

Approved: 11/19/98

Revised and Approved: 2/11/99 and 2/26/99

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Preamble

The Geography Department, in accordance with the post-tenure review policy established by the University, seeks to create an atmosphere that allows faculty members to achieve the professional goals they have set for themselves, encourages faculty members to aspire to the heights of scholarship and professional development, and assures that faculty members continue to make contributions to the Department's missions of teaching, research, and service. This policy document is based on the following guiding principles: 1) post-tenure review is aimed at faculty development, not accountability; 2) the post-tenure review should be conducted so as to protect academic freedom and the quality of education; and 3) the system of post-tenure review must be periodically evaluated as to its effectiveness in redressing inadequate faculty performance and enhancing faculty development.

It is understood that post-tenure review involves expectations that define acceptable performance in teaching, research, and service. It is applied to senior faculty whose careers may have emphasized one or another of these areas, so a holistic assessment of that individual's overall contribution to the Department's mission must be part of any review. The outcomes of the procedures outlined below are intended to recognize superior performance, assure that all faculty maintain a satisfactory level of contribution, and provide those faculty whose performance is rated as unsatisfactory, an opportunity to improve.

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The general procedures for post-tenure review described below are in accordance with the post-tenure review policy outlined in the University's *Faculty Manual*. The post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established by the Office of the Provost.

II. Time Period

The timing for post-tenure review is based on date of tenure. Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, 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., dean or a chaired professorship). Furthermore, post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review. For the first cycle of reviews, the relevant time period under examination is from the date of tenure or date of last promotion until the present. During this initial review, particular emphasis will be placed on faculty performance during the previous six years. Subsequent reviews will be done on a six-year cycle.

III. Criteria

Tenured faculty are to maintain their contributions in three general areas: teaching and mentoring; research and scholarship; and professional/university service. Faculty should meet the minimum expectations in two of the three areas to receive a **satisfactory** review. An **unsatisfactory** rating is given to faculty who do not meet the minimum expectations in two or three of these areas. A **superior** evaluation is given if faculty meet expectations in all three areas and significantly exceed the minimum expectations in two of these areas.

The minimum expectations are described below:

Teaching and mentoring--an average score of 3.0 or better on student course evaluations, positive peer reviews of teaching, successful mentoring of graduate and/or undergraduate students.

Research and scholarship--the equivalent of one published refereed journal article or book chapter per year, extramural grant activity where appropriate.

Professional/university service--demonstrated professional service activity at the regional, national, or international level; participation in University governance/service commensurate with rank.

It should be noted that the post-tenure review takes into consideration the changing profile of senior faculty who play a different role within the unit. For example, a faculty member may de-emphasize research and scholarship while providing invaluable contributions in other areas such as teaching, professional activity, and service. Stronger involvement in one area is required to compensate for potential deficiencies in another area of the faculty member's profile. The assessment is designed to evaluate the overall contributions of the faculty member to the Department during the review period.

IV. Evidence in support of Criteria

The post-tenure review must include peer and student evaluations, research/creative activities evaluated by peers outside the unit (although not necessarily outside the University); and service. Refereed publications or other reviewed research/creative exercises may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit. The post-tenure review must include detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period.

A. *Teaching and Mentoring*

Teaching and mentoring effectiveness will be demonstrated by student course evaluations, written peer reviews of teaching, and the successful supervision of theses and dissertations and/or undergraduate advising. Other evidence can include awards for teaching by the college or university, national recognition of teaching effectiveness or contributions to educational leadership, leadership in curriculum changes and innovations at the department or collegiate level.

B. *Research and Scholarship*

Quality scholarship is assessed through the peer review process, most notably publication in peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed presses. Published reviews of one's work (e.g., book

reviews), selection of work for republication and/or reprinting, and awards for papers, presentations, or books are also evidences of quality scholarship. The impact of one's contributions to the discipline (citation indices, active paper presentations at regional, national, or international scholarly meetings) is additional evidence that can be used to demonstrate scholarly contributions.

C. *Professional Activity/University Service*

Membership on editorial boards, editorships of journals, service on regional, national, or international committees of scholarly associations, elected offices, and active participation in professional meetings are all evidence of professional activity. Manuscript reviewing for journals and/or funding agencies also demonstrates professional activity. University service will vary by rank, but it is expected that these contributions will go beyond the departmental level (e.g., college or university committees).

V. **Procedures**

A. Creating the post-tenure review file.

It is the candidate's responsibility to put his or her own file together to demonstrate performance in each of the three areas. The overall contents of that file are up to the individual, but each file **must** contain the elements listed below. Those with an asterisk (*) are the candidate's responsibility to provide.

1. curriculum vitae*
2. copies of publications for the previous six years*
3. teaching evaluation summaries*
4. peer evaluations of teaching
5. sabbatical reports*
6. annual activity reports*
7. annual performance evaluations

B. Review Committee

The post-tenure review will be conducted by the chair and a select committee of peers. The committee will consist of three members, one of whom who is exempt from the post-tenure review process (e.g., chaired professor). The other two will be elected from the appropriate peer group (i.e., Associates and Full Professors will evaluate Associates, only Full Professors will evaluate each other) on a yearly basis. The committee will serve for one year and will handle all post-tenure reviews during that time period. The committee will select its own chair.

C. Committee Assessment

The post-tenure review committee will make the file available to all tenured faculty in the department and solicit input from them. In addition, the committee will examine the candidate's file for supporting documentation. They will also have access to the annual reviews of the candidate's performance by the Chair. The committee will provide a written recommendation to the Chair (based on a majority vote of the committee) which indicates superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory overall performance based on the criteria outlined in Section III. If an

unsatisfactory recommendation is made by the committee, the file will be remanded to the entire tenured faculty for a vote and final recommendation. Further, the Committee must identify those faculty members whose performance is superior in any category. The Chair will make a separate recommendation. The candidate's file, committee recommendation, and chair's recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean's office for review. Upon completion of post-tenure review, the faculty member must receive a written statement that provides specific evaluative information of the faculty member's performance in the categories of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The review should be sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development.

VI. Outcome

A. A Superior Review

A superior evaluation will be noted in a faculty member's personnel file. Any faculty member who receives a superior evaluation in a post-tenure review may receive a permanent merit increase to base pay as determined by the provost, in addition to any annual raise.

B. A Satisfactory Review

A satisfactory evaluation will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file.

C. An Unsatisfactory Review

If the committee determines that the overall performance of a faculty member is unsatisfactory, and this conclusion is supported by a simple majority vote of the tenured faculty, the committee must prepare recommendations that could help restore the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. If the tenured faculty do not support the committee's recommendation, then the Chair will make the decision based on the committee's report and in consultation with the tenured faculty. The Departmental Chair, the committee, the Dean, and the faculty member will establish a development plan. The plan may include the appointment of a development committee to assist the faculty member in improving performance. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored. The timetable for meeting and maintaining the minimum criteria for a satisfactory rating is at the discretion of the committee, but normally will be from one to three years in duration. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost.

At the next annual review, the chair will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. The evaluation will be forwarded to the unit tenure and promotion committee. The 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. The dean will make the final determination on progress or lack thereof and whether or not further measures are necessary. Failure to make substantial progress toward the performance goals outlined in the development plan may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination.

VII. Appeal Procedures

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the local unit tenure and promotion committee, in general or in any particular. 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.

If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Chair, he or she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Dean of the College. The Dean, in consultation with the Provost, will make the final determination of the adequacy of the appealed development plan.