

POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina

I. Purpose

In response to a mandate from the State of South Carolina, the Department of Psychology at the University of South Carolina established this policy and procedure for post-tenure review, the purpose of which is to demonstrate that the academic freedom afforded by tenure has resulted in continuing contributions to the discipline and to the tenure-granting institution. Post-tenure review also serves to identify individuals who have distinguished themselves with superior accomplishment, as well as those who have ceased to make the contributions justifiably expected of tenured faculty. As a matter of principle, the department affirms that post-tenure review does not infringe upon the academic freedom that accompanies a tenured faculty appointment.

II. Policy

A. Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Authority for post-tenure review of faculty within the Department of Psychology resides in the Post-Tenure Review Committee, which consists of all tenured faculty members within the department. The administrative work of the committee is managed by a chair and an assistant chair/chair-elect, both of whom hold the rank of full professor with tenure and neither of whom is scheduled for post-tenure review during the period in which they hold these positions. Each year the committee will elect by majority vote an assistant chair/chair-elect, who will serve in that position for one year and then serve as chair of the committee in the subsequent year. Duties are described in section III, "Procedure."

B. Frequency of Review.

Consistent with university policy, each tenured faculty member will be reviewed every six years, with the following exceptions: (a) by agreement with the Post-Tenure Review Committee, the faculty member is reviewed a year earlier than scheduled; (b) the faculty member has been reviewed for promotion to or retention of an appointed position (for example, a chaired professorship) during the preceding six-year interval; or (c) the faculty member has announced his or her retirement within three years of the scheduled review. For exceptions (a) and (b), the next post-tenure review would be scheduled for the sixth year following early review or review for promotion to or retention of an appointed position. Post-tenure review is conducted on a schedule of rotation so that a portion of the tenured faculty is reviewed each year.

C. Post-Tenure Review File.

All of the material pertinent to a faculty member's post-tenure review will be contained in a Post-Tenure Review File, which must include the following: (a) a current vita; (b) a self-assessment detailing how the faculty member's record meets the review criteria of significantly scholarly work, effective teaching, and effective service; (c) copies of the annual activity reports from the six-year period pertinent to the review; (d) a summary of student and peer teaching evaluations, which is to be prepared by a committee member appointed by the assistant chair/chair-elect; and (e) evidence of evaluation of the faculty member's scholarly work by reviewers external to the department. If the faculty member has been on sabbatical leave during the period under review, specific outcomes of activity during the leave must be described. Additionally, any other materials that the faculty member under review deems relevant to the review may be included in the file.

D. Review Criteria.

Post-tenure review of faculty in the Department of Psychology is based on the individual's academic record in the domains of scholarly work, teaching, and service, using as a frame of reference the criteria applied when tenure was earned. Although tenure obligates faculty members to engage in these activities, it also provides flexibility in meeting such obligations. The criteria used in post-tenure review do not infringe upon or constrain the freedom of inquiry and expression on which this flexibility is based.

1. *Significant scholarly work.* Within the period included in each review, a faculty member's record must reflect significant scholarly work, which may take many forms (see Appendix A). In all cases, the significance of scholarly work refers to its value to science or practice as assessed through peer judgment, including evaluation by reviewers external to the department. Because faculty members in the department are scientists or scientist-practitioners, scholarly work is typically in the form of publications, with the review process employed by journals or publishers serving as external evaluation. In some cases, a faculty member may have no work published during the period under consideration. Nevertheless, tenured faculty members satisfactorily engaged in scholarly work must be able to submit for peer review papers presented at meetings, manuscripts in progress, manuscript reviews, manuals, or other documents reflecting their contributions to the science or practice of psychology. Unpublished work of this type will be reviewed by peers external to the department.

Because tenured faculty members select the topics that they study, the methods that they use for investigation, and the means by which they communicate the results of their endeavors, judgment of the significance of their work cannot be based on consideration of a single dimension, such as number of publications. Instead, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, relying on external and internal evaluation, is responsible for reaching a collective omnibus judgment of significance based on consideration of work done within the six-year period under review.

In some cases, external and internal evaluation may lead to the judgment that the work is outstanding, meaning that it is of high quality, has had (or is very likely to have) a sustained impact on the area or problem involved, and, accordingly, has brought (or is very likely to bring) added distinction to the individual and the department. If external and internal evaluators judge a faculty member's scholarly work during the period under review to be outstanding, the Post-Tenure Review committee will consider that faculty member for a "superior" designation as an outcome of the review process (see section II-E, "Outcome of the Review").

