



POST-TENURE FACULTY REVIEW

Faculty Review Process and Procedures

Revised September 2025

POST-TENURE FACULTY REVIEW

Review Process and Procedures

September 2025

-
- a. The comprehensive post-tenure review shall include consideration of the following.
 - i. The level of accomplishment and productivity relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research, teaching, and service, including creative arts, extension, clinical, and administrative assignments. The university shall specify the guiding documents. Such documents shall include quantifiable university, college, and department criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit as appropriate.
 - ii. The faculty member's history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the university and its students.
 - iii. The faculty member's non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
 - iv. Unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses.
 - v. Substantiated student complaints.
 - vi. Other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.
 - b. The review shall not consider or otherwise discriminate based on the faculty members' political or ideological viewpoints.

5. Review Procedures

- a. The faculty member shall complete a university-designated dossier highlighting accomplishments and demonstrating performance relative to assigned duties and submit the dossier to the appropriate Level 1 Reviewer.
- b. Level 1 reviewers are usually department chairs, unit directors, or associate deans in schools and colleges without departments or divisions. In the case where a Level 1 Reviewer is unavailable to complete the review, the provost or designee in consultation with the dean may designate a replacement Level 1 Reviewer.
- c. The faculty member's Level 1 Reviewer shall review the completed dossier, the faculty member's personnel file, and other records related to professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance.

- d. The faculty member's Level 1 Reviewer shall add to the dossier the following:
 - i. Additional records related to substantiated student complaints, professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance concerns.
 - ii. A letter assessing the level of achievement and certification that the letter includes, if applicable, any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the period under review.
- e. The faculty member's Level 1 Reviewer shall forward the dossier, including all records and the Level 1 Reviewer's letter, to the appropriate dean.
- f. The dean shall review all materials provided by the faculty member's Level 1 Reviewer. In the case where the dean is unavailable to complete the review, the provost will designate a replacement for the Dean's Review.
- g. The dean of the college (or designated replacement) shall add to the dossier a brief letter assessing the level of achievement during the period under review. The letter shall include any concerns regarding professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance. The letter shall also include the dean's recommended performance rating using the following scale:
 - i. **Exceeds expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment **beyond the average performance** of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
 - ii. **Meets expectations:** expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
 - iii. **Does not meet expectations:** performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement.
 - iv. **Unsatisfactory:** failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.
- h. The dean of the college shall forward the dossier to the provost for review.

- i. With guidance and oversight from the university president, the provost will review and rate the faculty member's professional conduct, academic responsibilities, and performance during the review period. The provost may accept, reject, or modify the dean's recommended rating. The provost may request assistance from an advisory committee in formulating an assessment of the faculty member's performance.

Each faculty member reviewed will receive one of the following performance ratings, as defined above:

- i. Exceeds Expectations,
 - ii. Meets Expectations,
 - iii. Does Not Meet Expectations,
 - iv. Unsatisfactory
- j. A faculty member must obtain "Exceeds Expectations" in all performance areas to receive an overall rating of "Exceeds Expectations."
- k. The provost shall normalize the overall ratings among faculty reviews across common evaluation metrics including but not limited to appropriate teaching, scholarship, service and professional conduct measures.
- l. The provost shall notify the faculty member, the Level 1 Reviewer, and the appropriate college dean of the outcome.

6. Review Outcomes

- a. University regulations and policies regarding outcomes of the comprehensive post-tenure review process shall include recognition and compensation considerations and consequences for underperformance.
- b. For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "exceeds expectations" or "meets expectations," the appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty member's department chair, shall recommend to the provost if appropriate recognition and/or compensation is warranted. The provost shall make the **final** determination regarding recognition and/or compensation.
- c. For each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of "does not meet expectations," the appropriate college dean, in consultation with the faculty member's Level 1 Reviewer, shall propose a performance improvement plan to the provost:
 - i. The plan must include a deadline for the faculty member to achieve the requirements of the performance improvement plan. The deadline may not extend more than 12 months past the date the faculty member receives the improvement plan.

- ii. The provost shall make final decisions regarding the requirements of each performance improvement plan.
- iii. Each faculty member who fails to meet the requirements of a performance improvement plan by the established deadline shall receive a notice of termination from the provost.
- d. Each faculty member who receives a final performance rating of “unsatisfactory” shall receive a notice of termination from the provost.
- e. Final decisions regarding post-tenure review may be appealed to the provost advisory committee. Final decisions of “Do Not Meet” are automatically appealed.
- f. Faculty members may appeal the decision of the advisory committee under university regulations or collective bargaining agreements, as applicable to the employee. consistent with the following:

Notwithstanding section 447.401, Florida Statutes, or any other law related to faculty grievance procedures, personnel actions, or decisions regarding faculty, including in the areas of evaluations, promotions, tenure, discipline, or termination, may not be appealed beyond the level of a university president or designee. Such actions or decisions must have as their terminal step a final agency disposition, which must be issued in writing to the faculty member and are not subject to arbitration.

The filing of a grievance does not toll the action or decision of the university, including the termination of pay and benefits of a suspended or terminated faculty member.