

**PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

**PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

- I. Preamble**
- II. Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Eligibility**
- III. Funding of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases**
- IV. Post Tenure Review Cycle and Timelines**
- V. Departmental Authority and Responsibility**
- VI. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review**
- VII. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Department Chairs/Unit Heads and Program Directors**
- VIII. Roles and Procedures for Administrative Review**
- IX. Professional Development Plan**
- X. Assessment of the Post Tenure Review Process**

**Adopted by Faculty Senate Spring 2015**  
**Ratified by PSU-AAUP September 4, 2015**  
**Revised per PTR Article X Spring 2017**

## I. Preamble

By awarding tenure, Portland State University recognizes its obligation to invest in and support the lifelong careers of its faculty. The purpose of tenure is to support and maintain a vibrant and committed faculty who contribute, in their individual ways, to the mission of the university and the excellence of the institution. Post-tenure review is founded on the principle that a strong and healthy university is one that supports, recognizes, and rewards faculty members throughout their careers for their contributions to the institution's mission. Post-tenure review acknowledges and values both the continuing scholarly work of the faculty directed towards research, teaching and outreach, and the many dimensions of service that are often a significant part of the career of tenured faculty members.

The faculty narrative is defined as a document that

- clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, and service;
- describes an individual's accomplished and proposed contributions to the above areas;
- articulates the manner in which the individual's activities relate to the departmental needs, mission, and programmatic goals and changes in the department over time.

As tenured faculty progress through their careers, their narratives will change to reflect varying proportions of time dedicated to research, teaching, advising, outreach, departmental, university, and professional service, administration, and academic leadership.

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay. Whereas reviews for tenure and promotion measure a candidate against the norms for his or her field via external review and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within an institution, the goals of post-tenure review are

- to assure that individual faculty members work responsibly within their units to ensure that unit contributions are shouldered equitably. A key aspect of this process is collaboration in aligning each faculty member's career path with unit missions while upholding academic freedom and a faculty member's proper sphere of professional self-direction;
- to be a collegial, faculty-driven process that supports faculty development;
- to recognize and motivate faculty engagement.

Post-tenure review is not a re-evaluation of tenure.

The procedures for post-tenure review herein are a supplement to the PSU *Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Increases* 1996, revised and reapproved April 7, 2014.

## **II. Post-Tenure Review Guidelines and Eligibility**

Tenured faculty members shall undergo post-tenure review every five years after the award of tenure. Successful reviews for promotions in rank of tenured faculty shall be considered as reviews in lieu of post-tenure review and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post-tenure review. In the event of an unsuccessful promotion review, there is no break in the timeline for post-tenure review.

All AAUP-represented tenured faculty members, tenured department chairs/unit heads, and program directors shall undergo post-tenure review. The reviews shall commence in the AY 2015-2016, as delineated herein.

In the event of changes in Article 30 Section 6b (Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases) of the University/AAUP CBA, the Faculty Senate shall reopen this document to make adjustments that maintain an appropriate balance between workload and incentives.

OAA shall be responsible for creating a list of tenured faculty who are eligible for post-tenure review with regard to the year of the last review, ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion.

A fifth of all eligible tenured faculty will be reviewed in each of the first five years, ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion. Post-tenure reviews done prior to the approval of these guidelines will not be considered in judging eligibility.

Tenured faculty who provide a letter to the Dean, with a copy to HR stating they will retire within 2 years shall be allowed to opt out of post-tenure review. In these cases, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile during the first five-year cycle of reviews. If the faculty member subsequently rescinds their plan to retire, their post tenure review will occur with the next available quintile.

With written agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer post-tenure review if review for promotion occurs within the same year, or for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions. Faculty may not apply for post tenure review and promotion in the same academic year. As faculty in a quintile are deferred, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile during the first five year cycle of reviews.

### III. Funding Of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases

The pool for Post-Tenure Review Salary increases (currently equal to 4% of salaries of reviewed faculty per Article 30, Section 6 of AAUP-PSU CBA 2013- 2015) shall be divided into equal increments, per the number of faculty under review in a year. A faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equal to this increment. The increase will be added permanently to the faculty member’s base salary, effective at the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

Notwithstanding the above, the first two quintiles of tenured faculty shall be reviewed during the initial post tenure review period of 2015-16. The first cohort shall have their salary increase retroactive to September 16, 2015. The second cohort shall have their salary increase effective September 16, 2016.

