College of Arts and Sciences
Post Tenure Review
(Post Tenure Reviews are due at the end of each academic year)

Department: ___________________________ Faculty Name: ___________________________

Rank: ___________________________ Review Date: ___________________________

Please attach a hard copy of the following documents:

1). Faculty member’s materials
   - Five year plan/goals
   - CV
   - Faculty Member’s One Page Summary
   - Annual Reviews for previous five years

2). PTR Committee Recommendation

3). Chair’s recommendation that includes faculty member’s primary responsibility, strengths, weaknesses, etc.

4). Please provide your Faculty Member’s Post Tenure Review ratings below:

   Teaching:
   - Exceeds Expectations
   - Meets Expectations
   - Does Not Meet Expectations

   Scholarship:
   - Exceeds Expectations
   - Meets Expectations
   - Does Not Meet Expectations

   Service:
   - Exceeds Expectations
   - Meets Expectations
   - Does Not Meet Expectations

   Overall Rating:
   - Exceeds Expectations
   - Meets Expectations
   - Does Not Meet Expectations

5) Faculty Member receives a “Does Not Meet Expectations.”
   Faculty member will be given the opportunity to improve performance. In consultation with the dean, the faculty member’s chair will: (a) consider the evaluation from the post-tenure review committee and the faculty member’s response; and (b) prepare a written individual professional development plan for the faculty member. A specific timeline including steps for improvement must be included in the development plan, with a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line. Consequences may include discharge or demotion for “sustained unsatisfactory performance” after the faculty member has been given an opportunity to remedy such performance and fails to do so within a reasonable time, pursuant to section 4.10.1.1 of the Faculty Handbook. The chair is encouraged to assign one or more mentoring peers to the faculty member, and the chair must hold a progress meeting with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified time line. If the faculty member’s duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, the development plan should indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities.