

**Beauvais Lyons Notes on Periodic Post-Tenure Review Policies  
Sent to the UFC by Vice-President Linda Martin**

**Institutional Taskforce Reports/Studies/Recommendations:**

Sense of the Senate Document: Post-Tenure Review Recommendation at the University of Dayton (2006): [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1027&context=senate\\_docs](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1027&context=senate_docs)

**Drafted in 2006, this document presents the University of Dayton's recommendation for a periodic peer review of tenured faculty to be conducted on a six-year cycle with a focus on faculty development. It is not clear if the policy was implemented, or if the outcomes have been assessed.**

Report of the Tenure Principles Committee: Post Tenure Review Process. Senate of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Campus (1997): <http://www.senate.illinois.edu/principle.asp>

**Drafted in 1997, it is not clear if this policy was adopted, and if so, is still in effect. It is unclear regarding the composition of the review committees, and a number of details regarding the process.**

Building a Foundation for Career Long Faculty Development at Purdue University: A Report on Post-Tenure Review and Faculty Development (2003): <https://www.purdue.edu/senate/docs/feedback/faculty.pdf>

**Drafted in 2003 after several years of study and a series of focus groups conducted by the faculty senate Faculty Affairs Committee, this report on post-tenure review stresses placing emphasis on the formative rather than summative aspects of post-tenure review. On pages 34-36, the report cites a 2002 study regarding issues raised about post-tenure review by Chris Licata and Joseph Morreale for the American Association for Higher Education Faculty Roles and Rewards Conference in Phoenix, Arizona (New Pathways Project). The report indicated less than favorable perceptions of periodic post-tenure review by faculty, heads and dean, with specific concerns about the lack of thorough training of heads to conduct annual reviews, the time required for periodic peer reviews and lack of resources to support faculty development.**

**The report states: "It is our opinion that few of these identified goods can be pursued or assured at this time, much less perpetuated, simply by creating yet another institutional review process in addition to our already pre-existing but often pro forma and sometimes bogus annual review process. Additionally, it appears to us that however well intended most non-annual and periodic post-tenure reviews at other institutions attempt to be, the proper and laudable ends of the review (faculty growth and development) are seemingly lost in the hasty efforts to invent or shore up the means by which the ends are presumably attained or verified (the reviews themselves). In part, we believe, this approach to faculty development is simplistic and is precisely why there is such confusion and uncertainty being reported from the universities who have undertaken one or another post-tenure review processes." (p. 37)**

**Instead of instituting periodic post-tenure reviews, they recommended addressing the following goals:**

- 1) Ensuring there is greater uniformity in the implementation of annual reviews.**

- 2) As a condition for appointment, providing department heads the training to conduct thorough annual reviews.
- 3) Improve the faculty mentoring system.
- 4) Rethinking faculty sabbatical (Faculty development leave) systems to focus on faculty development.
- 5) Expanding the conception of the ways that academic careers are measured with a focus on career-long faculty development.

#### **Publications:**

AAUP's Post Tenure Review: An AAUP Response (1983): <https://www.aaup.org/report/post-tenure-review-aaup-response>

The AAUP position is that post-tenure review should stress faculty development, and “should not be undertaken for the purpose of dismissal, noting that “other formal disciplinary procedures exist for that purpose.” The paper notes that “Despite assurances by proponents that they do not so intend, the substitution of managerial accountability for professional responsibility characteristic of this more intrusive form of post-tenure review alters academic practices in ways that inherently diminish academic freedom.”

The position paper continues “The objectionable change is not that tenured faculty would be expected to undergo periodic evaluation. As noted here, they generally do—and they should. Nor is there any claim that tenure must be regarded as an indefinite entitlement. Tenured faculty are already subject to dismissal for incompetence, malfeasance, or failure to perform their duties, as well as on grounds of bona fide financial exigency or program termination. Nor is the issue, as many faculty imagine, simply who controls the evaluation. Faculty members as well as administrators can and do err.”

A Post-Tenure Review System that is Good Personnel Policy: Is It Possible? *International Business & Economics Research Journal*,

1(5): <https://www.cluteinstitute.com/ojs/index.php/IBER/article/download/3919/3964>

From the abstract “This paper argues that because of the unique nature of academic labor markets, summative review systems may not be appropriate for most universities. By weakening the institution of tenure, summative post-tenure review systems decrease academic freedom. They also reduce efficiency within universities by discouraging collegiality and collaboration. We propose that universities in need of systems of post-tenure review establish “developmental” programs that do not threaten academic freedom or weaken the institution of tenure. These systems give faculty members a chance to critically evaluate past performance and motivate them to develop professionally. A developmental post-tenure review system recently adopted at Illinois Wesleyan University is presented as an example.

Post Tenure Review through Post-Tenure Development: What Linking Senior Faculty and Technology Taught Us; Mary Deane Sorcinelli (1999); *Innovative Higher Education*,

24(1): <http://umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.umb.edu/file/view/Post-tenure+Review+Through+Post-tenure+Development+-+Linking+Senior+Fac+and+Technology.pdf>

This paper differentiates summative and formative roles of post-tenure review, and notes that it adds greatest value when the emphasis is on formative reviews that assist tenured faculty through formal, structured development opportunities, individual support services, collegial opportunities that support dialogue, a focus on acquiring new skills, and the creation of reward systems.

On Post-Tenure Review (1997); *Academe*; Published by

AAUP: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/40251586.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A80db238d8b9384db17cc5721fafa8aeb>

This paper serves to update the 1983 position paper on post-tenure review. It notes that periodic review systems either emphasize “developmental” or “managerial” objectives, the latter which reflects a corporate model which defines teaching as a “client-centered activity” and redefining accountability in fiscal rather than pedagogical or scholarly terms. The paper raises concerns regarding how a managerial justification is used by those who both wish to undermine tenure, and those who wish to protect it from outside or political influences. The report seeks to address those who support tenure, but think a post-tenure review system will serve to protect the system. While the paper recommends that additional post-tenure review systems are unnecessary if the systems in place, such as annual reviews are appropriately administered, it does include guidelines for considering the establishment of a system of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty, as well as standards for good practice in post-tenure review.

Post-tenure Review from a Growth Mindset (2016); Harvard Graduate School of

Education: <https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/blog/post-tenure-review-growth-mindset>

This paper looks at COACHE survey data to consider faculty evaluations.

Post-Tenure Review Best Practices (2012); Hanover

Research: <http://www.hanoverresearch.com/2012/03/16/post-tenure-review-best-practices/>

This report provides a comparison of some approaches to post-tenure review on different campuses.