



Eastern Kentucky University

Policy and Regulation Library

University Policy: 4.6.17POL

Responsible Office(s): Office of the Provost

Effective: November 12, 2025

Next Review Date: Fall 2030

University Policy: 4.6.17POL

Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

Statement

Tenured faculty members at Eastern Kentucky University share the responsibility to maintain an appropriate level of teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. The goal of annually reviewing tenured faculty members is to recognize exemplary performance, identify areas for potential growth, establish goals, and create professional development plans. For each of their tenured faculty members, Department Chairs/Unit Heads will collaborate with the faculty member to create and support individual goals and professional development plans annually and to assess every four (4) years the faculty member's performance, using department/unit-approved standards for teaching, scholarly/creative, and service activities. The review process respects the uniqueness of disciplines within the University and provides for appropriate professional flexibility at department/unit levels; however, the process is designed to provide consistency with department, school, college, and University policies, as well as KRS 164.360. The annual review process defined herein shall only apply to non-administrative, full-time tenured faculty and shall not be used to evaluate academic administrators, as set forth in Academic Regulation 4.8.1, Annual Evaluation of Academic Administrators, who may also be tenured faculty.

Entities Affected

- Tenured Faculty
- Departments
- Colleges

Procedures

- I. Establishing Performance Standards
 1. The Board of Regents, in accordance with KRS 164.360, shall adopt a base level of performance and productivity standards. The Board hereby adopts the Tenured

Faculty Evaluation Rubric, which shall be Appendix A to this Policy. For the purposes of the Rubric, Collegiality shall have the same definition as it has in Policy 4.6.4, Promotion and Tenure. Each Department/Unit may establish more detailed performance and productivity criteria that align with those adopted by the Board, which can take into account the uniqueness of the academic discipline. Tenured faculty shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. In reviewing all three areas, collegiality shall be considered. Since individual faculty members' activities may vary yearly, their specific workload assignments, long-term projects, and professional development plans must be taken into consideration.

2. For the evaluation of teaching, in addition to the university-sanctioned student opinion of instruction survey, the Department may use a second systematic method of assessing teaching performance. (This method shall include a consideration of the perspectives of colleagues and/or supervisors and shall be clearly defined and communicated in Department policy.)
3. Any more detailed Department/Unit performance criteria shall be approved by a majority of full-time tenured faculty members and shall be approved by the Chair or Unit Head and Dean. Changes in the Department/Unit criteria shall be made by a majority vote of the full-time tenured faculty members of the Department/Unit and shall be approved by the Dean by May 1 prior to the academic year in which the changes are to take effect.
4. A statement of the more detailed performance criteria shall be filed in the offices of the Provost, the Dean, and the Department Chair/Unit Head.
5. It is the obligation of the Department Chairs/Unit Heads to disseminate the more detailed criteria to the full-time tenured faculty in their Department/Unit.

THE ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

The tenured faculty review process will consist of annual reviews over a four-year recurring cycle of assessment. Years one, two, and three are brief and formative in nature; year four is more in depth. All reviews shall focus on the faculty member's goals and professional development plan. Sabbaticals do not shift a faculty member's cycle. A faculty member with a sabbatical in the current year of assessment should include any reportable activities in the annual report. Leaves of absence separate and apart from sabbaticals will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Years One, Two, and Three Reviews

1. During the spring semester, but no later than April 1, Department Chairs/Unit Heads shall hold a conference with each tenured faculty member in the department/unit. At this or subsequent spring conferences, the Department Chair/Unit Head and the faculty member will discuss the faculty member's achievements with specific reference to the goals set in the previous conference. This conference will include a discussion of a brief written summary or department form prepared by the Chair of the faculty member's professional development goals for the next year, progress toward or achievement of the previous year's goals, and any areas of concern.

2. At the conclusion of all faculty conferences, the Department Chair/Unit Head will send the annual review summaries/department forms for each faculty member to the Dean with a copy to the faculty member.