2. *Effective teaching.* As educators, tenured faculty members in the department must maintain a record of effective teaching. An effective teacher maintains up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter being taught, conveys content in a clear manner that students can readily follow, responds appropriately to students' questions, conducts evaluations of academic performance in a fair and appropriate manner, and structures teaching activities in an organized way that is conducive to learning. Effectiveness in graduate training also requires properly preparing students to meet the intellectual, professional, and ethical standards of academic and practicing psychologists. The department has identified a number of different teaching activities and indicators of teaching effectiveness (see Appendix A). In the typical case, judgment of teaching effectiveness can be based on information contained in student and peer evaluations and in course syllabi. In unusual cases, however, faculty may not have taught a regular university course during the period under review. In such cases, the effectiveness of research or clinical supervision must be documented through reference to the activities supervised and the outcome of the supervision (for example, research publications or professional skills resulting from supervision).

Because of the diverse teaching roles within the department, a judgment regarding teaching effectiveness cannot be based on a single dimension, such as student ratings. Instead, relying on various sources of information, the Post-Tenure Review Committee is responsible for reaching a collective omnibus judgment of teaching effectiveness.

Multiple sources of evidence may indicate to the committee that an individual's teaching during a period of review has been outstanding, meaning that it is of the highest quality, has been widely acknowledged by students or trainees for its effectiveness, and has brought (or is very likely to bring) added distinction to the individual or the department. In such cases, the committee will consider the individual for a "superior" designation as an outcome of the review process (see section II-E, "Outcome of the Review").

3. *Effective service.* Contributions in the form of effective service to the institution, the community, or the profession are an ongoing responsibility of tenured faculty members. By definition, service connotes pro bono work, that is, non-profit activities dedicated to maintaining or enhancing the well-being of others, individually or collectively. Service also connotes those activities that in academic departments are considered to constitute "good departmental citizenship," such as attendance at or participation in regular department functions. Overall,

service is effective if it actually maintains or enhances well-being. Because of the diverse interests and backgrounds of faculty members, service takes many forms (see Appendix A). Typically, a faculty member participates in regular department functions and is appointed or is elected to departmental committees, in which case the effectiveness of their service is readily apparent to their departmental peers. In some instances, however, a faculty member may have no committee assignments during a six-year period under review. In such cases, other service to the discipline or to the profession must be documented. Relying principally on information contained in vitae and activity reports, the Post-Tenure Review Committee is responsible for reaching a collective omnibus judgment of service effectiveness.

E. Outcome of the Review.

Consistent with university policy, the outcome of each review will be one of the following designations:

1. *Satisfactory*. The designation “satisfactory” indicates that the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee found the faculty member under review to have engaged in significant scholarly work, effective teaching, and effective service during the period covered by the review. This designation is the result of a faculty member being designated neither “superior” nor “unsatisfactory” and the reviewer generally agrees with the faculty member’s self-assessment.

2. *Superior*. The designation “superior” indicates that by majority vote of its members, the Post-Tenure Review Committee found the faculty member under review not only to have engaged in significant scholarly work, effective teaching, and effective service during the period covered by the review, but also to have demonstrated outstanding performance in the domain of either scholarly work or teaching.

3. *Unsatisfactory*. The designation “unsatisfactory” indicates that by two-thirds vote of its members, the Post-tenure Review Committee found the faculty member under review to have failed to meet the department’s criteria (that is, significant scholarly work, effective teaching, or effective service) in at least one of the three domains during the period covered by the review.

In summary, the outcome of a review will be a designation of “satisfactory” unless (a) a majority of the votes are for a “superior” designation, or (b) two-thirds or more of the votes were for a designation of “unsatisfactory.”

D. Right of Appeal.

A faculty member can appeal the outcome of the post-tenure review on the grounds that the review was not conducted on the basis of, and only on the basis of, the department’s policy and procedure (see section III-D-4, “*Appeal procedure*”).

III. Procedure

A. Preparation for Review.

Each year, the Department Chair will provide formal notification to faculty members who will be reviewed in the subsequent two years. In the spring term prior to the year of review, the assistant chair/chair-elect will contact each faculty member to determine how he or she intends to meet the requirement for external review of scholarly work and will appoint a committee member to prepare the written summary of teaching evaluations.

If the faculty member wishes to be considered for a “superior” designation on the basis of his or her scholarly work or if the faculty member has no published work during the period under review, letters from external evaluators must be obtained. In such cases, faculty members will nominate outside evaluators to the assistant chair/chair-elect, who will also obtain additional nominations from committee members familiar with the faculty member’s scholarly work. The assistant chair/chair-elect will then contact outside reviewers in the order requested by the faculty member until two such evaluators have agreed to write an evaluative letter. A third evaluator will be selected from experts nominated by other committee members. As indicated in university policy, external evaluators must be outside the department, but not necessarily outside the university.

