Department of Physics and Astronomy
College of Science and Mathematics
Post-Tenure Review

[Revised June 2, 1999]

General Procedures and Calendar

An attempt as been made to make sure that the procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on Post-Tenure Review established by the University *Faculty Manual.* If any discrepancy occurs between the procedures given in this document and the regulations given in the *Faculty Manual,* the *Faculty Manual* will take precedence. The 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 Department's 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, or retention in, a higher position. Thus, faculty promoted to a higher professorial rank, reviewed for a chaired professorship or renewal, 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.

II. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The review will be conducted by a Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) which will be composed of three elected members and the Department Chair, *ex officio*. All tenured full professors are eligible to serve, and all tenure-track faculty members are eligible to vote. Tenured full professors who are having a Post-Tenure Review conducted will be excluded from Committee membership that year. The elected members of the Committee will designate one of their number as Chair of the Committee. The Department Chair may participate in the proceedings and is eligible to vote. In case of a tie vote, the Committee Chair's vote will be considered the deciding vote. The Dean is not eligible to serve on the Committee or to vote. Faculty members tenured in the Department of Physics and Astronomy and holding joint appointments in other programs or institutes shall follow established Tenure and Promotion procedures.

The Department adopts the Post-Tenure Review policy to recognize and reward faculty for superior performance and to assure that each faculty member's contribution is at least satisfactory and each is working constructively to achieve the Department's goals. Each faculty member will be evaluated in the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service.

III. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a Post-Tenure Review file to the Committee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member *must* include an up-to-date curriculum vitae, a personal statement not to exceed three pages, and a file covering the previous six years activity that contains at least the following material:

A. Teaching
   1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous six years.
   2. A quantitative summary and comments from the student course evaluations for each of the courses listed.
   3. Copies of peer reviews of teaching conducted on any of the listed courses in accordance with departmental policy.

B. Scholarship
   1. A listing and copies of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous six years.

C. Service
   1. A listing of all service and outreach activities conducted during the previous six years.

D. Annual Evaluations
   1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations for the past six years or since the initial tenure date or since the last Post-Tenure Review

E. Sabbatical Reports
   1. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities (if one was taken during the review period).

Note: The existence of a reasonable number of peer-reviewed publications in major journals in the past six years and/or grant proposals funded during this same period may be deemed by the Committee 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 scholarship will be viewed as Unsatisfactory and no outside evaluations will be solicited at that time.

Overall Post-Tenure Review Rating

The Post-Tenure Review files will be evaluated by the Committee and the faculty member will be given ratings in each of the three categories and an overall rating. The Committee Chair will then address a letter to the Department Chair and to the Dean providing the committee's

assessment of the faculty member's performance relative to the evaluation criteria and giving the ratings determined by the Committee. The Department Chair has the option of writing a separate concurring or dissenting letter. The faculty member will be given copies of the Committee letter and the Department Chair's letter, if any, and copies will be permanently retained in the faculty member's personnel file by the office of the Department Chair and the office of the Dean.

An overall Satisfactory Post-Tenure Review rating generally requires a Satisfactory rating in Teaching and in at least one other category. A Superior rating overall generally requires a Superior rating in at least two of the three categories with at least a Satisfactory rating in the third. An exceptional contribution in any of the three categories can warrant a Superior overall rating.

Post-Tenure Review ratings may be appealed by the faculty member to the appropriate Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee as defined by the Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures. A simple majority of the Tenure and Promotion Committee can recommend changes in the findings of the Peer Review Committee. According to University regulations the findings of the unit 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"

In the case of an overall Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, which will then act as a "Development Committee", will make specific recommendations to remedy deficiencies and problems. These recommendations will be in the form of a Development Plan aimed at restoring overall Satisfactory performance within a three-year period. The Committee will also offer assistance to the faculty member under review to improve performance in the deficient areas indicated by the review. During each of the three years, the faculty member must demonstrate substantial progress toward meeting the criteria specified by the Plan for improved performance. The Department Chair will inform the Post-Tenure Review Committee of the results of the annual performance review of the faculty member with respect to the performance criteria given in the Development Plan. The Committee will review the Chair's assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. Copies of an Unsatisfactory review and the associated Development Plan will be sent to the Dean and the Provost. At the three-year anniversary of the overall Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review, the faculty member will again be evaluated by the Post-Tenure Review Committee in the same manner as the usual Post-Tenure Review to determine whether satisfactory progress has been made toward improvement as detailed in the Development Plan.

