Department of Biological Sciences

Post-Tenure Review Policy version: 08 April 2012

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

1. Superior performance. Effective performance that significantly exceeds the assigned responsibilities and expectations of the faculty member. 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, favorable teaching evaluations and annual peer reviews.

2. Satisfactory performance. Effective performance consistent with the assigned responsibilities and expectations of the faculty member, and consistent with the mission of the department.

3. Unsatisfactory performance. Performance that, taken as a whole, fails to meet the Departmental minimum standards for the rank and time in service in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. Additionally, performance that is detrimental to the mission and reputation of the Department, including a combination of the following, may be considered 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 grounds for an unsatisfactory rating. The expression of unpopular ideas, theories or opinions regarding any matter related to a faculty member's field of specialization shall not result in an unsatisfactory review.

III. Logistics

1. Tenured faculty will be reviewed as described in the Faculty Manual. Every tenured faculty member shall be reviewed every six years. Approximately one-sixth of the tenured faculty will be reviewed each year. Exceptions are granted for faculty successfully reviewed for advancement during the preceding six years. Thus, faculty

promoted to full professorship or appointed or re-appointed to a chaired professorship need not have a post-tenure review for six years from the date of the promotion or appointment or re-appointment. Post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the Department Chair in writing of retirement within three years.

2. Written copies of all annual performance reviews, third year reviews, post-tenure reviews and development plans, if appropriate, will be given to the faculty member who is reviewed and will be permanently retained by the Office of the Department Chair and the Office of the Dean. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost.

3. 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 the joint appointment is held in accordance with the faculty member's memorandum of understanding.

4. The Peer Review Committee for Associate Professors will also serve as the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the Department of Biological Sciences. 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.

5. Upon completion of post-tenure review, the faculty member must receive a written statement that provides specific evaluative information of the faulty member's performance in the categories of teaching, research/scholarship activities, and service. The review should be sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development.

6. Faculty will be rated as Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

7. Faculty will be evaluated in three areas: 1. Teaching, 2. Research and Scholarship, and 3. Service. The overall rating will be based on the composite of the rating for all three areas.

IV. Documentation

Following notification by the Chair of the Department, 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, Honors College thesis) directed. If the project is funded by an external or internal grant to the student such as a Magellan Scholar award, then that information should be included.
e. A list of graduate students directed and thesis and dissertations completed.
f. A list of post-doctoral associates supervised.
f. A list of instructional material (textbooks, lab manuals, web based materials, videos, etc) produced.
g. Other information relevant to instructional performance.

2. Research and Scholarship

a. A list, and set, of reprints, original research articles and reports in peer-review 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 whether the presentation was invited or contributed; 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.
g. Detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period.

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, officer position 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. Detailed reports about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period will be placed into the file.

6. A Personal 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.

V. External Evaluations

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 impartial 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.

VI. Criteria and Standards

1. 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 research program. However, these standards shall not supersede those generally stated or accepted at the time of the faculty member's initial employment. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion policies address the types and degree of research/scholarly productivity expected of tenured faculty.

2. 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 review, student-originated evaluations, documented comments of former students and general reputation among colleagues and students. Development of instructional materials, e.g. lab manuals, videos, web based materials, etc. should be considered in an overall evaluation. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion criteria include direction of graduate and independent study students as a component of teaching co-equal with formal classroom teaching.

3. Service. Satisfactory service is expected of all tenured faculty, but may involve a wide spectrum of activities from the unit to the national 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.

VII. Overall Ratings

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 ("Research", "Teaching", and "Service") as to whether the performance in a

category is “Superior”, “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory”. Committee determinations will be by simple majority. The Committee shall send to the Department Chair a justification for its rating for each faculty member under review with a copy to the faculty member reviewed.

Overall Evaluations. 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 at least two of the three areas, teaching, research, and service. The only exceptions to this are cases where a faculty member’s appointment explicitly exempts the individual from participation in one of the three categories.

Development Plan. In cases where the ranking is Unsatisfactory a Development Committee will be appointed by the Chair of the Department after consultation with the faculty member. If the faculty member holds a joint appointment, the Chair of the Department will consult with the head of the other unit about the composition of the Development Committee. The goal is to improve the performance of the faculty member. The members of the Development Committee must hold a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored. The Chair of the Department shall forward both a justification for the unsatisfactory review and the recommendations for restoring the faculty member's performance to the satisfactory level to the Dean. If agreement on a plan cannot be reached by the Development Committee and the faculty member reviewed, both the faculty member and the Development Committee shall submit proposed development plans to the Dean for final determination of the plan. If the faculty member refuses to consult with the Development Committee in designing the development plan, the Development Committee will write the plan and forward the plan to the Dean. The time line for the development plan will normally not be less than one year or more than three years.

At the next annual review, both the Development Committee and the Chair of the Department will use the development plan to make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. The assessment will be forwarded to the Post-Tenure Review Committee, representing the Tenure and Promotion Committee-of-the-Whole. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the assessments by the Development Committee and the Chair and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. The assessments and the Post-Tenure Review Committee’s response will be forwarded to the Dean and copies provided to the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination on progress or the lack thereof, and whether or not further measures may be necessary to restore the faculty member’s overall performance to a satisfactory level.

VIII. 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. There are many ways for faculty to fulfill their responsibilities in teaching, research and service.

Version: 4/8/2012
Committee: Sarah Woodin (chair), Beth Krizek, Alan Waldman, David Reisman