

Greetings Colleagues,

On behalf of the IUB chapter of the AAUP, I write once again with an urgent request that all IU faculty participate in the [10-Day public review and comment period](#) for University Policy: **BOT-24 Annual and Post-Tenure Faculty Productivity Reviews**. All responses must be sent to policies@iu.edu by **this Wednesday, April 22, 2026**.

Faculty across multiple units have raised significant concerns about the current version of BOT-24. Below I provide a summary of these concerns for your review. At this critical stage it is essential that faculty take part in this brief 10-day review and comment period. This will be the only opportunity for faculty to document their concerns and participate in the policy revision process.

These points are provided only for your review and consideration. Feel free to copy/paste, modify, or ignore any of these points as you feel appropriate. But, please submit a response.

Respectfully submitted,

David McDonald, President
IUB AAUP

BOT-24 Annual and Post-Tenure Faculty Productivity Reviews

- The policy appears to go beyond what is required under state laws SEA 202 and HEA 1001, particularly in combining post-tenure review with misconduct processes. HEA does not mandate termination, yet this policy language often implies it.
- This policy conflates productivity evaluation with misconduct. Misconduct is already addressed in separate university policies. To conflate productivity and misconduct risks double jeopardy.
- It introduces mechanisms that will weaken tenure protections by establishing pathways to termination tied to post-tenure review outcomes. This policy reimagines tenure as conditional rather than durable.
- It relies heavily on administrative discretion, with limited clarity or accountability regarding decisions that may override faculty judgments. The policy provides only vague criteria for how ratings are determined and when administrators can overturn decisions. This creates a risk for arbitrary or inconsistent enforcement.
- It reduces the role of shared governance in evaluating faculty performance and disciplinary actions.
- It includes ambiguities in key areas such as performance improvement plans (PIPs), evaluation criteria, and review procedures. There is conflicting language about whether

termination is mandatory vs. optional. PIPs tied to misconduct may constitute duplicate punishment.

- There is a lack of protections for faculty facing termination and appeals beyond formal grievance.
- It may have significant implications for faculty recruitment, retention, academic freedom, and the university's national standing.

We believe that policies governing post-tenure review must:

- Clearly distinguish between productivity evaluation and misconduct processes
- Protect due process and academic freedom
- Ensure meaningful faculty participation in evaluation and oversight
- Align precisely with, but not exceed, state law requirements