

Post-Tenure Review

Information Session for Chairs

February 6, 2026

Jeanette Taylor/Craig Stanley

Office of Faculty Development & Advancement

History of Post-Tenure Review

- This is only the third year of PTR
- Statute passed in July 2022
- BOG and FSU Regulations approved by June 2023
- Initially bargained and added to CBA September 2024

Post-Tenure Review

- Who is reviewed?
 - Tenured faculty beginning 5 years after being awarded tenure (including those hired with tenure) or promoted to Full Professor
- What is the review period for PTR 2026?
 - 5 calendar years: 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025
- What is reviewed?
 - Faculty performance of assigned duties
 - **Substantiated findings** resulting in disciplinary action
- Who are the reviewers?
 - Chair/Director
 - Dean
 - Provost

Selection of Faculty for 2026 Post-Tenure Review

- Faculty awarded tenure or promoted to full effective fall 2021
PLUS
- 20% of faculty tenured/promoted prior to 2019 (“catch up” cohort)
 - Randomly selected

2026 Post-Tenure Review Timeline

September 4, 2025: Faculty members participating in 2026 PTR confirmed by the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement.

September 26, 2025: Decisions sent to faculty on postponement/eligibility requests

October to December 2025: PTR participants update their CVs in FEAS and prepare their materials for review.

January to April 2026: PTR materials are reviewed by department chairs and deans.

Summer 2026: Provost review of deans' PTR ratings.

NOTE: Colleges and departments will establish internal submission deadlines

Review Process: Faculty Role

Faculty members submit to their department chair/school director (or dean, for colleges without departments/schools) the following materials:

1. **FEAS Post-Tenure Review Report** (includes CV, AOR, SPCI and grade distributions for the review period).
2. Summary of Accomplishments during the review period (**1-page limit; required**).
3. Additional Evidence of Performance during the review period (**3-page limit; optional**).
4. Opportunity to review materials and provide a response.

Review Process: Chair/Director Role

Chair/director adds to the review materials the following information for submission to the dean:

1. Evaluations for the review period.
2. Any disciplinary action reports during the review period (generated by HR and sent to chair/director by FDA).
3. Letter assessing the faculty member's performance (with input from a faculty committee). **No rating** made at this review level.

Making Sense of the Information

Attend to the level of effort in each area (Summary of AOR report in PTR Report from FEAS)

Committee input is just that – input. It must not be ignored, but your assessment is what is represented by your letter

Annual evaluation ratings are just one element and are made for a different time frame than the 5-year review

Only official disciplinary actions by HR must be considered (NOT shared with faculty committee)

Performance Assessment Letter

Clear, succinct assessment of performance in each area of assignment

Providing evidence for your assessment is key

Comment on quantity and quality of activity and any **outstanding** accomplishments (it's OK if there aren't any)

Is the level of productivity similar, less than, or greater than others in the unit/discipline **given the assigned level of effort?**

Do NOT offer a rating in your letter

Faculty Review of Materials

Chair/director letter and all materials added at that review level are sent to the faculty member for review and, if desired, response.

Any response must be added no later than 5 working days from receipt of the chair/director letter.

Review Process: Dean & Provost Roles

Dean submits to the Provost a letter assessing each faculty member's performance for the review period (may include input from a college committee) and a recommended rating.

Provost assigns to each faculty member a rating, in consultation with the president (may include input from an advisory committee).

Performance Ratings

- **Exceeds Expectations:** a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Evidence of awards, honors, and other criteria recognized by academic units as meritorious performance is expected for assigning this rating.
- **Meets Expectations:** expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit.
- **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.
- **Unsatisfactory:** failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct, as defined by applicable university regulation and policies. Evidence of prior feedback of performance problems with an opportunity to remediate performance problems is expected for assigning this rating.

Outcomes of Ratings

“Exceeds Expectations” or **“Meets Expectations”**: monetary reward that may consist of a salary increase, one-time bonus, or both.

“Does Not Meet Expectations”: placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), given 12 months to meet goals or proceed to proposal to terminate.

“Unsatisfactory”: proposal to terminate employment, pursuant to applicable University processes.

Outcomes from the Post-Tenure Review process may be appealed via the applicable collective bargaining agreement (CBA) or the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee.

Questions?

Dr. Jeanette Taylor

Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement

jtaylor@fsu.edu

Dr. Craig Stanley

Associate Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement

cstanley@fsu.edu

Melissa Crawford

Faculty Administrator

Office of Faculty Development and Advancement

mucrawford@fsu.edu

644-7500

Website: <https://fda.fsu.edu/faculty-development/post-tenure-review>