Year Four Review

1. For the Year Four Review, tenured faculty members will prepare a reflection of their work since the last Year Four Review which shall be due by February 1.
2. During the spring semester, but no later than March 1, Department Chairs/Unit Heads will hold a conference with each of their tenured faculty members scheduled for their Year Four Review. The purpose of this conference is to evaluate work from the previous four years and to establish the professional development goals of the faculty member for the next year (Year One). The evaluation of the faculty member's work will take into account the standards set by the department/unit in regard to teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. In reviewing all three areas, collegiality shall be considered.
3. Within 10 Days following this conference, the Department Chair/Unit Head will provide to the faculty member a completed Tenured Faculty Evaluation Rubric, evaluating the tenured faculty member, and may include a written statement of evaluation. Department Chairs/Unit Heads will use the Board-approved Tenured Faculty Evaluation Rubric and, if they exist, the department/unit's performance standards, as well as the faculty member's reflection and workload, to assess the tenured faculty member as "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," or "falls below expectations".
4. Assessments of "falls below expectations" must be explained in writing.
5. The tenured faculty member will have an opportunity to respond in writing within five (5) Days.
6. The Department Chair/Unit Head will submit all Year Four Reviews, including any written response by each faculty member to the Dean no later than April 1.
7. The Dean will respond in writing to the Year Four Reviews, either concurring with each assessment or providing explanation for a differing assessment.
8. The Dean will notify the faculty member and the Department Chair/Unit Head no later than April 1.
9. Upon receipt of the Year Four Review from the Dean, a tenured faculty member that receives a "falls below expectations" in any category may request a review by the College Fourth Year Review Committee for Tenured Faculty ("FYR Committee"). The College Promotion and Tenure Committee will serve as the FYR Committee. The tenured faculty member may request a review in writing to the Department Chair/Unit Head within three (3) days of receipt of the Year Four Review from the Dean. The Department Chair/Unit Head shall provide the Committee with a copy of the relevant department/unit's performance standards in addition to the review materials. The FYR Committee shall indicate in writing, with an explanation, whether they concur with the assessment of each "falls below expectations"

- rating in a written report to the Department Chair/Unit Head within ten (10) Days. The Department Chair/Unit Head shall forward the written assessment of the FYR Committee to the Dean upon receipt.
10. The Dean shall review the assessment of the FYR Committee and reconsider the Year Four Review of the tenured faculty member. The assessment of the FYR Committee is a recommendation and not binding. The Dean shall issue a final response and Year Four Review to the Department Chair/Unit Head and tenured faculty member no later than May 1.
 11. For any faculty member with a Year Four Review that receives a “falls below expectations” overall or in any of the three areas, the Department Chair/Unit Head will set professional development goals in consultation with the faculty member for the following year to address any below expectations ratings.
 - a. The Department Chair/Unit Head will assess these goals during Year One of the next review cycle to determine whether meaningful progress has been made in the area(s) of deficiency and whether the “falls below expectations” ratings have been remedied. Within ten (10) Days following the annual review conference, the Department Chair/Unit Head will provide to the faculty member a written statement of evaluation, following up on the deficiencies and goals of the year prior. If meaningful progress has been made and the deficiencies have been corrected, the faculty member resumes the normal second year of the four-year cycle. If meaningful progress has not been made, the Department Chair/Unit Head will note that the tenured faculty member has shown “insufficient progress,” and the tenured faculty member will have an opportunity to respond in writing within ten (10) Days. The evaluation, including any written response from the faculty member, will be sent to the FYR Committee.
 - b. The FYR Committee will review the initial Year Four Review, professional development goals, and Year One assessment by the Department Chair/Unit Head which determines whether meaningful progress was made in the area(s) of deficiency. The FYR will provide a written assessment in ten (10) Days to the Department Chair/Unit Head.
 12. If the FYR Committee concurs that there is “insufficient progress” made in any area of deficiency, the FYR Committee will indicate so in writing.
 13. If an assessment of “falls below expectations” occurred in the Year Four Review and the FYR Committee concurred there is “insufficient progress” in the same area of deficiency in the subsequent year, then the Department Chair/Unit Head will activate the Post-Tenure Review process. (See Policy 4.6.7, Post-Tenure Review, for the post-tenure review process.)