### IV. Post Tenure Review Cycle and Timelines (effective XXX)

Task	Due Date	
OAA creates list of eligible faculty and provides to Deans and Chairs	May 1	
Eligible faculty notified	No later than <del>June 1</del> <u>May 15</u> prior to the year of eligibility	
Faculty requests deferment/ <u>opts out</u>	<del>June 15</del> <u>1</u> prior to the year of eligibility	
Department Committee formed	Per Dept. P & T guidelines	
Faculty submits dossier		1st Friday in October
Committee completes review of eligible faculty and submits report		End of October
Chair completes reviews of eligible faculty and submits report	Within 10 business days from receipt of committee report	Mid November
Faculty member receives chair’s letter and committee report	Within 10 business days of the transmittal of the committee’s report	Mid November
Faculty member requests reconsideration	Within <del>10</del> <u>5</u> business days of receipt of recommendation	<del>Late</del> <u>Third week in</u> November
Faculty member submits supporting materials to committee and/or chair	Within 20 business days of request for reconsideration	<del>Mid</del> <u>Second week of</u> December
Committee and/or chair responds to reconsideration request and forward all materials to the Dean.		Second week of January
Dean completes reviews of eligible faculty and submits report	Within 10 business days of the receipt of the committee and chair reports	Fourth week of January
Department chair, chair of the committee or faculty member requests reconsideration conference	Within <del>10</del> <u>5</u> business days of receipt of Dean’s letter	<del>Mid</del> <u>First week of</u> February
Faculty member submits supporting materials to committee and/or chair	Within 10 business days of request for reconsideration	<del>Late</del> <u>Third week of</u> February
Dean completes review, issues report and submits to provost.		<del>Mid</del> <u>First week of</u> March
Faculty member requests	Within <del>10</del> <u>5</u> business days of the	<del>Early April</del> <u>Second</u>

reconsideration conference with the Provost	receipt of the Provost letter	<u>week of March</u>
Faculty member submits supporting materials to the Provost Faculty member requests meeting with provost (optional)	Within business 20 days of receiving Provost letter	<del>Early May – Second-week of –April</del>
Provost issues decision		<del>Mid</del> Fourth week of April
Post tenure review PDP developed and jointly agreed to by faculty member and chair	Within 30 business days after Provost’s post tenure review decision is issued	<del>Early June*</del> <u>Fourth week of May</u>
If faculty member and chair cannot agree they will meet with the Dean	Within 14 business days	Second week of June *
Final PDP with Dean, Chair and faculty member developing PDP	June 15, year of review	<u>*June 15</u>
*May be extended if necessary and approval received.		

**V. Departmental Authority and Responsibility**

- A. The primary responsibility for assessing an individual faculty member’s contributions rests with the faculty of the department or unit. Therefore, each department or unit shall establish procedures and criteria for post-tenure review that are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Procedures for Post-Tenure Review, which have priority. Guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit.
- B. Approval of departmental/unit procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of departmental procedures and criteria, then he or she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his or her objections and recommendations to the Provost for resolution. The final version must be returned by the Provost to the department/unit and ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit and approval by the Dean. If the procedures and criteria are not ratified by the tenure-line faculty the department/unit will return to the process in step A to develop modified procedures and criteria. Faculty members will not be eligible for review until procedures and criteria are in place.
- C. After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department/unit faculty and to the Dean. Department chairs shall distribute these guidelines to new tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.
- D. In cases where a faculty member’s appointment is equally divided between two or more departments or involves interdisciplinary research or teaching, ~~there shall be a written agreement~~ the faculty member and the department chairs shall agree in writing as to which department is responsible for post-tenure review and how the

other department(s) are to contribute to that review, and the faculty member is to be so informed. The Department Chair of the department responsible for the review shall write the agreement.

- E. In schools that do not have departments or colleges that do not have schools, the faculty in the academic discipline will establish post-tenure-review guidelines that:
- 1) describe the procedures and criteria to be used,
  - 2) are consistent with the procedures and criteria set forth in the University's post-tenure review guidelines, which have priority, and
  - 3) provide procedures to choose review committee members from academic disciplines closely aligned with the faculty's member's career interests. The proposed unit guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the unit.

