

## Senate Recommendation to the Provost

**Originating Body:** Faculty Senate

**Originator:** Senator Ragan

**Date Submitted:** 5/13/2025

**Requested Effective Date:** 5/13/2025

The Faculty Senate recommends to add the language on Action Plans for TT Faculty not meeting expectations in the attached motion to the Faculty Handbook.

**Date Approved by the Faculty Senate:** 5/6/2025

*Joerg Tuske*

**President, Faculty Senate**

\_\_5/13/2025\_\_

**Date**

---

**Action Taken by Provost**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Recommendation Accepted

☐ Recommendation Not Accepted\*

☐ Recommendation returned to the Originating Body for further review (see attached)

**Disposition for Approved Recommendation:**

☐ President

☐ VP Student Affairs

☐ Faculty Senate President

☐ VP Finance

☐ Consortium Chair

☐ School Deans

☐ Webmaster

☐ Graduate Council

☐ Catalogue Editor

☐ Provost Council

---

**Provost**

---

**Date**

## SALISBURY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MOTION

Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

**TITLE:** Action Plan for Faculty not meeting expectations

**SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION:** Elizabeth Ragan

**SENATOR SECONDING MOTION:** Mia Waldron

---

**MOTION** (this section alone will be recorded in the minutes):

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate approve the following for inclusion in Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook, within “Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty,” at the end of section 4, “Annual Review Procedures.”

If a tenure-track faculty member's performance *does not meet expectations*, a specific **Faculty Action Plan** (or Development Plan) must be created and executed. This plan is developed collaboratively by the faculty member under review, peer reviewer(s), the department chair/school director, and the dean. The faculty member may select a colleague to assist in formulating this plan. The goal of the plan is to address areas identified as deficient and utilize SU’s scholarly and financial resources for faculty development.

The development of the plan should focus on supporting the faculty member’s growth. The plan should include: 1. the areas deemed deficient; 2. what actions must be taken to satisfy progress towards tenure; 3. the specific documentation or evidence needed to demonstrate progress; and 4. a clear statement about what consequences follow from this plan. The plan will be drafted and revised as needed until there is mutual agreement between the faculty member and the reviewer(s). If an agreement cannot be reached, the Faculty Development Committee will help the parties reach a consensus.

The plan must also outline a “procedure for evaluating progress at fixed intervals.” This procedure should include progress reports submitted to the reviewer(s) at least once a year, though shorter intervals may be requested by the faculty member. Departments might use SU’s annual evaluations as benchmarks for these intervals, in accordance with Regents’ policy.

If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the final plan, they have the option to file a grievance with the appropriate committee.

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Currently, the use of such a document is called for in Chapter 2, “Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty” for situations when tenured faculty are considered to be failing to meet expectations. When faculty are striving to achieve tenure, transparency and clarity about what kinds of improvement are needed, how that is to be demonstrated, and what the consequences of failing to meet those expectations are is of equal or even greater importance.

**ANTICIPATED IMPACT:****Negative:****Positive:****Is this a recommendation to the Provost?****Yes\_X\_\_\_\_****No\_\_\_\_****Is this a recommendation to someone else?****No\_\_\_\_****Yes, to \_\_\_\_\_****VOTE: Number of Senators Present:****Motion Passes or Fails:**