

GSBE Post-Tenure Review Policy

Passed 4/2/2026

1.0 POST-TENURE REVIEW PURPOSE, TRACKS, AND EVALUATION STANDARDS

1.1 For all tenured faculty, Post-Tenure Review is a mandatory accountability review conducted at least every five years to ensure continued professional development and faculty performance in alignment with GSBE standards. A post-tenure review may also be required if a faculty member falls out of their designated GSBE faculty qualification status or receives an “unsatisfactory” rating in any part of their annual performance evaluation.

1.2 The requirement for post-tenure review may be met through any of the following review tracks or procedures. The faculty member under review may designate their desired track based on their circumstances.

1) Post-Tenure Review (PTR): For tenured faculty of any rank, this is the standard, default review track. To meet expectations, a faculty member must meet their current GSBE Faculty Qualification criteria (e.g., SA, PA, SP, or IP/IA) and fulfill all professional responsibilities. This track maintains the faculty member’s current salary and rank, and is reviewed primarily by the internal GSBE Post-Tenure Review Committee (college committee).

Post-Tenure Review Necessary Requirements

Evaluation Ratings Applicable	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

2) Performance Compensation Plan (PCP): For tenured faculty who have held the rank of Professor for at least five years, the PCP is an optional, incentive-based application intended to reward performance that exceeds standard expectations. Faculty members may also meet the expectations of a post tenure review by successfully completing a PCP. PCP candidates must demonstrate that they meet the criteria for the rank of Professor and achieve thresholds higher than those required for basic faculty qualification. A successful PCP candidate must qualify for one of the channels for

promotion to Professor as defined in PPM 8-11. Success in this track results in a

permanent base-salary increase.. Candidates who do not meet the higher standards of PCP review may still be evaluated as successfully meeting the requirements for post tenure review.

3) Review for Promotion to Professor: For tenured faculty who are seeking advancement in rank to Professor, the promotion review process defined in PPM 8-11 and the GSBE Tenure and Promotion Policy Document also serves the dual function of Post-Tenure Review. The review will follow the usual timeline for promotion defined in PPM 8-11 and 8-12. Candidates who are successfully promoted to Professor rank automatically satisfy their post-tenure review requirement. In the event of non recommendation for promotion, the candidate's post-tenure review status is determined based on PTR criteria.

2.0 COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND FUNCTION

In accordance with PPM 8-11, Post Tenure and Performance Compensation evaluations are conducted by a college-level committee to ensure GSBE standards are applied uniformly across the school.

2.1 Committee Selection and Role

- Selection: Members are appointed by the Provost in consultation with GSBE Department Chairs and the Dean.
- Provost Designee: The Department Chair of the candidate under review shall serve as the Provost's designee on the committee and shall also act as the committee chair.
- Composition: The committee shall consist of at least five tenured faculty members, including the candidate's Department Chair. To ensure consistency and avoid departmental bias, the committee shall include at least two members from GSBE departments other than the candidate's home department. Additional members may be drawn from within GSBE or outside GSBE.
- Role: The committee shall conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, verify adherence to professional ethics and the maintenance of GSBE Faculty Qualification status, and provide a formal written recommendation to the Dean by December 10.

2.2 Committee Functional Equivalency

To be consistent with PPM 8-11 Section 3.0, the GSBE Post-Tenure Review Committee shall serve as the functional equivalent of the "Departmental" or "Program" committee. While the review is conducted at the College level to ensure uniform application of GSBE criteria and

requirements, the committee shall evaluate each candidate based on the specific departmental performance standards of the candidate's home department.

3.0 DATED GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

- **Sept 8:** Dean identifies and notifies faculty due for review.
 - **Sept 23:** GSBE Department Chairs discuss committee selection based on criteria in 2.1 and submit PTR/PCP committee membership recommendations to the Provost.
 - **Oct 1:** Provost appoints committees for each college
 - **Nov 10:** Candidate submits professional files electronically using the method designated by the Dean's Office.
 - **Dec 10:** College PTR/PCP Committee evaluates candidate and submits written recommendation to the Dean.
 - **Jan 10:** Dean completes review and submits final recommendation to the Provost.
 - **Feb 5:** Provost review due.

4.0 TEACHING EVALUATION

Teaching effectiveness is a core requirement for a successful PTR or PCP review.

