Proposed Post Tenure Review Policy Version: 19 May 99

Biological Sciences

I. Purpose.

Post Tenure review in the Department of Biological Sciences is established to evaluate and promote the effectiveness of tenured faculty members. It is a process distinct from the annual peer review and from the promotion and tenure procedures.

II. Definitions.

a. Superior performance. Effective performance that significantly exceeds the satisfactory level. Performance that exhibits characteristics such as enthusiasm, innovation, ingenuity, talent and dedication, and that is recognized by objective criteria such as favorable publicity, positive grant reviews, awards, teaching evaluations and annual peer reviews.

b. Satisfactory performance. Effective performance consistent with the assigned responsibilities and expectations of the faculty member, and generally viewed as a positive contribution to the mission of the department.

c. Unsatisfactory performance. Performance that fails to meet minimum standards for the rank and time in service. Performance that is detrimental to the mission and reputation of the department, including a combination of the following, depending on the degree and extent of the deficiency: indifference to assigned tasks, habitual inefficiency, frequent reluctance or refusal to participate in departmental functions considered a normal faculty responsibility, failure to follow through on projects initiated, wasteful utilization of departmental resources, unwillingness to heed advice or to make efforts to meet objectives designed for professional improvement. Abrasive or idiosyncratic personality characteristics are not, per se, grounds for an unsatisfactory rating.

III. Logistics.

1. Tenured full professors will be reviewed as described in the Faculty Manual. Every tenured faculty member shall be reviewed every six years beginning in the Fall 1999. Approximately one-sixth of the tenured faculty, in order of seniority according to date of tenure, will be reviewed each year. Exceptions are granted for faculty successfully reviewed for advancement to a higher position during the preceding six years. Thus, faculty promoted to full professorship, or appointed to a chaired professorship need not have a post-tenure review prepared. Post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the department chair in writing of retirement within three years.

2. The evaluation of faculty members shall begin in the faculty member's department. Faculty holding joint appointments shall be reviewed by the unit in which he/she holds tenure, but a report from other units in which an appointment is held will be considered part of the record. This report shall be prepared by

the faculty, or a committee of the faculty, of the unit in which joint appointment is held.

The Department of Biological Sciences will establish a Post Tenure Review Committee for evaluation of tenured faculty. Normally the Peer Review Committee for Associate Professors will also serve as the Post Tenure Review Committee. The membership of the Post Tenure Review Committee shall consist of five tenured Full Professors, representing the Tenure and Promotion Committee-of-the-Whole. Professors will not serve on the Post Tenure Review Committee during the year in which they undergo review. The Chair of the Committee shall be elected from among the Full Professors by the faculty.

Faculty will be evaluated in three areas: 1. Teaching, 2. Research and Scholarship, and 3. Service.

IV. Documentation.

The faculty member being reviewed will prepare a file for the Post Tenure Review Committee. The file will include:

1. Teaching.

a. A list of courses taught during the previous five years, with enrollments.

b. Relevant information and summary scores from student teaching evaluation.

c. Peer review of teaching reports or summaries of these reports.

d. A list of undergraduate projects (independent study; Hughes program; Honors College thesis) directed.

e. A list of graduate students directed and thesis and dissertations completed.

f. A list of instructional materials (textbooks, lab manuals, videos, etc.) produced.

g. Other information relevant to instructional performance.

2. Research and Scholarship.

a. A list, and set of reprints, of original research articles and reports in peer-reviewed journals during the previous five years.

b. A statement of research projects in progress and the status of these projects.

c. A list of grants received and submitted, agency making the award, amounts awarded, duration of awards, for any grants held during the previous five years.

d. A list of presentations at professional meetings, including name of the organization, place and dates; and invited seminars presented at other institutions.

e. A list of research awards, commendations, and other evidences of national recognition during the prior five years, including appointment to grant review panels, and requests to referee scientific publications and grants.

f. A list of non-peer reviewed publications, abstracts, technical reports, etc.