## **VI. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty Members**

### **A. Notification**

1. OAA shall notify each tenured faculty member eligible for post-tenure review by June 1 of the academic year prior to the year of eligibility. Requests for deferral shall be made by June 15 of the year a faculty member is notified.
2. OAA shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the Dean and chair/head of the appropriate academic unit.

### **B. Dossier**

1. The faculty member shall compile a dossier that includes
  - i. Current curriculum vitae.
  - ii. Narrative of work done since the last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) in relation to the faculty member's career path. If the career path changed significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain how and why in the narrative. The narrative should succinctly describe the faculty member's activities that demonstrate continuing professional development and contributions to the life of the university and external communities which he or she has served during the review period. The narrative may also inform the review committee of the changes in work or life circumstances that occurred that have affected the faculty member's work during the review period. In addition, the narrative should speak to future plans.
  - iii. Any additional materials required by departmental/unit guidelines for post-tenure review. Documentation of teaching accomplishments in keeping with department/unit practice is expected.
  - iv. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that he or she feels are relevant for the review.

### **C. The Post-Tenure Review Committee**

1. Composition

- i. In order to clearly distinguish the P&T Process from the Post Tenure Review Procedure, departments/units shall create a Post tenure Review Committee for each faculty member under review.
  - ii. Departments/units shall specify in their guidelines that the committee shall be comprised of three people; one of whom will be selected from a list of three faculty members submitted by the faculty member under review; the other two will be selected as specified in department/unit guidelines, which shall be a clearly-articulated process for constituting committees that is collegial, equitable, and ~~formative~~ objective, and ensures that faculty under review have input into the selection process.
  - iii. Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's career trajectory. Faculty members from other departments may be utilized as necessary to fill post tenure review committees.
2. Committee Review Procedures and Criteria
- i. When the committee is constituted, its members shall select a chair and arrange a meeting with the faculty member.
  - ii. The committee shall use the criteria below for their review, and any other criteria that have been approved for inclusion in department/unit guidelines:
    - a. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements (Research);
    - b. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching);
    - c. Community Outreach (Outreach);
    - d. Service to the department/academic unit, school, university and profession/academic community (Service).
  - iii. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on research, teaching, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career. The committee will find the faculty member to have met university standards for post-tenure review if:
    - a. the faculty member adequately demonstrates ongoing activity in each of the four areas (above), *or* the faculty member adequately demonstrates to the committee how his or her activities are consistent with departmental/unit needs and priorities, and
    - b. the effort expended totals the effort expected of a full time (1.0 full time equivalent) faculty member or prorated commensurate to the faculty member's FTE assignment for those parts of the review period when the faculty member's assignment was less than full time.
  - iv. Other factors from the faculty narrative to be considered when determining whether the faculty member has met the standards include

but are not limited to:

- a. the faculty member's teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation time required for new, different and/or non-lecture forms of instruction or delivery.
  - b. time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of research, teaching, outreach, or service.
  - c. increased departmental service, research, and/or instruction loads as a consequence of department staffing issues, such as the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty, increasing enrollments, absences of other faculty members due to sabbaticals, personal circumstances, or released time, unfilled vacancies, administrative appointments, changes in instructional support, increasing class sizes and/or changes in the physical workspace in the department.
  - d. Personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances that have had an impact on the faculty member's work that did not result in a deferral.
  - e. Increased advising or mentoring duties due to departmental changes or to the role the faculty member plays in the campus community
3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report to the chair. In its report, the committee shall explain its decision and provide evidence to support the decision. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions meet the standards set forth for post-tenure review, it shall document this in their report. If the committee finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the report shall document the areas the committee finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.
  4. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee report shall include the views of the majority and the minority.

#### D. Role of the Department Chair/designee

1. The department chair/designee must assure that the faculty member's post-tenure review committee has followed department/academic unit and university post-tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member's dossier, and that the committee's report is complete and uses the proper forms. In units that do not have departments, the department chair responsibilities shall be fulfilled by a person or persons specified in unit guidelines; potential *chair designees* may include program directors, area directors, or the faculty member's supervisor, ~~or post-tenure review committee chair.~~
2. The department chair/designee shall write a letter affirming or challenging

the committee's decision and recommendation based on the criteria in departmental post-tenure review guidelines, and explain his or her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the chair's letter shall document the areas he or she finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

3. The department chair's letter and the committee report must be sent to the faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee's report.
4. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the post-tenure committee report(s) and the department chair's letter, before it is forwarded to the Dean. The faculty member should indicate he or she has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he or she may request reconsideration, as outlined in Section E.
5. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the post-tenure review committee and the department chair.
6. The department chair must provide to the Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed and submit to the Dean for each faculty member reviewed:
  - i. A completed recommendation form (Appendix PT-1) signed by members of the post-tenure review committee and the department chair or chair designee;
  - ii. The post-tenure review committee's report and the department chair's letter;
  - iii. If a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member's request, the materials submitted, and the reconsideration reviews done by the chair and/or committee.

