Approved: 6/2/2016

Policy for Post-Tenure Faculty Review
Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina

1 Overview

The primary function of post-tenure review is faculty development. Post-tenure review is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. Instead, the process is designed to examine a professor's contributions to the University's teaching, research, and service objectives over a 6-year period to complement the annual review process in which all faculty participate. It culminates in a performance rating of **superior**, **satisfactory**, or **unsatisfactory** from the Department and the dean. The Department's policy on post-tenure review is governed by the University policies which are described in the Faculty Manual.

2 Faculty Subject to Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, shall 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, a chaired professorship, promotion to a higher professorial rank). However, post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing prior to the next scheduled review, of plans for retirement within three years after the review would have been scheduled.

3 Review Criteria

Post-tenure review of faculty in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice is based on the individual's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

3.1 Teaching

As educators, tenured faculty members in the department must maintain a record of effective teaching. An effective teacher maintains up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter being taught, conveys content in a clear manner that students can readily follow, responds appropriately to student's questions, conducts evaluations of academic performance in a fair and appropriate manner, and structures teaching activities in an organized way that is conducive to learning. Tenured faculty members are expected to exhibit a reasonable level of service on examining committees and to collaborate with students on independent studies, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations. In the typical case, judgments of teaching effectiveness can be based on information contained in student and peer evaluations, course syllabi, and a track record of successful involvement and oversight of independent studies and graduate student scholarship.

3.2 Research

A faculty member's record must show significant scholarly work, which was generated after the award of tenure (or between post-tenure reviews). Significance can be demonstrated by publishing research in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals and books, seeking and obtaining external funding to support research activities, and recognition by the field for scholarly contributions (for example, being asked to serve on editorial boards or receiving awards and honors for scholarly contributions).

3.3 Service

Contributions in the form of effective service to the department, university and community, or the profession are an ongoing responsibility of tenured faculty members. The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice recognizes that there are many dimensions of service and outreach that advance department and university goals. Some examples include acting as a peer reviewer for scholarly publications and grant proposals, delivering invited addresses and presentations, consultation and advisory board membership on major research projects, election to an officer position in major disciplinary organizations, and responding to questions from journalists and membership or involvement in community organizations that relate to the faculty mem-

ber's expertise. Tenured faculty members are expected to regularly participate in department, college, and university service such as attending faculty meetings and reasonable committee service.

3.4 Overall Rating

In general, an overall rating of **superior** shall reflect a superior rating in each of the three major categories of review. On the other hand, an overall rating of **unsatisfactory** shall reflect a serious deficiency in one or more of the three major categories of review. In the case where there are no serious deficiencies *and* one or more of the category ratings attains the **satisfactory** level, the overall rating shall be **satisfactory** as well.

4 Procedural Requirements

Consistent with the University policies on post-tenure review (as outlined in the Faculty Manual), the Department's policy mandates the following procedures for post-tenure review:

- Once a faculty member is notified that it is time for post-tenure review, the Department chair must provide the faculty member with copies of all previous annual performance reviews, post-tenure reviews, and development plans. At this time, the Department chair will clearly define the boundaries of the review period.
- The Department chair will appoint a post-tenure review (PTR) committee comprised of all tenured faculty members who are of equal or higher rank of the faculty member who is being reviewed.
- The PTR committee shall receive copies of all annual performance reviews during the review period from the Department chair and a post-tenure review file (described in Section 5) from the faculty member who is being reviewed.
- The PTR committee will review all of these materials according to the criteria described in Section 3. Each member of the PTR committee should submit a post-tenure review evaluation form (see Section 7 below) including that committee member's ratings of the faculty member's performance and a written justification for the ratings.

- The PTR committee with approval of the majority of its members shall produce a written report characterizing the faculty member's performance as **superior**, **satisfactory**, or **unsatisfactory** and set forth the reasons for the rating.

- In the event the PTR committee produces an **unsatisfactory** rating, the report shall include a recommended development plan for restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level.

- The PTR committee shall provide the Department chair and the dean with a copy of the report (including any recommended development plan). The report shall be retained by both offices as permanent records.

- If the rating is **superior** or **satisfactory**, the PTR committee shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the report. The summary must provide specific evaluative information on the faculty member's performance in the categories of teaching, research, and service. The summary must be sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development.