Responsibilities

- College Dean
 - Approving minimum performance standards for Departments/Units and approving Year Four Reviews for tenured faculty
- Department Chair/Unit Head
 - Conducting annual reviews of tenured faculty
 - Working with faculty to create goals and development plans
 - Working with faculty and university administrators to support professional development
- Tenured Faculty Member
 - Knowing and adhering to Policy 4.6.17
 - Working with the Department Chair/Unit Head to create goals and development plans
 - Implementing each plan
 - Writing a reflection for the Year Four Review
- Fourth Year Review Committee
 - Reviewing and making recommendations regarding “falls below expectations” and “insufficient progress” ratings made by a Department Chair/Unit Head

Definitions

- **Day:** Day shall have the same meaning it has under Kentucky law, specifically KRS 446.030, where in computing any period of time, the day of the act or notification which the designated period of time begins to run is not to be included. The last day of the period so computed is to be included, unless it is a Saturday, a Sunday, a legal holiday, or a day on which the University is closed, in which event the period runs until the end of the next day which is not one (1) of the days just mentioned. This applies even if the period of time prescribed or allowed is less than seven (7) days.

Policy Adoption Review and Approval

Policy Revised

DATE

November 12, 2025
February 28, 2025
October 21, 2024

ENTITY

Board of Regents
Provost
University Counsel

ACTION

Adopted
Reviewed & Readopted
Editorial Revision

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ENTITY</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
June 18, 2019	Board of Regents	Adopted revised language regarding student opinion of instruction
October 19, 2015	Board of Regents	Adopted
October 2, 2015	President	Approved
May 6, 2015	Provost Council	Approved
May 4, 2015	Faculty Senate	Approved
May 1, 2015	Chairs Association	Reviewed without comment

Policy established in part through Policy 4.6.7, Tenured Faculty Member Review

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ENTITY</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
October 21, 2000	Board of Regents	Adopted
September 21, 2000	Council on Academic Affairs	Approved
September 11, 2000	Faculty Senate	Approved

APPENDIX I

Tenured Faculty Evaluation Rubric

Category	Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Falls Below Expectations
Teaching	Instructional Quality & Professionalism	Demonstrates innovative, engaging, and effective teaching; communicates professionally with students and colleagues regarding instructional matters.	Provides clear instructions and generally professional communication with students and colleagues.	Instructional quality lacks clarity or professionalism; communication with students or colleagues is frequently ineffective or inappropriate.
	Student Learning Assessment & Student Success	Uses varied assessments to measure learning outcomes; actively fosters a supportive academic environment; provides strong support for student success.	Uses appropriate assessments; provides adequate support for student success.	Assessments are limited or misaligned; support for student success is inconsistent or absent; does not communicate with students or colleagues in a timely and responsible manner.
Scholarly/ Creative Activities	Research/Creative Output	Consistently produces peer-reviewed and/or creative works appropriate to the field; and/or engages constructively and collaboratively with colleagues in scholarly endeavors.	Maintains steady scholarly/creative output appropriate to the field; participates in collaborative efforts as appropriate.	Limited or no scholarly/creative contributions as appropriate to department and college standards.

	Dissemination/ Recognition	Enhances the reputation of the department/institution by sharing work through highly respected outlets appropriate to the field (for example, publications, conferences, grants, or exhibitions, etc.).	Shares work through respected outlets appropriate to the field (for example, publications, conferences, grants, or exhibitions, etc.); maintains appropriate professional engagement.	Rarely disseminates work or contributes to the scholarly reputation of the department/institution.
Service	Department/College /University Service & Collegial Engagement	Plays active/leadership roles on committees or initiatives, and provides student advising as assigned and evidence of mentorship; collaborates respectfully with colleagues to advance shared goals.	Participates regularly and fulfills assigned service roles, such as advising; demonstrates basic collegiality.	Makes minimal contributions or rarely participates in service activities. Behavior may obstruct collective work.
	Professional & Community Service	Engages meaningfully in external service activities, such as leadership in professional organizations, community partnerships; and represents the institution with professionalism.	Actively participates in professional organizations or community.	Minimal or no professional/community service; does not represent the institution positively.

Tenured Faculty Evaluation Summary

Faculty Member: _____

Department: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Category	Criteria	Rating
Teaching	Instructional Quality & Professionalism	
	Mentoring & Student Learning Assessment	
	Overall Teaching Rating	
Scholarship	Research/Creative Output & Collaboration	
	Dissemination/Recognition	
	Overall Scholarship Rating	
Service	Department/College/University Service & Collegial Engagement	
	Professional, Community, & Advising Service	
	Overall Service Rating	
Overall Rating		

Evaluator Comments (required for ratings of “Falls Below Expectations”):