External evaluators will be provided with the faculty member’s vita, copies of scholarly work during the six-year period, and a letter explaining the purpose of the post-tenure review process. In the case of faculty members seeking a “superior” designation, the section of this document in which the meaning of “outstanding” is considered will be provided (see II-D-1, “*Significant scholarly work.*”). In the case of faculty members without publications, the section of this document in which the meaning of “significant scholarly work” is considered will be provided (see II-D-1, “*Significant scholarly work.*”).

Faculty members who wish to be considered for a “superior” designation on the basis of teaching should discuss with the assistant chair/chair-elect the multiple sources of supporting information that will be included in the file, especially if external letters are to be obtained. Also, faculty members who have taught no university classes during the period covered by the review should discuss with the assistant chair/chair-elect the sources of information pertinent to verifying effective teaching or service. In all cases, letters from current or former students, post-doctoral associates, supervisees, employees, or service recipients must be obtained through the assistant chair/chair-elect.

B. The Committee Meeting.

The committee chair will notify committee members, including those on sabbatical leave, at least two weeks prior to the annual meeting that files are prepared for perusal. During the meeting, typically held in the first half of the fall term, the chair will present each file for

consideration and will preside over discussion. The committee member under review must be absent from the meeting during the time his or her file is presented and discussed. At the conclusion of the meeting, a ballot will be distributed for each faculty member under review. In the usual case, each committee member will write on the ballot one of the three outcomes. If the vote is for “superior” or “unsatisfactory,” a brief justification for the judgment must be included. In instances of a “satisfactory” vote, each ballot should include a justification ranging from concurrence with the faculty member’s self-assessment to a detailed commentary in instances when the reviewer evaluates the tenured faculty member’s record differently than presented in the self-assessment. In cases in which a faculty member has been working under a Development Plan (see II-D-3, “*Consequences of an Unsatisfactory Outcome*”), the vote will be either for “satisfactory progress” or “unsatisfactory progress.” The chair will collect the ballots, count the votes, synthesize vote justifications, and inform the faculty members under review, the Department Chair, and committee members of the outcomes within one week of the meeting. All outcomes will be followed with a written summary regarding votes and evaluative feedback to the faculty member under review, the department chair, and the dean.

D. Consequences of the Outcomes.

1. *Consequence of a “Satisfactory” Outcome.* It is anticipated that a “satisfactory” designation, indicating the faculty member is successfully fulfilling his or her obligations under the terms of a tenured position, will be the result of the large majority of post-tenure reviews. This outcome, which carries with it no unusual consequences, will be reported in writing to the faculty member and to the Department Chair, whose responsibility it will be to communicate it to other levels of university administration..

2. *Consequences of a “Superior” Outcome.* Consistent with university policy, faculty members who receive a “superior” designation will be notified in writing and identified to the Department Chair, with a recommendation that they be presented to the Provost for consideration of a merit increase in annual salary.

3. *Consequences of an “Unsatisfactory” Outcome.* Faculty members who receive an “unsatisfactory” designation will be informed of this outcome in writing, as will the Department Chair, who is responsible for communicating this outcome to other levels of university administration. Consistent with university policy, these faculty members will be encouraged to ameliorate shortcomings identified in the review process. To this end, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will elect a Development Committee to assist the faculty member in the formulation of a Development Plan, which will specify goals designed to remedy shortcomings and provide a time-table for goal-directed progress. The Development Plan, which is to be filed with the Department Chair, must provide the faculty member a reasonable period, but not less than one year and nor more than three years, to demonstrate substantial progress towards meeting the goals of the plan. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost.

At the end of the specified period, the faculty member must provide a report of progress toward remediation of the shortcomings identified in the post-tenure review process. The report, along with the faculty member's file, is then presented to the Post-Tenure Review Committee at its annual meeting. The committee will then make a collective judgment as to whether the faculty member's progress in the context of the Development Plan was "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Either outcome must be reported to the Department Chair, who then communicates it to other levels within the university administration. Satisfactory progress, as designated by majority vote of the committee, has the same result as a satisfactory post-tenure review, with the faculty member re-entering the regular six-year review cycle as of the current year. Unsatisfactory progress, as designated by majority vote of the committee, places the faculty member at risk of proceedings for termination of tenure.

4. *Appeal procedure.* Within seven days of notification of an outcome, the faculty member who wishes to appeal must ask the committee chair for an oral explanation of the outcome. If no explanation is offered within fourteen days or if the explanation is considered unsatisfactory, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Such an appeal must be made within seven days of the absent or unsatisfactory response from the committee chair, and the Department Chair must be notified of the appeal. During an appeal, the committee chair serves as the principal source of information about the department's policy and procedure and about specific actions taken by the committee.

