

Department of Educational Leadership and Policies

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

Revised: 2/5/99

Approved: EDLP Faculty, December 15, 1998

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review established in the University *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the regulations given in the University *Faculty Manual*, the University *Faculty Manual* will take precedence.

The College post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions (other than the Dean), will be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six year period, the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., Dean, Department Chair, or a chaired professorship). However, Department-level post-tenure review will be waived for: any faculty member who signs an approved retirement agreement that will take effect within three years of the next scheduled review; and any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The membership of the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee for faculty holding rank of professor will consist of all tenured full professors on the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The membership of the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee for faculty holding rank of associate professor (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full and associate professors on the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenured full professors or associate professors who are having a post-tenure review conducted will be excluded from Committee membership that year. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committees will be the chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the Chair of the Department Tenure and

Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Committee will elect a new chair for that year. The Department Chair is neither eligible to vote nor to serve on the Committee.

In the event that there are fewer than five Department faculty members eligible to serve on either the Post-Tenure Committee for Full Professor or for Associate Professor, the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Education, will identify and secure a sufficient number of faculty members from other units within the College of Education that do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a committee of five voting members.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Chair of the Post-Tenure Committee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member must include at least the following material in the file:

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous five years;
2. A numerical and descriptive summary of the student course evaluations and peer evaluations for each of the courses listed (to be prepared by the Department Chair's Office);

B. Scholarship

1. A listing, and relevant copies, of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous five years. Scholarly activities are defined as those listed in the Department's Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Scholarship," appropriate to the rank at which the faculty member is being reviewed.

C. Service

1. A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous five years. Service activities are defined as those listed in the Department's Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Service," appropriate to the rank at which the faculty member is being reviewed.

D. Annual Evaluations

1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations resulting from the departmental review process during the previous five years.

E. Sabbatical Reports

1. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities (if one was taken during the review period).

F. 1. A Copy of an Up-To-Date Curriculum Vita

V. Committee Procedures

- A. The chair of the Post-Tenure Committees (the EDLP T & P Chair) will ensure that peer reviews of the faculty member's teaching (appropriate Departmental faculty) and of scholarly activities (faculty outside the Department) are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship is considered as having partially fulfilled the peer review of scholarly activities requirement. Faculty with three or more refereed articles in the previous five year period will be required to have only two additional external peers review their post-tenure portfolio.
- B. After review of the faculty member's file, each member of the Committee will complete a written evaluation form for the faculty member. The form will rate the faculty member's performance in four areas: teaching, scholarship, service, and overall performance. In each of the four areas, the committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as either: superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.
- C. For purposes of post-tenure review, the following performance rating terms will be defined as:
 1. 'Superior performance' means performance at the very highest level. Superior performance is performance exceeding at the appropriate rank the tenure and promotion criteria as delineated in the Department "Promotion and Tenure: Criteria and Procedures."
 2. 'Satisfactory performance' means performance that meets the expectations of the Department. The faculty member continues to meet the tenure and promotion criteria at the appropriate rank as delineated in the Department "Promotion and Tenure: Criteria and Procedures" document.

3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' means performance, taken as a whole, which fails to meet relevant Department post-tenure review standards in teaching, research, and service. The faculty member fails to meet the tenure and promotion criteria as delineated in the Department "Promotion and Tenure: Criteria and Procedures" document at the appropriate rank.

D. In a meeting of the Post-Tenure Committees, the Chair of the Committees will collect the performance evaluation forms from the Committee members and tally the ratings in each of the evaluation areas as defined in V.B. (scholarship, teaching, service, overall). A majority evaluative rating is achieved when at least fifty-one percent of all eligible Committee members have cast a ballot with the same rating (i.e., superior, satisfactory, unsatisfactory). Should the fifty-one percent figure not be achieved, the voting faculty will discuss their ratings, rate the faculty member individually again, and have the Chair of the Committee re-tally the ballots. In the event that a majority of faculty members do not rate the performance of a faculty member the same in a given performance area, the committee report will give a performance rating of "satisfactory, lacking a majority opinion."

A Committee member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the Department Chair of a desire to do so before the beginning of the leave.

E. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the Post-tenure Committee, the chair of the Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include at minimum the Committee's rating of the performance for each of the four evaluation areas defined in V.B, and sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development. Individual vote counts in each evaluation area will not be revealed, and individual written evaluations will be destroyed by the Committee chair after the report is approved by the Committee.

F. A copy of the Post-tenure Committee report must be sent to the faculty member and to the Department Chair, who, after reviewing the file, will provide any written comments he/she deems appropriate, and forward the Committee's findings to the Dean of the College Education for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, a copy of the Committee report and development plan must also be sent to the Provost.

G. If the overall performance rating for each evaluation area defined in V.B of the faculty member is either "superior" or "satisfactory," the evaluation of the faculty member is concluded with the distribution of the report. If the Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is

satisfactory, but that his/her performance in either teaching, scholarship, or service areas is unsatisfactory, the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level in that area. A review that results in an overall performance rating of satisfactory, but includes an unsatisfactory rating in one of the other areas does not require a development plan for the faculty member under review.