Although 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 Post-Tenure Review Committee and Department Chair on the Development Plan, then he/she may appeal the Plan to a special Post-Tenure Appeal Committee appointed by the Dean. The proposed plan and the justification for

the appeal should be provided to the chair of the Post-Tenure Appeal Committee. That committee may meet in private to discuss the appeal and shall meet with the faculty member involved to further discuss the issue. The Post-Tenure Appeal Committee shall issue a decision on resolution of the appeal. If the faculty member still does not agree to the Development Plan, the issue shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College for resolution. The Plan may be amended during the Annual Performance Review process if the faculty member is found to be performing Unsatisfactorily relative to the Development Plan.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

I. Teaching Criteria

The faculty member's teaching will be evaluated in the three categories of introductory courses, advanced courses and the mentoring of students. Faculty members holding joint appointments in other programs may be judged by their teaching activities in those programs. A faculty member may elect to specialize in one or more of these areas but should be proficient in at least two areas. Both the quality (effectiveness) and quantity of the teaching will be taken into account in the evaluation. Other important activities are the development of new courses, new instructional materials, new programs or new methods of delivery of instruction such as developing distance education courses.

Faculty on sabbatical leave are not expected to participate in teaching activities during the period of their leave and should not have the duration of their leave included in calculating any average course loads. New faculty or others granted teaching exemptions or load reductions should not have the semesters in which these variances exist included in calculating any average course loads. Specific measures of teaching performance can include:

1. Ratings on student evaluations of teaching Effort should be made to compare teaching performance in courses of similar size, level, and audience taught by other departmental faculty.
2. Ratings on Peer Review of teaching
3. Production of graduate degrees as the primary advisor
4. Receipt of a competitive award for teaching.
5. Development of new instructional materials, such as multimedia material, distance learning material, or a textbook.
6. Organization of programs to improve the quality of undergraduate and/or graduate instruction
7. Receipt of external funding for teaching improvement or development programs.

A Superior rating in teaching will require a consistently outstanding performance in categories 1 and 2 above and in at least one of the remaining categories. A Satisfactory performance will require at least a consistently Satisfactory performance in categories 1 and 2.

II Research and Scholarship Criteria

Faculty members are expected to maintain an active research and scholarship program

throughout their careers. The measure of the quality of a faculty member's research program will ultimately depend on the impact of the research on the field. There are various measures of scholarly contributions which should be considered, such as:

1. Papers published in mainstream refereed journals. Publication of approximately one paper per year in mainstream peer reviewed physics journals during the past six years. Also, publication of chapters or papers in refereed special volumes, or publication of research monographs, graduate level textbooks, or refereed works in interdisciplinary journals are important and may be viewed as sufficient contributions if fewer than one paper per year in mainstream physics journals is published during the review period. Publications of faculty members holding joint appointments in other programs will be judged by standards appropriate to those areas.
2. Consistent submission of formal proposals to appropriate government, industrial or foundation sources for sufficient funds to support the faculty member's research program during the previous six years.
3. Presentations of research and scholarship at national and international meetings, universities and national and international laboratories and research centers.
4. Local, national or international awards or prizes,

A Satisfactory rating will require 1, 2, and 3. A Superior rating will require 1, 2, and 3, together with receipt of external funding for significant periods during the past six years, and demonstration of the impact of the published work through citations or the through the receipt of a national or international competitive award for research accomplishments.

III. Service Criteria

Departmental faculty members are expected to effectively serve the department, University, and their professional community. This service can take many forms. Some examples of such service activities are:

A. Service to the department:
   1. Effective service on departmental committees or in department leadership/administrative positions (such as Undergraduate Studies Director, Astronomy Center Director, Department Chair, Graduate Director, etc.)
   2. Active participation in departmental seminars, faculty meetings, and other department functions.
   3. Recruitment and outreach efforts, field trips and other programs intended to enhance graduate and undergraduate enrollments and educational experiences.
B. Service to the College or the University:
   1. Effective service on College- or University-wide committees.
   2. Effective service in an administrative position in the college
   3. Effective consulting to support research and training of students, faculty, and staff within the College and/or University.
C. Service to the professional community:

1. Election or appointment to committees of professional societies, research consortiums, and other national or international organizations, including the organizing of national or international scientific meetings.
2. Editing activities for mainstream physics journals. Regular review of manuscripts for mainstream physics and related journals
3. Service on review panels. Review of proposals for funding agencies.
4. Service to the K- 12 education system and/or the state government or business/industry community, for example, consultation with business/industry/government agencies).

A Satisfactory rating can be achieved through a consistent record of service in at least one of the above categories. A Superior rating requires a substantial record of service in at least two of the above areas and Satisfactory service in the other. A Superior performance in service will need to be supported by appropriate written documentation.

Amendment of the Post-Tenure Review Procedures and Criteria

This document may be amended at any time by at least two-thirds vote of the faculty of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, subject to approval by the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics and the Provost. A faculty member may choose to be reviewed under the Post-Tenure Review document in effect at the time of his/her review or under any previous Post-Tenure Review document in effect since that faculty member's last such review.