

Post-Tenure Reviews (10/2025)

Review of Tenured Faculty

Desired Outcomes of the Review

These periodic reviews should address the quality of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and should result in recommendations that help to enhance that performance. They also inform departmental decisions about merit pay increases, course staffing, distribution of responsibilities for departmental service, professional development and leaves of absence, nomination for teaching awards, and other decisions under the department's purview.

CPH Post-Tenure Review Policy

This is the University Policy for Tenured Faculty Members, with the specific procedures for the College of Public Health imbedded **in bold** within text boxes. (Pages 4 and 5 approved by CPH Faculty council on October 21, 2011; approved by faculty vote on November 18, 2011. Modified and approved by faculty vote on November 24, 2014. Timelines modified October 2025 to reflect annual reviews that were shifted from fall back to spring semester.)

10.7 REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS.

(Faculty Senate 3/29/11; amended Faculty Council 8/11)

Note: Effective August 2011, this policy has been revised. For individual changes, see the [redlined version](#).

a. Introduction.

(1) Scope. This section establishes procedures to be followed by the University in conducting reviews of a tenured faculty member's academic performance in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. There are two kinds of review of tenured faculty: annual reviews conducted by the unit head, and periodic reviews conducted by faculty peers.

(a) An annual review should, in the main, be evaluative, but may also be formative and developmental.

(b) A peer review should, in the main, be formative and developmental, and should facilitate and encourage professional vitality.

(2) Academic freedom. All proceedings under this section shall respect the principles of academic freedom and tenure stated in the Statement on Tenure and Academic Vitality at The University of Iowa (III-10.1a(2) above), which commits the University to the principle that "free inquiry and expression are essential to the maintenance of excellence; tenure is essential to free inquiry and expression." The expectation is that all post-tenure reviews will respect the significance and importance of tenure.

(3) Rationale. A tenured faculty member has the responsibility of strengthening his or her university citizenship through his or her work in education, research, and service. The faculty member must also ensure that he or she continues to strive to meet this responsibility. Post-tenure review is a process that has been developed to assess a tenured faculty member's progress. The process includes annual review or evaluation conducted by the faculty member's unit head, and a five-year review conducted by the faculty member's peers.

b. Annual review of tenured faculty. An annual performance review of all tenured faculty members, through a process developed by the unit head (DEO, or equivalent) in consultation with the faculty of the department, or in nondepartmental units with the faculty of the college, and approved by the dean and Provost, is conducted by the unit head as part of the salary-setting process. Review of tenured faculty shall include an evaluation of research/scholarship, teaching, and service. As part of this review, each

faculty member must make available to the unit head materials specified in the statement of the department's review process (e.g., vitae, teaching evaluations, etc.).

In the College of Public Health, the departments will use the following process with regards to annual reviews of tenured faculty, within the context of university policy:

- 1. All tenured faculty with less than a 50% administrative appointment will be reviewed by their DEOs on an annual basis. This review is intended to be evaluative (as part of the salary-setting process), as well as developmental. If a promotion review or a five-year post-tenure peer review is being held, then that review will also serve the purpose of the annual review.**
- 2. The faculty member will provide the following to the DEO by January 1, or by another date mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the DEO, consistent with meeting by April 1st:**
 - a. An updated electronic CV.**
 - b. Copies of teaching evaluations from students SPOT forms, summaries, and Assessment of Teaching) and from peers for courses taught since the past review.**
 - c. CPH Faculty Review Form, summarizing the accomplishments of the previous year and future goals. This should address previously stated goals, as well as any concerns raised in the most recent past review. It may also contain concerns or suggestions that the faculty member wants to express.**
 - d. Additional materials, if requested (e.g., copies of publications).**
- 3. The DEO and the faculty member will meet to discuss the above materials by April 1st. The DEO will bring a copy of the most recent review (post-tenure or promotion) and will also provide a copy of the "TFEA" ("Tenured Faculty Effort Allocation") form that was in effect for the previous fiscal year. This meeting will be in person unless otherwise dictated by unusual circumstances, such as extended leaves. The following are additional guidelines for the review:**
 - a. The focus of the review will generally correspond to the previous fiscal year, although scholarly publications will be reviewed for the previous calendar year. However, year-to-date progress on publications may also be discussed. It may also be helpful to examine averages and trends across multiple years to identify relevant long-term patterns.**
 - b. A comparison of the previous FY TFEA plan with the accomplishments achieved in the last year (including the amount of salary offset).**
 - c. The DEO should provide feedback on past performance and future plans, which is essential to improving performance. The faculty may also express needs that, if met, could facilitate success in achieving future plans.**
 - d. The DEO should indicate how the faculty member's performance in the last year compares to previously stated goals and to departmental expectations. Any rubric or formula used for making comparisons should be explained. The university policy for follow-up (next page) will be used if significant deficiencies are noted.**