3. Service.

Since faculty service encompasses a wide variety of activities within the university, local community and the scientific community at large, as well as consulting and public service related to the faculty member's expertise, the file should contain a record of:

a. Internal service on departmental, college and university committees, or in the Faculty Senate.

b. Service to the local community, citing specific activities.

c. Service to the scientific community at large including proposals reviewed, service on panels, publications refereed, editorships, officerships in professional societies, etc.

4. The file shall include annual performance reviews, or summaries of reviews, during the previous five years to be furnished by the Department Chair.

5. Sabbatical leave reports during the period, where relevant, will be placed into the file.

6. A statement by the faculty member regarding his/her activities and performance during the previous five year period may be placed in the file. The faculty member may address any special strengths or perceived areas of weakness.

7. Current Curriculum Vita

V. Evaluation.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will examine the materials in the file and determine whether an external review is necessary. Receipt of one or more competitive research awards or publication of three or more refereed articles in journals of national or international scope during the prior five years shall be prima facie evidence of research competence, and shall satisfy the requirement for external review. Otherwise, the Committee will select at least two non-partial referees, external to the department, who will evaluate the research contributions of the faculty member.

Faculty members who have produced no scholarly works during the previous five years will be viewed as unsatisfactory in the area of research, and will not be externally reviewed.

Upon examination of all documentation and discussion within the Post Tenure Review Committee. The Committee members, by secret ballot, shall vote for each of the categories ("Teaching", "Research and Scholarship" and "Service") whether the performance is "superior", "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory". Each member shall prepare an unsigned written statement

supporting his/her vote appended to the ballot. Committee recommendations will be based on a simple majority vote.

VI. Criteria and Standards.

Research: The minimal standard for effectiveness in research will be based on an acceptable level of publication in peer-reviewed journals or in books, ability to garner extramural funding and operation of an active program. However, these standards shall not supercede those generally stated or accepted at the time of the faculty member's employment. For example, faculty can satisfy the requirement for research activity by directing 399 projects, presenting work at local and regional meetings and collaboration with research-active colleagues. Alternatively, superior performance, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in other areas may substitute for a research role.

Teaching: The minimal standard for effective teaching is consistent acceptable performance as an instructor of subjects in his/her area of expertise. This will be based on teaching loads, formal peer reviews, student-originated evaluations, documented comments of former students and general reputation among colleagues and students. Development of instructional materials, e.g. lab manuals, videos, etc. should be considered in an overall evaluation. The departmental tenure criteria include direction of graduate and independent study students as a component of teaching co-equal with formal classroom teaching.

Service: Satisfactory service is expected of all tenured faculty, but may involve a wide spectrum of activities from the national to the unit level. Service may be compensated or not. Administrative appointments are included in the service record. The departmental Tenure and Promotion policies address the types of service appropriate for tenure-track faculty. All faculty are expected to demonstrate effective service in some area regardless of when he/she was appointed to the faculty.

Overall Evaluations. Tenured faculty will be evaluated in each of the areas given above, and rated "Superior", "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" in each area. An overall Superior rating requires a rating of Superior in two areas and at least a Satisfactory rating in the third. A Satisfactory rating requires a Satisfactory rating in teaching and at least one additional Satisfactory rating in a second area. In cases where the ranking is Unsatisfactory a development plan will be constructed by the Chair and the faculty member reviewed. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost. If agreement on a plan cannot can not be reached, the faculty member may appeal to the Post-Tenure Review Committee. If a consensus within the Committee cannot be obtained, the Dean will decide on the appropriate plan. The time line for the development plan will normally be not less than one year or more than three years.

VII. Guiding Principles.

For the purposes of post tenure review, no faculty member shall be held to a standard higher than that generally stated or accepted at the time of employment. In addition, the Post Tenure Review Committee should recognize the changing role of tenured faculty members that comes with maturity and experience, which may be manifested by a shift in career emphasis from research to other special responsibilities.

There are many ways for faculty to fulfill their responsibilities in teaching, research and service. The expression of unpopular ideas, theories, or opinions regarding any matter related to a faculty member's field of specialization, including political, social and cultural matters that impinge only indirectly on his/her specialization, should not, in itself, result in a poor review.