4.1 Every five-year review cycle must include formal peer observations and peer reviews of teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, assessments, and Canvas course design) specific to the 5 years under review. In principle, these reviews shall be conducted by peers within the candidate's home department to ensure evaluation is based on discipline-specific pedagogy, though faculty from other GSBE departments may be included in cases where the number of available faculty reviewers is insufficient. Completed evaluations must be included in the PTR or PCP file as one of the multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness.

4.2 The College Committee shall review the submitted peer evaluations alongside student evaluations and other evidence of instructional effectiveness. In accordance with PPM 8-11, student evaluations shall not be the sole basis for an "Unsatisfactory" rating, nor shall they be used for direct comparison between faculty members.

4.3 Candidates must demonstrate a commitment to instructional excellence by providing evidence of continuous improvement and pedagogical innovation. This may include documentation of course redesigns, adoption of new technologies, or responses to previous peer/student feedback.

5.0 RESEARCH EVALUATION

Faculty must submit documentation of research, including any intellectual property or commercialization efforts. The GSBE utilizes a points-based system defined within the GSBE Faculty Qualifications Policy Document to evaluate scholarship.

5.1 To be eligible for a successful PTR or PCP review, a faculty member must first meet the quantitative point thresholds defined in the GSBE Faculty Qualifications Document and its rolling 6-year window (e.g., 12 points for PTR; 16 points for PCP). It should be noted, however, that the achievement of specific point totals is viewed as a necessary condition, but not necessarily sufficient, condition for a successful review.

5.2 In keeping with PPM 8-11, candidates must provide evidence of sustained scholarly activity, which is evaluated by the distribution of output across the five-year window to ensure research is ongoing rather than clustered at the beginning or end of the review period. This evaluation encompasses both the quality and rigor in traditional peer-reviewed journal articles and other intellectual contributions (OICs), as defined and weighted in the current GSBE Faculty Qualifications Policy Document. Furthermore, the candidate must demonstrate a viable plan of ongoing scholarly work that extends through the upcoming review window, as evidenced by works currently in progress, active data collection, and/or a formal research statement outlining specific projects with their current status and target venues.

6.0 SERVICE EVALUATION & EXPECTATIONS

Professional service is a non-negotiable component of a faculty member's workload and is evaluated as part of both the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) and the Performance Compensation Plan (PCP). Service is assessed based on the candidate's active contribution to the Department, College, University, and the broader professional or local community.

6.1 Evaluation Criteria and Context:

- **Department-Specific Role:** Service shall be evaluated in the context of the faculty member's specific department and role. The College Committee shall defer to the home department's standards to determine if the quantity and type of service are appropriate for the candidate's department and program.
- **Impact and Leadership:** Evaluation focuses on evidence of active participation, contribution, reliability, and, where applicable, leadership roles (e.g., chairing a committee, leading a task force, or serving as a faculty senator) rather than a simple list of committee memberships.

- **Professional and Community Service:** Scholarly service (e.g., reviewing for journals, serving on editorial boards, serving in professional societies) and community-based service related to the candidate's expertise are recognized as vital contributions to the GSBE mission and AACSB standing.

6.2 For a PCP application, the candidate must demonstrate leadership that significantly impacts the institution or the profession. This may include initiating and completing major projects that improve GSBE operations or student success, holding high-level leadership positions within the GSBE, university-wide governance, or national professional organizations, and demonstrating a sustained pattern of service that exceeds standard departmental expectations.

6.3 Candidates must include a summary of their service activities for the five years under review. This summary should provide a brief description of the candidate's specific contributions and any measurable outcomes or impacts resulting from their service, rather than a simple list of organizations or committees.

7.0 OTHER NECESSARY CRITERIA

Faculty Qualification Status Maintenance: The candidate must provide evidence of sustained alignment with their designated GSBE Faculty Qualification category (SA, PA, SP, or IP/IA). Failure to maintain faculty qualification status constitutes a failure to meet the necessary conditions for Post-Tenure Review.

Professional Ethics: Success in any track requires adherence to the professional ethics and responsibilities outlined in PPM 9-1 through 9-5. This includes compliance with university policies regarding conflicts of interest, research integrity, and professional conduct.

8.0 FACULTY SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Faculty must submit their professional file electronically using the method designated by the Dean's Office by **November 10**. Files are expected to exclusively cover the 5-year evaluation window, and must include the following in order:

1. **Narrative Statement:** (PTR: Max 2 pages; PCP: Max 5 pages). Address the impact of teaching, service, and scholarship.
2. **Annual Faculty Performance Reviews:** Copies of the five most recent annual faculty performance reviews conducted by the Department Chair.
3. **Current Curriculum Vitae (CV):** Identifying peer-reviewed outputs and professional engagement.