- If the rating is **unsatisfactory**, the Department chair shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the report along with any recommendations for a development plan. If the faculty member disagrees with the unit report's unsatisfactory assessment of the faculty member's overall performance or with any aspect of the PTR committee's recommendations for a development plan, the faculty member may appeal to the Department's tenure and promotion committee, or a subcommittee of the Department's tenure and promotion committee designated to hear issues arising in the post-tenure review process, by submitting a written statement of the faculty member's basis for disagreeing with the report or recommendation. The findings of the Department's tenure and promotion committee, or subcommittee, together with its recommendations for action and any statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the dean through the Department chair.

- The University's procedures give the dean an equally weighty voice in the final rating. For a faculty member to receive an **unsatisfactory** overall rating, the PTR committee and the dean must concur in that

rating. Similarly, for a faculty member to receive a **superior** overall rating, the PTR committee and the dean must concur in that rating. In the event of a final **unsatisfactory** rating, the faculty member's progress toward meeting the objectives outlined in the development plan will be annually evaluated by the Department chair and the PTR committee.

5 File Preparation

A faculty member who is engaged in the post-tenure review process should prepare a file for the department and dean to review. The file should contain the following items from the review period (preceding 6 years):

- Teaching: (1) a list of all courses taught; (2) student and peer evaluations for all of the above-listed courses; (3) a list of all student projects the faculty member has supervised and a status report (completed or in-progress with expected completion date) on each of those projects; (4) a list of examining committee activities; and (5) any other materials the faculty member wants the committee to consider in its assessment of teaching performance.

- Research: (1) a list of all research and scholarly activities (if the curriculum vitae is used to convey this information, then those activities occurring during the review period should be clearly distinguished from activities that occurred at other times); (2) examples of research and scholarship selected by the faculty member; and (3) any other materials the faculty member wants the committee to consider in its assessment of research and scholarship.

- Service: a list of all service or outreach activities occurring during the review period that clearly differentiates between service to the discipline, service to the community, and service to the University (if the curriculum vitae is used to convey this information, then activities occurring in the review period should be clearly distinguished from activities that occurred at other times).

- Annual Evaluations: all annual evaluations (letter from the chair to the faculty member) during the review period.

- Sabbatical Reports: a copy of the official report of activities occurring during sabbatical leaves that occurred during the review period.
- Current Curriculum Vitae

6 Normative Timeline

Typically, the post-tenure review process should proceed in accordance with the following calendar:

- April: Tenured faculty members who will be reviewed in the coming post-tenure review cycle are notified in writing by the Department Chair. The Department Chair identifies and charges the members of the PTR committee. The PTR committee elects a chair.
- May: The PTR chair appoints a member of the PTR committee to prepare a summary of student and peer teaching evaluations.
- August 1: The faculty member under review submits a complete post-tenure review file to the PTR chair.
- September: The PTR chair adds the teaching summary to the file and announces that all files are available for PTR review. Absentee review forms are sent to faculty members on leave.
- October: PTR committee meets and evaluates each faculty member under review. All post-tenure review forms (see Section 7 below) including those from faculty members on leave, are submitted to the PTR chair, within one week of the meeting. The official PTR report reflecting the committee's assessment of the faculty member should be completed by the end of the month. The report, all evaluation forms, and rating justifications should be distributed in accordance with Section 4 (above).
- November: If the faculty member wishes to appeal, the appellate process is initiated. The faculty member should submit written grounds for appeal to the Department chair who will convey them to the tenure and promotion committee chair. The written grounds for appeal should be submitted by the end of the month.

- December: In the event of an appeal, the tenure and promotion committee will meet to consider the written grounds for the appeal and issue its recommendation (by majority vote) to the Department chair.

7 Post-Tenure Review Form Components

The post-tenure review form shall be completed by each member of the PTR committee. These completed forms will become part of the post-tenure review file. The form will include the following items:

- The date the form is completed.
- The name of the faculty member being reviewed.
- The name of the PTR committee member submitting the form.
- A rating of **superior**, **satisfactory**, or **unsatisfactory** in the area of teaching with a corresponding justification for the rating.
- A rating of **superior**, **satisfactory**, or **unsatisfactory** in the area of research with a corresponding justification for the rating.
- A rating of **superior**, **satisfactory**, or **unsatisfactory** in the area of service with a corresponding justification for the rating.
- An overall rating of **superior**, **satisfactory**, or **unsatisfactory** with a justification for the rating that is consistent with Section 3.4 (above).