4. **By April 15, the DEO will complete a document summarizing the meeting(s) where the review was performed. This document may be of any length, but substantive concerns should be specified. The faculty member will have 10 business days to respond by letter, if he/she chooses. In lieu of signatures, acknowledgment of the documents may be made through the UI workflow system by the faculty member, DEO, and Dean. The review materials, the faculty member's response (if any), and the review form are to be forwarded to the Dean by April 30th.**

When, as a result of an annual review, the unit head concludes that there are significant deficiencies related to teaching, research, or service, the unit head shall provide written notifications of these conclusions to the faculty member being reviewed, and the faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond in writing. The final report and the faculty member's response will be sent to the dean and will be kept with the faculty member's personnel records.

The annual review will consider, as appropriate, issues of long-term research, instructional development, or service that cannot be adequately represented on a strictly annual basis. Faculty members being reviewed by their department for the special purpose of promotion may be exempted from this annual faculty review requirement.

c. Five-year peer review of tenured faculty.

(1) Overview. In a shared-governance academic environment, the faculty plays an indispensable role in appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal of faculty members. One of the ways that faculty exercise this responsibility is through the formal process of peer review. Post-tenure peer review is intended to acknowledge achievements and to provide an appropriate mechanism to encourage constructive responses to normal changes that are likely to occur over the course of a successful academic career. The developmental nature of post-tenure review mandates that a faculty member being reviewed should be accorded adequate time to respond to the review and to improve performance where necessary, prior to initiation of any proceedings which may be viewed as adversarial or punitive.

(2) Procedure. All tenured faculty members will undergo a peer review once every five years subsequent to their most recent tenure or promotion review. Faculty members are exempted from their scheduled five-year peer review if:

(a) they are being reviewed for promotion to a higher rank during the year of the scheduled review,

(b) they are within one year of announced retirement or are on phased retirement, or

(c) they serve as DEO, assistant dean, associate dean, or dean.

The five-year peer review will include a comprehensive review by a committee composed of tenured faculty peers in the same college as the faculty member undergoing review and at the same or higher academic rank appointed by the DEO or dean in consultation with the faculty member who is to be reviewed. DEOs and other academic administrators may not serve on peer review committees. The outcome of this peer review is confidential and confined to the faculty member being reviewed, the review committee, the DEO, the dean, others directed by the faculty member, and in special circumstances the Provost.

(3) Plan. Consistent with the foregoing, each college must develop and implement a plan for the five-year peer review of each tenured faculty member. The plan is to include specific guidelines regarding:

(a) selection of the five-year peer review committee;

In the College of Public Health, the committee will be composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty peers from CPH at the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member undergoing review (“the faculty member”). This committee will be chosen by the DEO in consultation with the faculty member, and approved by the Dean. When possible, the committee must include a minimum of one member from within and one external to the faculty member’s department. Deans, Associate Deans, and DEOs may not serve on peer review committees. Formal mentors may be included in the committee. The membership of the committee will be known to the faculty member.