E. Procedures for Reconsideration of Recommendations by the Post-Tenure Committee and Department Chair

1. If a faculty member questions the post-tenure review committee's recommendation and/or the department chair's recommendation, he or she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendations within 10 working days of receiving them.
2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supporting materials must be submitted to the post-tenure review committee and/or the department chair as appropriate within 20 working days of the request for reconsideration.
3. If the reconsideration is requested for the committee's decision, the committee chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the committee's reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then

- be forwarded to the department chair for his or her review.
4. If reconsideration is requested of the chair's decision, the chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of his or her reconsideration. The faculty member's materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her consideration.
  5. Should the committee and/or the department chair reverse their original decisions and find the faculty member's contributions to meet standards, they shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with the original report and the faculty member's submission, and forward all materials to the Dean.

## **VII. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Department Chairs/Unit Heads, and Program Directors**

The procedure of evaluating department chairs/unit heads, and program directors will be the same as those for tenured faculty except that the role of the department chair shall be filled by the immediate supervisor of the individual under review provided the immediate supervisor is not the Dean. If the immediate supervisor of the individual under review is the Dean, the Dean must designate a person to fulfill the role of the immediate supervisor (e.g. an Associate Dean).

## **VIII. Roles and Procedures for Administrative Review**

### **A. Role of Dean or Equivalent Administrator**

1. The Dean shall provide to the Provost a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed.
2. The Dean shall review materials submitted by the faculty member and the report of the post-tenure review committee and the chair or chair designee with regard to the dossier submitted by the faculty member in order to write a letter affirming or challenging the recommendation of the committee and the chair.
3. If the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the post-tenure committee and/or the chair, he or she must explain his or her decision and document which criteria in the department's post-tenure guidelines were not being met and provide evidence to support the decision.
4. The Dean's letter shall be delivered within 10 working days to the department chair, the post-tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member.
5. If the Dean finds that the faculty member's contributions do not meet standards, the department chair, chair of the committee, and/or the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the Dean's letter. The conference must be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. After notifying the Dean that the faculty

member requests reconsideration, the faculty member has 10 working days to provide additional materials to the Dean in support of the reconsideration.

6. If upon reconsideration, the Dean reverses his or her original decision and finds the faculty member's contributions meet standards, the Dean shall so report in writing and provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair and faculty member. The Dean shall send the original letter and all materials to the Provost.
7. If the Dean finds that the faculty member has met standards when the post-tenure review committee's and the department chair's finding disagree, the Dean shall provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair and faculty member. The Dean's letter to the Provost shall give his or her reasons.
8. The Dean's original recommendation, and Dean's recommendation after reconsideration, shall be included in the dossier. The Post Tenure Review dossier will be housed in the Dean's office.

#### B. Role of the Provost

1. The Provost shall review the materials only in those cases when a faculty member is found not to have met standards and requests reconsideration.
2. The Provost will review the decisions by the Dean, department chair or chair designee, and post-tenure review committee to ensure that they comply with university guidelines. If the Provost finds that the review does not comply with university guidelines, then he or she must give reasons for his or her decision, addressing evidence provided at earlier levels of review.
3. The Provost will review the decisions by the Dean, department chair or chair designee, and post-tenure review committee to determine if the faculty member meets or does not meet standards. If the Provost finds that the faculty member does not meet standards, then he or she must give reasons for his or her decision, addressing evidence provided at earlier levels of review.
4. The Provost shall notify each faculty member, the chair, and the Dean in writing of his or her final decision.
5. The faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Provost within 10 business days of the receipt of the Provost's letter and may add additional evidence to the file within 20 business days of receiving the Provost's letter. If requested, the Provost shall meet with the faculty member.
6. The Provost's decision after reconsideration shall be forwarded to the faculty member, the chair, and the Dean. The Provost's decisions shall be included in the PTR dossier housed in the Dean's office.
7. After receipt of the Provost's final decision, a step 3 grievance may be filed

by or on behalf of the faculty member, as provided in the PSU-AAUP collective bargaining agreement, or through the non-contractual grievance process, as applicable, if the faculty member believes that there has been a violation, misinterpretation or improper application of these guidelines.