H. An Unsatisfactory Review

1. If the Post-tenure Committee determines that the overall performance evaluation rating of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory," the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The Committee will also act as the faculty member's Development Committee. The Committee may recommend the inclusion of additional members to the Development Committee from outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.
2. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Post-tenure Committee and the faculty member, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member. The timetable is at the discretion of the Committee depending on the nature of the development plan, but in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year nor more than three years in duration. The Department Chair will forward the plan to the Dean.
3. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the development committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the Chair of the Department and recommend in writing to the Chair whether or not they believe the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in any particular area. Such reviews will occur within the standard annual review cycle of the Department.—The Department Chair will provide to the Dean annual reports of progress based on the Committee reviews and the Department Chair's own assessment.
4. The Chair in consultation with the Dean will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the development plan, and whether or not further measures may be necessary.

5. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination.

VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations in general or in any particular, may appeal to an ad hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee of five full professors appointed by the Dean. The findings of the ad hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the dean for final determination of the evaluation.
- B. If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Department Chair, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Dean. The Dean will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.

Commentary to Accompany the Post-Tenure Review Procedures of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policies

The following is a description of the logic used in formulating the post-tenure review policy of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policies (EDLP). The components of the policy are divided into three categories: those required by the post-tenure review sections of the *Faculty Manual*; those recommended by the Provost's Office for clarity of procedure; and, those that are the option of the local unit.

The reference numbers refer to sections of the draft EDLP Post-Tenure Review Procedures document.

Section I. General Procedures and Calendar

This section is recommended by the Provost's Office as a guard against the inadvertent inclusion of a unit procedure contrary to the *Faculty Manual*.

Section II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.

Section III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

This section is a local unit option section. The proposed EDLP post-tenure review document provides for direct faculty participation in the review process, but does not establish a new standing committee to effect this end. By using sub-committees of the EDLP Tenure and Promotion Committee as the review committees, the idea was to both emulate the tenure and promotion process and to protect faculty members who in rank or tenure status are less than tenured full professors from having the duty of reviewing colleagues who may be asked to vote in future on an application for promotion or tenure. The document does address the idea of minimum size of the committees. A minimum number of five is recommended, again, emulating the tenure and promotion process in this regard.

Section IV. File Documentation

Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review. The EDLP document does not elaborate on the possible sources of documentation in these areas. Instead, definitions already established in the EDLP tenure and promotion policy are used.

Section V. Committee Procedures

- A. Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
- B. The *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review requires that an evaluation be conducted in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The EDLP document adds a fourth area - overall performance.
- C. The *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review establishes the three rating terms: superior, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. It also provides the meaning of the terms. However, it is a local unit option to decide what set of definitions will be used to guide the rating. The proposed EDLP document proposes to use definitions related to the current EDLP tenure and promotion criteria, as interpreted by members of the post-tenure review committees. Reviewers will mark 'unsatisfactory,' 'satisfactory,' or 'superior' based upon whether they consider the performance of the faculty member under review meet, exceed, or fall short of expectations delineated in the EDLP T&P policy document for tenure at the appropriate rank. The assumption is that the use of these definitions in combination with specified criteria will allow the review committee to fairly evaluate the changing nature of a faculty member's career progression, while giving the faculty member being reviewed guidance on what standards he/she is being measured against.
- D. This is a local unit option to cover the mechanism of how votes are to be taken and counted. With a three rating system, it was recognized that the possibility of a non-majority vote could be cast. The default rating in such a circumstance is designed to be "satisfactory", duly noted as a non-majority opinion.

The last sentence in this sub-section (concerning members on leave) is recommended by the Provost's Office to avoid possible confusion on eligibility.

- E. Most of this sub-section is a local unit option regarding the contents of the written review and the disposition of the individual ballots. The sentence which includes the wording: "and sufficient comments to aid the faculty

- member in his/her growth and development," is from the *Faculty Manual*.
- F. Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
 - G. This sub-section is a local unit option and sets forth the mechanism for concluding the review, unless the result is an unsatisfactory review of the faculty member.
 - H.1. The sentence that includes the wording: "must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level," is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review. The remainder of the sub-section is a local unit option. The EDLP draft proposes that there should be a development plan and that the review committee would also be the development committee since those faculty members would be the most familiar with the circumstances of the initial unsatisfactory review.
 - H.2. The mechanism for a development plan timetable is a local unit option and is elaborated here. The EDLP draft includes both a maximum and minimum timetable to both ensure some uniformity but also to give the Department Chair some flexibility depending on the nature of the unsatisfactory review.
 - H.3 This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
 - H.4. This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
 - H.5 This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on Academic Grievance Procedures.

Section VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
- B. This sub-section is a local unit option, which gives the faculty member an administrative appeal mechanism for the proposed development plan.