

## CHANGES IN OUR POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

July 2003

Page 1, section II.:

~~Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions, shall be reviewed every six years. Post-tenure review shall be waived, however, for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review, as well as for any faculty member who has been tenured or promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years, or who currently holds a chaired professorship.~~

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). However, 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. (PROVOST)

Page 2, section IV, number 2.:

~~A copy of all annual performance reports (compiled by the Faculty Performance Review Committee) and all annual review letters written by the Chair during the review period (required). (DEAN)~~

Page 3, section V:

\*\*\* For the purpose of PTR only, Level 1 in Scholarship is defined as four (4) examples of scholarly activity (as described under the rubric "Types of Scholarly Activity" of the Department's Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion) during the six-year period in question, one of which must be a refereed publication of at least 2500 words, **either refereed or otherwise demonstrably reputable**. All levels for Teaching and Levels 2 and 3 in Scholarship correspond to those defined in the Department's Criteria for Tenure and Promotion. (DEAN)

Pages 7-8, section VII:

- B. If the overall performance rating of the evaluatee has been rated as "Superior," a copy of the report shall be sent to the Chair of the Department and forwarded to the Dean of the College. Notice of Superior performance shall be forwarded by the Chair of the Department to the Dean ~~and Provost~~ for possible merit salary increase. (DEAN)
- D. An uncontested Unsatisfactory review will be noted in the evaluatee's personnel file and forwarded to the Dean of the College. An evaluatee who receives an overall performance rating of "Unsatisfactory" and disagrees, in general or in particular, with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations contained therein, may appeal **in writing** to the Department's elected T&P Committee. The findings of this committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the evaluatee, will be forwarded to the Dean of the College for final determination. (PROVOST)
- F. If the evaluatee disagrees with the Development Plan produced by the Development Committee in concert with the Chair of the Department, he/she may appeal specific provisions to the Dean ~~and Provost~~. (DEAN)

H. ~~At the next Faculty Performance Review and appropriate Faculty Performance Reviews thereafter, the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Development Committee, shall assess the progress of the evaluatee. This written assessment shall be forwarded for review to the elected T&P Committee members of a rank equal to or higher than that of the evaluatee. The T&P Committee so constituted shall state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in particular, to the assessment. The Department Chair's assessment and the P&T Committee's response shall be forwarded to the Dean and Provost.~~

**At the next annual review, the Chair of the Department and the development committee, if any, will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. The evaluation will be forwarded to the elected 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 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 the lack thereof, and whether or not further measures may be necessary. (PROVOST)**

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND CULTURES  
POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES  
July 2003

**I. General Procedures and Calendar**

A. The procedures defined hereafter are in compliance with regulations on post-tenure review outlined in the University *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise concerning differences between the procedures defined in this document and the regulations as defined in the University *Faculty Manual*, the University *Faculty Manual* takes precedence.

B. The annual post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost. Faculty members should have their dossier prepared and submitted for review by the due date indicated in that calendar.

C. Whereas basic post-tenure performance procedures and standards are described in the sections that follow, it is understood that in a unit as diverse as the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures faculty performance should be viewed holistically. Each faculty member's contribution is thus viewed as unique and no single performance profile should be viewed as dominant.

**II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review**

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). However, 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.

**III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee**

A. Post-tenure review will be conducted by individual committees constituted for each faculty member under review and consisting of three members.

B. Members of said committee must be tenured and of a rank equal or superior to that of the faculty member to be evaluated.

C. Faculty who are in their post-tenure review year will be ineligible for post-tenure review committee membership. The Chair of the Department is neither eligible to vote nor to serve on Post-Tenure Review (hereafter referred to as PTR) committees.

D. Each year the elected Tenure and Promotion Committee (hereafter referred to as the T&P Committee) will establish a slate of all eligible evaluators for each individual faculty member to

be evaluated. In consultation with the Chair of the T&P Committee, the faculty member to be evaluated (hereafter referred to as evaluatee) shall be accorded the opportunity either to select or refuse one eligible evaluator to serve on his/her PTR Committee.

