

Subject: Post-Tenure Review

Policy: A1.06

Date: 9/25/98

Reviewed: 4/15/16

POLICY

The School of Library and Information Science will review all tenured faculty as set forth in the regulations on post-tenure review established in the University Faculty Manual.

PURPOSE

The primary function of post-tenure review, an internal SLIS process, is faculty development. Post-tenure review is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. Moreover, although the failure of a faculty member to make substantial progress toward meeting the goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may be evidence of “incomplete and/or habitual neglect of duty,” the post-tenure review process may not be used to shift the burden of proof in a proceeding to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause.

PROCEDURE

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 in this document and the regulations given in the University Faculty Manual, the University Faculty Manual will take precedence.

I. The School post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions (other than the Director), 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., Director or a chaired professorship). However, School-level 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 and any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years. Post-tenure review will be conducted by tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank.

Tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments will undergo post-tenure review according to the criteria, and by the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank, of the primary unit. Input from appropriate evaluators (e.g. faculty, chair, dean) of the

secondary unit including performance reviews, teaching evaluations, service and research evaluation must be solicited by the primary unit in reaching their determination.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The membership of the School Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full professors on the School Tenure and Promotion Committee, acting as a sub-committee of the School Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenured full professors who are having a post-tenure review conducted will be excluded from Committee membership that year. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be the chair of the School Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the Chair of the School Tenure and Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Committee will elect a new chair for that year.

The Director is neither eligible to vote nor to serve on the Committee. In the event that there are fewer than five School faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the Director of the School will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from other units within the University that do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a committee of five voting members.

IV. 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 pertinent, the faculty member must include at least the following material in the file:

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous five years. Teaching is defined as in the SLIS Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Definition of Teaching."
2. A numerical and descriptive summary of the student course evaluations for each of the courses listed (to be prepared by the Director's Office);
3. A copy of a peer evaluation of teaching, conducted in accordance with the School's policy on peer evaluations.

B. Scholarship

1. A listing and relevant copies of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous five years. Scholarly activities are defined as those listed in the School's Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Definition of Scholarship."

C. Service

1. A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous five years. Service activities are defined as those listed in the School's Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Service."

D. Annual Evaluations

1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the Director and/or the School Tenure and Promotion Committee accumulated since the initial tenure review 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).

V. Committee Procedures

A. The chair of the Committee will ensure that peer reviews (from within the College) of the faculty member's teaching, and peer reviews of scholarly activities are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship is an example of the peer review of scholarly activities requirement.

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

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

1. 'Superior performance' means performance at the very highest level.

Superior performance meets the definition of "superior" or "excellent" for any given evaluation area in the School's Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

2. 'Satisfactory performance' means performance that meets the expectations of the School. Satisfactory performance meets the definition of "good" or "fair" for any given evaluation area in the School's Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' means performance, taken as a whole, that fails to meet relevant School standards. Unsatisfactory performance meets the definition of "unsatisfactory" for any given evaluation area in the School's Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

D. In a meeting of the Committee, the Chair will collect the performance evaluation forms from the Committee members and tally the ratings in each evaluation areas defined in V.B. A majority evaluative rating is achieved when fifty-one percent of all eligible Committee members have cast a ballot with the same rating. In the event that a majority of Committee members do not rate the performance of a faculty member the same in a given performance evaluation area, the committee report will give a performance rating of "satisfactory, lacking majority opinion." A Committee member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the Director of a desire to do so before the beginning of the leave.

E. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the Committee, the chair of the Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review, which will include at minimum the Committee's rating of the performance for each of the four evaluation areas defined in V.B, 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 Committee chair after the report is approved by the Committee.

F. A copy of the Committee report must be sent to the faculty member and to the Director of the School for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, a copy of the Committee report and development plan must also be sent to the Provost.

G. If the performance rating for each evaluation area defined in V.B of the faculty member is either "superior" or "satisfactory," the evaluation of the faculty member is concluded with the distribution of the report. If the Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is satisfactory but that his/her performance in either teaching, scholarship, or service areas is unsatisfactory, the 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.

H. An Unsatisfactory Review

1. If the Committee determines that the overall performance evaluation rating of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory," the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The Committee will also act as the faculty member's Development Committee. The Committee may recommend the inclusion of additional members to the Development Committee from outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.

2. The Director of the School, in consultation with the Committee and the faculty member, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member.

3. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the Development Committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will recommend to the Director of the School whether they believe the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in any particular. The timetable is at the discretion of the Committee depending on the nature of the development plan, but in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year or more than three years in duration.

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

5. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may result in proceedings for termination of the faculty member.

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 School Tenure and Promotion Committee, in general or in any particular. The findings of the School Post-Tenure Review Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the Director for final determination of the evaluation.

B. If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Director of the School, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.