DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH AND CLASSICS
POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES
February, 1999

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review 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 for this purpose by the Office of the Provost. Faculty members under review should have their dossier prepared by March 1 of the review year, unless the Office of the Provost mandates a different date.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions (other than the Chair), will 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., Chair or a chaired professorship). Post-tenure review will be waived, however, for any faculty member who notifies the unit Chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review, and any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee and Faculty Participation

A. A Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the PTR Committee) will be constituted for each faculty member under review. Each PTR Committee is comprised of three tenured professors (excluding the Department Chair), one of whom is first chosen by the faculty member under review and two of whom are then elected by the tenured faculty of the Department. At least one member of the PTR Committee of each faculty member under review shall come from the program (French or Classics) of the faculty member under review. Two members of the PTR Committee must be equal or superior in rank to the faculty member under review. The three members of the PTR Committee elect the chair of the PTR Committee.

Faculty who are in their post-tenure review year will be ineligible for PTR Committee membership that year. The Chair of the Department is eligible neither to vote nor to serve on PTR committees.

B. At least one member of each PTR Committee shall be responsible for assembling such relevant information, documents, etc. as are required for post-tenure review, and for making them available to the PTR Committee for their consideration, discussion, and vote.

C. Should a PTR Committee recommend a superior or an unsatisfactory rating, at least one member of each PTR Committee shall be responsible for coordinating faculty participation in the Post-Tenure Review process.

D. In the event that there are fewer than two full professors eligible to serve on the PTR Committee of a full professor, the Chair of the Department may serve on the committee. If there are still not two full professors available, the Chair will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from other units within the University to make up a PTR Committee which includes at least two tenured full professors.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Chair of his/her PTR Committee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the dossier must include at least the following material in the file:

A. General

1. An updated curriculum vitae (CV).

2. A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the Chair and/or the Tenure and Promotion Committee accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.

3. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities (if one was taken since the last PTR).

B. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught during the period under review;

2. A numerical and descriptive summary of the student course evaluations for courses taught during the previous three years (to be prepared by the Chair's Office);

3. A copy of at least three peer evaluations of teaching, during the period under review, conducted in accordance with the Departmental policy.

C. Scholarship

1. A listing of all scholarly activities conducted during the period under review. Copies of publications should be included when deemed appropriate by the faculty member under review or when requested by the PTR Committee of the faculty member under review. Scholarly activities are defined as those listed in the Departmental T&P Criteria under "Areas of Performance," B. Scholarship. Research activity will be evaluated by peers outside the unit (although not necessarily outside the University). Refereed publications or other reviewed

research work will be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit.

D. Service

1. A listing of all service activities conducted during the period under review. Service activities are defined as those listed in the Departmental T&P Criteria under "Areas of Performance," C. Service.

V. PTR Committee Procedures

A. The chair of each PTR Committee will ensure that, when necessary, peer reviews (from outside the Department) of scholarly activities are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship is considered as having fulfilled the peer review of scholarly activities requirement.

B. After review of the faculty member's file, each member of the PTR Committee will complete a written evaluation form for the faculty member. The form will rate the faculty member's performance in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. In each of the three areas, the PTR Committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as either superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Each PTR Committee member will also rate the overall performance of the faculty member under review as either superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

C. For purposes of post-tenure review, the following performance rating terms will be defined:

1. An overall satisfactory rating is defined as:
   a. A satisfactory rating in teaching, **and**
   b. Minimal performance (as defined below) in both scholarship and service, **and**
   c. A satisfactory rating in **either** scholarship or service

Descriptions of satisfactory performance can be found in the definitions of Level One in teaching, scholarship and service as defined by Departmental T&P Procedures and Criteria. More specifically, "satisfactory performance" in scholarship would normally include more than one refereed publication during the review period. Examples of types of publications are given in the description of Level One under scholarship in the Departmental T&P Procedures and Criteria.

"Minimal performance" in scholarship is defined as at least one refereed publication during the previous six years. "Minimal performance" in service is defined as carrying out adequately at least some service assignments during the previous six years.

2. "Superior performance" means performance at the very highest level. Examples of superior performance can be found in the definitions of Level Three in teaching, scholarship and service as defined by Departmental T&P Procedures and Criteria.

