POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

With the intent of facilitating continued professional development of the faculty, rewarding outstanding faculty, and improving the teaching, service, and/or scholarly productivity of individual faculty members and of the College as a whole, all faculty members shall undergo formal periodic review of their professional activities. For the purposes here, the term "faculty" refers to tenured faculty. Instructors and lecturers who teach in the College on an ongoing basis also undergo periodic review, using grounds discussed in a separate document. Similar criteria are used for annual reviews of tenure-track/tenured faculty.

The primary purpose of this periodic faculty review is to:

1. recognize long-term meritorious performance;
2. improve quality of faculty efforts in teaching, scholarship, and service;
3. increase opportunities for professional development; and
4. reveal and correct impediments to faculty productivity.

Each faculty member will be reviewed every 5 years after getting tenure.

The periodic review will result in a report written by a three-member subcommittee of the P&T committee that must be approved by the whole of the P&T committee. The three members of the subcommittee will be at rank or above, with respect to the faculty member under review. The review, and the resulting report, will consider the following, for the period of review (that is, since the previous review, whether that was occasioned by a promotion or tenure, or the previous periodic review):

1. a narrative written by the faculty member under review that covers teaching; research, scholarly or creative activities; and documented service
2. a portfolio assembled by the faculty member under review that covers teaching, research, scholarly or creative activities; and documented service. That is, this may include syllabi, copies of teaching assessments by students or other student material; scholarly or professionally-relevant publications; documented service activities to the University, state, nation, professional community, or other organization; and other materials as the faculty member sees fit.
3. a report of the peer review of teaching, advising, and other relevant activities (such as supervising a bureau or lab. Each faculty member will be observed by at least two people, at two different times. The peer observation will involve sitting in on a class, looking at some relevant teaching materials for the course in question, and talking to students without the presence of the faculty member.
4. the report of the faculty member’s previous periodic review, if any.

The subcommittee report will be shown to the faculty member under review, who may wish to write a response. Faculty choosing to exercise this option shall submit the response to the review committee within 14 calendar days of receipt of the appraisal, or
establish an agreeable alternate deadline with the review committee for submitting the response.

In either case, the whole of the P&T committee will examine the narrative report written by the faculty member under review and the subcommittee report, and the response from the faculty member, if any. It will either write a new report or approve the subcommittee report. The standards by which the faculty members are evaluated are the standards for the relevant rank (associate or full professor). Thus, faculty members are expected to continue to perform at the level required for promotion to the rank they have attained. The final report, whether a revision of the subcommittee report or the original, will then be sent to the dean.

The results of a review should generate a discussion between a faculty member and the dean. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member.

If the P&T committee and the Dean agree that a periodic review indicates that a faculty member is significantly deficient in meeting College expectations, the faculty member and the Dean shall prepare a firm written development plan, with timetable, for enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance. The P&T committee will review that faculty member one year later, using the same criteria as above.

If two consecutive periodic reviews indicate that a faculty member is significantly deficient in meeting College expectations, the faculty member must respond, in writing, to the two reports. Using the post-tenure reports, the response of the faculty member, and other information as appropriate (for example, the dean can conduct separate observations and evaluations of teaching). The Dean will recommend an appropriate plan of action. This plan might, for example, specify additional service or teaching assignments, if the faculty member has not produced scholarship; or attendance at teaching workshops, if the problem is weaknesses in teaching. (These examples do not rule out a host of other potential solutions.) The faculty member will receive a copy of the Dean’s report, including the recommendations for appropriate action, and a time-line. The P&T committee will re-review the faculty member again after one year (or two, if this is agreed to be more appropriate); and this process will continue until such reviews are deemed positive.