4. **GSBE Faculty Qualifications Point Summary Table:** A self-report of points earned over the current rolling 6-year window used for Faculty Qualification purposes.
5. **Peer Evaluations of Teaching:** Formal peer reviews and peer evaluation of teaching materials consistent with GSBE peer review standards for the five-year window.
6. **Student Course Evaluations:** A comprehensive summary of student course evaluations spanning the five-year review period, in addition to the full evaluations provided by the Dean's Office.

9.0 DEAN'S OFFICE SUPPORT & ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

To facilitate a transparent and efficient review process, the GSBE Dean's Office will provide the following administrative support to the faculty member:

- **Official Notification:** By September 8, the Dean's Office will notify all faculty members scheduled for review in the current academic year.
- **Annual Faculty Performance Reviews:** The Dean's Office will provide the faculty member with digital copies of their five most recent annual evaluations as signed by their Department Chair.
- **Student Evaluation Data:** The Dean's Office will provide student evaluations for the five-year window to both the faculty member and the college committee by adding the evaluations to the faculty portfolio.
- **Faculty Qualification Status Verification:** The Dean's Office will provide a preliminary report indicating the faculty member's current qualification status (SA, PA, SP, or IP/IA) as recorded in the college database.

10.0 EVALUATION OUTCOMES

10.1 A faculty member is deemed to have met expectations for Post-Tenure Review through a two-tiered evaluation process. First, they must meet the objective eligibility thresholds: maintaining their designated GSBE Faculty Qualification status, achieving the required scholarship point totals within the Faculty Qualifications rolling six-year window, and receiving "meets expectations" or higher ratings in the majority of their annual performance reviews.

Second, meeting these eligibility thresholds enables the next step: a holistic verification by the College Committee to ensure the consistency and robustness of the body of work. This holistic

review confirms that the research portfolio demonstrates scholarly rigor and a viable future

6

pipeline, and that teaching and service contributions align with the mission-driven standards of the GSBE. A positive recommendation is contingent upon adherence to the professional ethics and responsibilities outlined in PPM 9-1 through 9-5

10.2 For the Performance Compensation Plan, meeting the 16-point research threshold is a necessary first step. In addition to meeting this threshold, the candidate must successfully meet the expectations of a channel for promotion to Professor as detailed in PPM 8-11, and the GSBE Promotion & Tenure Policy, as validated by the internal College Committee.

10.3 If a candidate applies for the PCP but fails to meet the threshold, they are denied the salary increase. However, if they still meet the sufficient PTR criteria, they are deemed to have passed their mandatory Post-Tenure Review with no penalty.

11.0 REMEDIATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (RDP)

11.1 In accordance with PPM 8-11, if the College Committee and the Dean determine that a faculty member's performance is "Unsatisfactory" in any of the primary categories (Teaching, Scholarship, or Service), a formal Remediation and Development Plan (RDP) must be established.

11.2 The Remediation and Development Plan (RDP) is not a disciplinary action but a developmental process intended to restore the faculty member to "Satisfactory" standing. The Dean, in direct consultation with the Department Chair and the faculty member, shall draft the RDP within 30 days of the final "Unsatisfactory" notification from the Provost's office. All completed RDPs must be submitted to and approved by the Provost prior to their official implementation.

11.3 The RDP must be specific and include:

- **Identified Deficiencies:** A clear explanation of where the faculty member failed to meet GSBE standards.
- **Specific Goals:** Measurable benchmarks that, if met, will result in a "Satisfactory" rating at the next review.
- **Timeline for Completion:** A period (typically no more than two years) to demonstrate sufficient improvement.
- **Resources:** A list of institutional supports (e.g., travel funds, teaching workshops, or research grants) provided by the college to assist the faculty member.

11.4 The Department Chair shall meet with the faculty member biannually to monitor progress and provide feedback on the benchmarks established in the Remediation and Development Plan (RDP). If the goals are successfully met within the specified timeline, the faculty member returns to the standard five-year Post-Tenure Review cycle. However, if the faculty member fails to meet the RDP goals within the allotted time, the Dean shall refer the matter to the Provost for further action in accordance with the due process and disciplinary action protocols outlined in PPM 9-9 through 9-17.