3. "Unsatisfactory performance" means performance, which, taken as a whole, fails to meet relevant Department standards in teaching, research, and service. Unsatisfactory performance in teaching, scholarship or service is performance below Level One in these areas as defined by Departmental T&P Procedures and Criteria.

D. The Chair of the PTR Committee of each faculty member under review will collect the performance evaluation forms from the other members of the PTR Committee and tally the ratings in each of the three evaluation areas, defined in V.B, and the overall ratings. In the event that a majority of these members do not rate the overall performance of a faculty member the same, the PTR Committee evaluation will give a performance rating of "satisfactory."

E. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the faculty member under review and to the tenured faculty, the chair of each PTR Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include at a minimum the PTR Committee's rating of the performance for each of the three evaluation areas defined in V.B, the overall rating, 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 individual written evaluations will be destroyed by the PTR Committee chair after the report is approved by the PTR Committee. If the faculty member under review wishes to attach a response to the PTR Committee report, he/she must do so within one week of receipt of the report.

F. A Satisfactory Review

1. If the overall performance rating of the faculty member is "satisfactory," the evaluation of the faculty member is concluded with the distribution of the report. If the PTR Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is satisfactory, but that his/her performance in either scholarship or service is unsatisfactory, the PTR Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level in that area. 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 (*FM* IV.C.2).

2. A copy of the PTR Committee report will be sent to the Chair and to the Dean of the College.

G. A Superior Review

1. If the overall PTR Committee evaluation of the faculty member is "superior," the PTR Committee makes the dossier available to the tenured faculty, who will meet to discuss the dossier and then vote on whether or not the case of the faculty member under review for a superior rating is strong enough to be forwarded to the Dean and Provost. A two-thirds vote is required for a recommendation for a superior rating to go forward. If there is not a two-thirds vote to confirm an overall superior rating, a rating of "satisfactory" will be given; see V.F.2

2. Notice of superior performance by a faculty member will be sent forward by the Department Chair to the Dean and Provost for possible merit salary increase.

H. An Unsatisfactory Review

1. If the overall PTR Committee evaluation of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory," the PTR Committee makes the dossier (including the report of the PTR Committee and any response by the faculty member under review) available to the tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than that of the faculty member under review, who will meet to discuss the dossier and then vote on whether or not the faculty member under review should indeed receive an overall unsatisfactory rating. A two-thirds vote is required to confirm an overall unsatisfactory rating. If there is not a two-thirds vote to confirm an overall unsatisfactory rating, a rating of "satisfactory" will be given; see V.F.2

2. If the tenured faculty determine that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, as defined in V.C.1 and V.C.3, the faculty member's PTR Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The PTR Committee will act as the faculty member's Development Committee, unless the PTR Committee recommends, in consultation with the faculty member under review, substituting or adding a member from within or outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.

3. The Development Committee and Department Chair, in consultation with and with the concurrence of the faculty member, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member. The timetable is at the discretion of the Development Committee, depending on the nature of the development plan, but in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year nor more than three years in duration. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will be sent to the Provost.

4. If a faculty member fails to agree to a reasonable Development Plan established in good faith, the Chair and the Development Committee will place a letter to that effect in the personal file of the faculty member under review and the faculty member under review will be judged by normal Annual Performance Review standards, not the standards of his/her development plan (see V.H.5 below).

5. The development plan will form the basis for the Annual Performance Review of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored.

6. At the next Annual Performance Review, the unit Chair and the Development Committee, if any, will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member under review. The evaluation will be forwarded to the unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, which in this case is made up tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than that of the faculty member under review. The unit Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the Chair's assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. The Chair's assessment and the unit tenure and promotion committee's response will be forwarded to the Dean and copies provided to the faculty member.

7. The Chair will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports with the Dean and the Provost. The Dean will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member under review in meeting the goals of the development plan, and whether or not further measures may be necessary.

VI. 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 Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (which in this case is made up tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than that of the faculty member under review), in general or in any particular. The findings of the Department 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 faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Chair in concert with the Development Committee, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Dean and the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.

[revised 2/22/99]