

## COLLEGE OF APPLIED PROFESSIONS POST TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

### I. General Procedures and Calendar

These procedures are in compliance with the post-tenure review regulations 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 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 with the following exceptions:

- Faculty members who have been promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor or reviewed and retained in connection with a chaired professorship during the previous five years.
- Faculty members scheduled for review who notify the dean in writing that they will retire within three years of their scheduled post tenure review. This three-year period begins at the end of the fiscal year in which the post tenure review would have taken place.

A notice from the dean to the faculty members scheduled to be reviewed will initiate the post tenure review process. This notice will be given no later than March 1 of the year prior to the year the review is to take place. If a faculty member normally scheduled for post-tenure review is excluded from post-tenure review due to being in one of the excluded categories list above, the review schedule of other faculty members will not be changed.

### III. Annual Performance Review

The post tenure review will serve as the annual performance evaluation for that year for the faculty member.

### IV. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The membership of the College Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full professors on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, acting as a sub-committee of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenured faculty members scheduled for post tenure review will not participate in their own review, but will participate in review of other faculty members scheduled for post tenure review. The chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be the chair of the College Tenure and Promotion committee. If the chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Committee will elect a new chair for that year. The dean is ineligible to vote or to serve on the Committee.

V. File Documentation

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

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the current and previous five years.
2. A numerical and descriptive summary of the student course evaluations for each of the courses listed where an evaluation was required;
3. A copy of at least one peer teaching review conducted in accordance with the College's policy.

B. Research

A listing and relevant copies of all scholarly activities conducted during the current and previous five years. Scholarly activities are defined as those listed in the College's Tenure and Promotion criteria under the heading of "Research Includes."

C. Service

A listing of service activities conducted during the current and previous five years. Service activities are defined as those listed in the College's Tenure and Promotion criteria under each "Service" heading.

D. Annual Evaluations

A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the dean and/or the College Tenure and Promotion Committee in the previous five years or since the last post-tenure review.

E. Sabbatical Reports

A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities if sabbatical leave was taken during the review period.

F. Statement of Future Goals

An outline of goals for the future as they relate to teaching, research and service.

G. Current Vita

VI. Committee Procedures

- A. When necessary, the chair of the Committee will ensure that internal peer reviews of the faculty member's teaching, and external peer reviews of

scholarly activities are conducted in a timely manner. Refereed publications will be considered as having been peer-reviewed.

- 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, research, service, and the overall performance. In each of the four areas, the committee member will rate the faculty member's performance superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. If the rating is judged unsatisfactory the committee member must provide a written justification for the evaluation.
- C. For the purposes of post-tenure review, the following performance rating terms will be defined as follows:
  - 1. 'Superior performance' in any given evaluation area means performance that exceeds the expectations of the College for faculty members at the candidate's present rank.
  - 2. 'Satisfactory performance' in any given evaluation area means performance that meets the expectations of the College for faculty members at the candidate's present rank.
  - 3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' in any given evaluation area means performance which fails to meet the expectations of the College for faculty members at the candidate's present rank.
- D. In a meeting of the Committee, the chair will collect the performance evaluation forms from the Committee members and tally the ratings in each evaluation area defined in VI. B. A majority evaluative rating is achieved when one more than half of all eligible members have cast a ballot with the same rating. In the event that a majority of Committee 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 majority opinion."
- E. A Committee member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the dean of a decision to do so before the beginning of the leave.
- F. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the Committee, the chair of the Committee will prepare a report of the post-tenure review which will include at a minimum the Committee's rating of the performance for each of the four evaluation areas defined in VI. 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 the Committee chair will destroy individually written evaluations after the Committee approves the report.

- G. If the performance rating for each evaluation area defined in VI. 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, research, 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. However, 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.
- H. A copy of the Committee's report must be sent to the faculty member and to the dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. If the Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, a copy of the Committee's report and development plan must also be sent to the Provost.
- I. An Unsatisfactory Review
1. If the 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 the faculty member to restore performance to a satisfactory level.
  2. In the event the faculty member does not appeal, a development plan including a timetable of not less than one year or more than three years will be prepared. The dean in consultation with the faculty member and the Committee will prepare the Development Plan. In the event that the faculty member and the Post Tenure Review Committee are unable to agree on the content and time frame of the development plan, the dean will make this determination.
  3. In accordance with the timetable established in the plan, the Committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee will recommend in writing to the dean of the College whether they believe the goals of the plan have been met.
  4. The dean will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the plan and whether further measures may be necessary. The dean will conform to the timetable established in the plan.
  5. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may lead to proceedings for termination.

## VII. Appeal Procedures

- A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, in general or in any particular. The findings of the College 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 faulty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the dean, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.