If an appeal is unsuccessful, the outcome specified by the committee stands as of the date it was reached. If the outcome was a "satisfactory" designation, the faculty member involved would be scheduled for the next review six years after the review that was appealed. If the outcome was an "unsatisfactory" designation, the schedule for goal-related progress specified in the Development Plan would stand as originally stated.

If an appeal is successful and the higher-level administrator overruling the departmental committee offers specific instances in which the process violated department policy and procedure, then the faculty member involved in the appeal will be reviewed again at the next regularly scheduled post-tenure review meeting, with special effort made by the committee to correct the violations of the preceding review. If an appeal is successful and the higher-level administrator overruling the departmental committee offers no specific instances in which the process violated department policy and procedure, then no further action will be taken by the committee. In such cases, the committee chair will write a letter to the Department Chair and to the administrator declaring that at the department level the outcome of the review stands as of the date it was reached but that the consequences of the outcome are in the hands of the administration rather than the department faculty. The faculty member involved in the appeal will be scheduled for his or her next post-tenure review six years following the date of the appealed review.

Appendix A
Forms and Evaluative Indicators of Scholarly Work, Teaching, and Service

Scholarly Work

Forms

Authored books.
 Edited books.
 Monographs.
 Journal articles.
 Book chapters.
 Research grants.
 Presentations at professional and scholarly meetings.
 Colloquium presentations.
 Book reviews.
 Publications and presentations from student supervision.
 Articles in non-academic periodicals or other publications.
 Unpublished work.

Significance Indicators

Type and outcome of review for publications, presentations, and grant applications.
 Scholarly reputation of journal or publisher for publications (authored and supervised).
 Citations of publications and presentations (authored and supervised).
 Invitations for presentations and for written work.
 Nominations or receipt of research awards.

Teaching

Forms

Teaching of undergraduate courses.
 Teaching of graduate courses.
 Practicum or internship supervision.
 Supervision of theses and dissertations.
 Supervision of graduate comprehensive projects.
 Supervision of undergraduate independent study projects.
 Supervision of postdoctoral training.
 Preparation of new courses.
 Preparation of instructional support materials.
 Publications and presentations from student supervision.

Effectiveness Indicators

Student evaluation of teaching or supervision (empirical and descriptive).
 Peer evaluation of performance derived from class observations and curriculum review.
 Number and quality of supervised theses and dissertations.
 Nomination or receipt of teaching awards.
 Importance of courses taught or prepared for undergraduate or graduate core curriculum.
 Desirability or quality of internship placements resulting from supervision.
 Number and quality of publications resulting from research supervision.

Service

Forms

Membership or chair position on department, program, college, or university committees.
 Director of department, program, clinic, or institute.
 Student advising.
 Consulting work with faculty and students on research issues.
 Consulting work with local, state or federal agencies.
 Presentations to community groups.
 Participation in groups that serve community.
 Officer of national, regional or state professional/scientific association.
 Committee chair or committee member for professional or scientific association.
 Editorial or review work for professional or scientific journals.
 Review work for funding agencies.
 Organizing professional or scientific conferences.

Effectiveness Indicators

Student evaluation of advising (empirical).
 Acknowledgments from service recipients.
 Acknowledgments of assistance or consultation in published work.
 Appointments to editorial boards and review panels.
 Nomination or receipt of service awards.

Appendix B
Suggested Time Line For Post-Tenure Review Procedure

Year Prior to Review

November: Tenured faculty members who will be reviewed in the following two calendar years are notified by the Department Chair.

February: Assistant Chair/Chair Elect of Post-Tenure Review Committee contacts each faculty member who will be reviewed in the following calendar to determine how external review of scholarly work and any other external evaluations are to be obtained.

May: Faculty members who desire or require evaluative letters from external reviewers must have packets to the Assistant Chair/Chair-Elect ready for mailing. In such cases, the list of nominees for external reviewers nominated by the faculty member under review must be completed. A new Assistant Chair/Chair-Elect must be elected by the Post-Tenure Review Committee prior to the end of the spring semester.

May-August: Committee Chair solicits evaluative letters from individuals who have agreed to serve as external reviewers.

Year of Review

September: Committee Chair announces that all files are available for committee review. Absentee ballots are sent to faculty members on leave.

October: Committee meets and evaluates each faculty member under review. All votes and justifications, including those from faculty members on leave, are submitted to the Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee within one week of the meeting. Results are communicated in writing to the committee, the faculty member under review, and the Department Chair. If there are to be appeals, the appeal process is initiated.