(b) committee procedures and timelines;

In the College of Public Health, the faculty member and DEO shall make relevant materials available for review no later than **January 1st. The committee shall review the faculty member's five-year record, comparing it to the performance standards in the faculty member's department. The committee shall prepare a written report that summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. The report may also contain specific suggestions to the faculty member to aid in career development and to address departmental and collegiate needs. The written report shall be submitted to the DEO by **March 1st**, who will forward to the faculty member. The faculty member will have 15 business days to provide a written response, if desired. The reviewed materials, the original committee report, the faculty member's response (if any), and a cover letter from the DEO are to be forwarded to the Dean by **March 31st**.**

(c) materials to be reviewed;

In the College of Public Health, the faculty member shall supply a copy of his/her CV, along with a personal statement (2000 word limit) regarding teaching, research and service, including a summary of previous accomplishments and plans for the next five years. The DEO shall supply copies of the following for the previous five years: Student evaluations of teaching (ACE) evaluations along with Departmental norms, peer evaluations of teaching, a record of annual salary offset percentages, and Post-Tenure Effort Allocation forms. The faculty member and DEO may supply additional information deemed relevant. They should also respond to committee requests for additional materials.

(d) distribution and use of the committee's written report; and

See text box under (3)(b), above. Also, in the College of Public Health, as per university regulations, the outcome of this peer review is confidential and confined to the faculty member being reviewed, the review committee, the DEO, the dean, the Associate Dean for Faculty, the Associate Dean for Finance and Administration, others designated by the faculty member, and in special circumstances the Provost.

(e) mechanisms for the faculty member to respond.

As explained under (3)(b), above, the faculty member will have 15 business days to insert a written response to the committee's report into the review record; they also may respond in writing to the DEO summary letter. They may also decide to respond to specific findings of the review by modifying their professional activities during the months and years that follow.

Faculty members of the college will approve the plan by vote. The dean and Provost will approve each plan and ensure consistency with review processes across the departments and colleges.

A faculty member who believes that she or he has been treated unfairly at any point during the five-year peer review process may seek redress of her or his grievance within the scope and framework of [III-29.6 Faculty Dispute Procedures](#).

d. Special cases procedures. If, after receiving the results of the five-year peer review, the dean, on advice of the peer review committee and in consultation with the DEO, if one exists, concludes, on the basis of the peer review's findings, that the faculty member's performance has fallen for a significant period of time below the expected standard of performance for the faculty member's unit, then the dean may initiate discussions with the faculty member concerning the development of a plan to address problems uncovered in the review. Such discussion may focus on the faculty member's individualized portfolio. The plan will be put in writing, will contain a justification for its implementation, will provide a specific timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress (normally to occur at the faculty member's next five-year review), and will provide a description of possible consequences for not meeting expectations by the time of that evaluation. The DEO and/or dean may monitor progress through the annual review and give feedback to the faculty member.

If the plan prepared by the peer review committee and the dean is not agreed to by the faculty member, then the faculty member will provide a written justification for not agreeing to the plan. The plan and the faculty member's response will be submitted to the Provost, who will make the final determination as to whether the plan should be implemented. If the faculty member believes that there are grounds for grievance, then the faculty member may seek redress of his or her grievance within the scope and framework of [III-29.6 Faculty Dispute Procedures](#).

In deciding whether or not to implement such a plan, it is important that the dean and DEO respect the importance of tenure and the academic freedom it is designed to protect. With respect to research, there is a critical distinction between a faculty member who has ambitious research programs that they are actively pursuing and the very few faculty members who have no such plans and who have had no work in progress for a substantial period of time. It is expected that if plans envisioned focus on research productivity, they would typically be appropriate only for the latter group.

If the plan is implemented, then the dean (or dean's designee) and the DEO will oversee the faculty member's progress under the plan. If after the agreed-to time period, the dean and the DEO, in consultation with the peer review committee, find no acceptable progress, then the DEO, the dean, the Provost, and the peer review committee will meet to decide which of the consequences described in the plan will go into effect. The consequences will be implemented by the dean, in consultation with the DEO, and monitored by the Provost.

Use of the special review procedures described above does not preclude deans from utilizing available, alternative procedures for addressing problems of unacceptable performance of duty ([III-29.7](#), [III-29.8](#)). On those rare occasions where a faculty member has proved unwilling or unable to benefit from developmental assistance to improve his or her performance, the administration may feel compelled to proceed against the faculty member in a disciplinary or unfitness proceeding, where the burden of proof is on the administration to show that the proposed sanction is justified. However, deans are strongly encouraged to proceed with formative and developmental plans before resorting to such measures.

[\[top\]](#)