8. Should a faculty member be deemed not to meet the standards of the post-tenure review, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

## **IX. The Professional Development Plan (PDP)**

### **A. Purpose and Objective**

1. A faculty member whose contributions have been determined to not meet standards shall develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) with input from the department chair or chair designee. As per Article 16, Section 3 of the PSU-AAUP CBA, an unsatisfactory review shall not be the basis for just cause sanctions pursuant to Article 27, or unilateral changes in the faculty member's letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.
2. The PDP can be up to three years in duration; a fourth year will be approved in exceptional circumstances. Upon request to the chair the PDP will be extended due to sabbatical or other approved leave.
3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member's career. The PDP shall only contain tasks that are substantially within the faculty member's control (e.g. the PDP could specify that the faculty member write a book but not that the book be published).

### **B. Role of the Department Chair, or Chair Designee, in Developing the PDP**

1. Using the information provided in the post-tenure review committee's report and the department chair's letter, the faculty member and his or her chair shall jointly agree on the PDP no later than 30 business days after the post-tenure review. The chair will forward the PDP to the Dean.
2. If the faculty member and the department chair cannot agree, or want modifications to the PDP, they will meet with the Dean within 14 business days to discuss modifications to the PDP. If no agreement can be reached, the faculty member and the chair shall write a letter identifying the modifications they recommend for the PDP and the reasons for the modifications. The faculty member's PDP and the department chair's letter are submitted to the Dean for resolution.

### **C. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP**

1. If the Dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the faculty member and the

- chair, the Dean shall sign the PDP form (Appendix PT-1).
2. Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the chair and the faculty member.
3. If the faculty member and the chair agree on the modifications requested by the dean, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the chair, whereupon the University shall make available the appropriate resources to implement the PDP.
4. The Provost will make the final determination if the faculty member, the department chair, and Dean do not agree on the modifications requested by the Dean. Items 1-4 of this section (C) will be completed no later than June 15 the year of the review.

#### D. Progress and Resolution of the PDP

1. The department chair, or chair designee in schools where there are no department chairs, shall meet with the faculty member every 6 months for the duration of the PDP to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the department chair and Dean.
2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member's request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the faculty member's request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean who shall reply within 15 working days. If the department chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination within 15 working days.
3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.
4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member's report to the Dean.
5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence of that finding along with a description of what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member. Additional funding may be required.
6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the

department chair within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair's letter to the Dean. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 working days of his or her request for reconsideration.

7. If the department chair reverses his or her decision, he or she shall write a revised letter to the Dean. The Dean will wait to make a decision until receiving the reconsideration letter from the department chair.
8. Should a faculty member refuse to create and/or follow the PDP (except due to circumstances that are substantially outside the faculty member's control), he or she shall be notified and subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA.
9. If the department chair and Dean agree that the PDP has been successfully completed, the faculty member will be eligible for the post-tenure review increase that is currently in force effective at the start of the following academic year.
10. The PDP, with information on how it was fulfilled, must be signed within 20 working days of completion by the faculty member, the department chair/unit head, and dean and filed with the Provost Office.

#### E. Funding of PDP

Any faculty member whose review finds that s/he does not meet standards shall be eligible for professional development funds for each year of the PDP, in an annual amount not to exceed the annual salary increase that would have been provided to the faculty member had s/he met standards to provide appropriate support needed for the completion of the PDP.

Recognizing that some PDPs will not require the full dollar amount described above, any unexpended funds in the pool established for post-tenure review salary increases shall be transferred to the Faculty Development Fund.

#### F. Training for developing and administering PDPs

OAA shall design and implement training for Deans, Chairs, and Directors and tenured faculty for developing and administering PDPs.

### X. Assessment of the Post Tenure Review Process

Faculty Senate shall convene an ad hoc committee including members from OAA and AAUP-PSU to assess the post tenure review process after the 2nd year of the review process and to make a report to Senate, OAA and AAUP-PSU that calls, if needed, for changes in the post tenure review process.

