in rare cases when dismissal is considered, tenured faculty would retain appeal rights, and the university must prove its case before the Board.

For full policy text and details on all procedural steps, see **2.5: Annual Evaluation** and **2.19: Post-Tenure Review** in FSH-24-25-9.