Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Post-Tenure Review
(May 10, 1999)

The Department seeks to use the post-tenure review to recognize and reward faculty for superior achievement and to help faculty members identify weaknesses and improve performance and thus maximize the number of its faculty who are working constructively to achieve the Department's goals. Each faculty member will be evaluated in the three categories of teaching, research, and service.

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review established by 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 Departmental post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

I. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Every tenured faculty member in the Department shall be reviewed every six years in accordance with University policies. Beginning in the Fall 1999, approximately one-sixth of the unit 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. Thus, faculty promoted to Full Professor, a chaired professorship, or a competitively advertised dean position in the previous six years 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 of the next scheduled review. Selection of individuals to be reviewed in a given year will be made in consultation between the Department Chair and the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair. The evaluation of faculty members shall begin in the faculty member's department. Faculty members holding joint appointments in programs or institutes shall follow established Tenure and Promotion procedures.

II. Post-Tenure Review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee

The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, less the individual being reviewed, shall perform post-tenure review. For post-tenure review of associate professors, the committee shall consist of all tenured associate and full professors. For review of full professors, the committee shall consist of tenured full professors only. The Department Chair may participate in the proceedings, but is not eligible to vote. The Dean is not eligible to serve on the Committee or to vote.

III. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Committee. The file will follow the format of the University Tenure and Promotion File, **including student evaluations of teaching and a summary of peer reviews of teaching, and** emphasizing accomplishments achieved and duties and services performed since the individual's last tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review. The file must also include annual performance reviews accumulated since the last tenure, promotion, or previous post-tenure review.

Note: The existence of a reasonable number of peer-reviewed publications in major journals in the past five years and/or a reasonable number of grant proposals funded during this same period shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement of external peer review. Otherwise, the Committee will select at least two external referees from whom to request evaluations of the faculty member's research quality and quantity. If the faculty member has produced no scholarly works in the review period, the area of research will be viewed as "unsatisfactory" and no outside evaluations will be solicited at that time.

IV. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The candidate being reviewed will be rated as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the three categories of scholarly work, teaching, and service. For a satisfactory rating in each category, the candidate must meet the specific criteria for that category for promotion to the rank currently held, as described in Departmental Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria. Superior ratings recognize performance at only the very highest levels. For a superior rating in a category, an associate professor must meet the criteria for

promotion to the rank of professor. To receive a superior rating in a category, the achievements of a full professor must be comparable to those of the chaired professors within the department. An overall satisfactory rating requires a rating of satisfactory or better **in two of the three categories, one of which must be teaching.** An overall rating of superior requires ratings of superior in two categories, **and a rating of at least satisfactory in the third.**

V. Tenure and Promotion Committee Action for Post-Tenure Review

The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall give all members at least five days advance notice of any Committee meeting. On all procedural questions, a simple majority of members present will be sufficient to decide the issue. For purposes of discussion or procedural action on post-tenure review matters, a quorum shall consist of 51% of all faculty members eligible to vote on the matter under consideration. A favorable vote on ratings in the various categories and the overall rating requires 51% of all eligible voters, not counting those on leave who have elected not to vote.

For each of the three performance categories, scholarly work, teaching, and service, the Committee members shall vote initially on whether the candidate

a) meets or exceeds criteria, or
b) fails to meet criteria.

A "fails to meet criteria" vote corresponds directly to an unsatisfactory rating in that category.

For each category in which the Committee finds the candidate has met or exceeded the criteria, the Committee will review the candidate's accomplishments to determine whether that performance sufficiently exceeds the criteria to be rated as superior. For each category, members of the Committee shall take a second vote to rate the candidate as

a) superior, or
b) satisfactory.

The Committee Chair shall write a letter to the Department Chair summarizing the Committee's assessment of the faculty member's performance relative to the criteria, giving the ratings in the three categories and the overall rating. This review should be

sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development.

VI. Action by the Department Chair

The Department Chair will make an independent evaluation of the candidate's file. Upon receipt of the assessment by the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair will write a letter to the Dean making a final assessment of the overall rating and including a copy of the letter from the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair. The Department Chair will give the candidate copies of letters from the Department Chair and the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair. Copies of these letters will be placed in the candidate's Departmental personnel file.

VII. Appeal of an Overall Rating

The faculty member has the right to appeal an overall performance rating. Within 5 working days after receiving copies of letters from the Department Chair and the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair, the faculty member reviewed may address a written appeal to the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair. The appeal may contain new information or interpretations of performance activities or call for letters from reviewers outside the Department or the University, who may have knowledge with which to evaluate the individual's accomplishments in one or more performance categories. If, following reconsideration, the Committee still supports the **overall rating, as previously determined**, the individual may appeal to the Dean for final determination of the evaluation.

VIII. The Development Plan

An Overall Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review requires the establishment of a Development Plan that details activities that the faculty member must undertake to improve performance. This plan shall be established through discussions between the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, and the faculty member involved. The plan shall contain specific performance criteria that the faculty member must meet in order to have the Unsatisfactory rating removed. The Plan should identify both the activities and the timeframe during which the Plan shall remain in effect, **normally not less than one year or more than three years.** The Department Chair must send a copy of the

Development Plan to the Dean. The Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, shall assess progress on the plan, at least once per year. If, during a subsequent annual evaluation, the Department Chair determines that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory relative to the Development Plan, the Department Chair shall consult with the Tenure and Promotion Committee to revise the Plan with additional performance criteria. The Department Chair must send copies of any amended Development Plan to the faculty member and to the Dean.

The goal of the Development Plan is to restore the faculty member's performance to a Satisfactory level. In some cases, it may be appropriate to use the Development Plan to define how an individual faculty member can best contribute to the department's goals and to outline criteria by which that contribution can be measured.

If the faculty member cannot reach agreement with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Chair on the Development Plan or on their assessment of a subsequent annual performance evaluation, the Department Chair shall summarize the disagreement and forward the matter to the Dean for resolution.

Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the provost.