E. For each evaluatee the elected T&P Committee shall then select the individual PTR Committee from the final slate of evaluators. Whenever possible, the committee shall be made up of faculty from both within and without the evaluatee's home program. In the event that there are fewer than two full professors included in the final slate of eligible evaluators for a full professor, the chair of the elected T&P Committee, upon consultation with the evaluatee, shall request that the vacancy or vacancies be filled by full professors from other units of the University.

F. Once the individual PTR Committee is duly constituted, the chair of said committee shall be elected by its members.

#### **IV. File Documentation**

The evaluatee will submit a post-tenure review file to the Chair of his/her individual PTR Committee in compliance with the Provost's PTR calendar. Whereas the evaluatee may provide any materials he/she deems appropriate, certain materials must be provided either by the evaluatee or by the unit and certain other materials or information may be requested in due course, as follows:

1. An updated curriculum vitae (required).
2. A copy of all annual performance review letters written by the Chair during the review period (required).
3. A copy of the evaluatee's report of sabbatical activities during the review period (required).
4. Lists of all courses taught, all scholarly activities, and all (major) service activities during the review period (required, may be included in the CV).
5. A copy of at least one peer evaluation of teaching conducted during the preceding three years (required).
6. Copies of all student course evaluations from the final three years of the review period (required). N.B. The individual PTR Committee reserves the right to require a numerical tabulation of student course evaluations, as well as the evaluations themselves, should a satisfactory teaching performance be in doubt.
7. Copies or offprints of materials published during the review period and manuscripts under consideration may be voluntarily supplied by the evaluatee or may be required by the individual PTR Committee.
8. Optionally, the evaluatee may include a personal statement.

## V. Assessment of Criteria

	Teaching*	Scholarship*	Service
<b>Superior</b>	Level 2 or better	Level 3**	Level 2 or better
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Level 1	Level 1***	Level 1
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	below Level 1	below Level 1	below Level 1

\* A rating of at least Satisfactory in Teaching (Level 1) and Satisfactory in Scholarship (Level 1, as defined) is necessary for the evaluatee to qualify for an **overall** Satisfactory rating.

\*\* A rating of Level 3 in Scholarship is necessary for the evaluatee to qualify for an **overall** Superior rating.

\*\*\* For the purpose of PTR only, Level 1 in Scholarship is defined as four (4) examples of scholarly activity (as described under the rubric “Types of Scholarly Activity” of the Department’s Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion) during the six-year period in question, one of which must be a publication of at least 2500 words, either refereed or otherwise demonstrably reputable. All levels for Teaching and Levels 2 and 3 in Scholarship correspond to those defined in the Department’s Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.

### Ratings of Individual Evaluators:

Each member of the PTR Evaluation Committee will rate the candidate’s performance in each area (Teaching, Scholarship and Service) and assign points in each area according to the following scale:

Superior= 3 points  
Satisfactory= 2 points  
Unsatisfactory= 0 points

The three sets of points will then be totaled and averaged. Keeping in mind the proviso that a rating of Satisfactory in both Teaching and Scholarship is necessary for an overall Satisfactory rating, and that a rating of Superior in Scholarship is necessary for an overall Superior rating, the final **overall** rating will be determined by the average of the three sets of points, according to the following scale:

Superior                    3.00 - 2.67  
Satisfactory                2.33 - 1.33  
Unsatisfactory             below 1.33

The following chart demonstrates how this system of averaging the three scores would work.

Superior:

Teaching	3	3	2
Scholarship	3	3	3
Service	3	2	3
	—	—	—
	9	8	8
	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.67</b>

Satisfactory:

Teaching	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2
Scholarship	2**	3	2	3	2	2	3	2
Service	3	2	3	0	2	0	0	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	8	7	7	6	6	5	5	4
	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.33</b>

Unsatisfactory:

A. Because of failure to earn at least a Satisfactory rating in either Teaching or Scholarship

Teaching	3	0*	3	2	0*	2	0*
Scholarship	0*	3	0*	0*	3	0*	2
Service	3	3	2	3	2	2	2
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	6	6	5	5	5	4	4
	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.33</b>

B. Because of low numerical calculation

Teaching	0	0	3	0	0	2	0
Scholarship	3	0	0	2	0	0	0
Service	0	3	0	0	2	0	0
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.00</b>

\* A rating of at least Satisfactory in Teaching (Level 1) and Satisfactory in Scholarship (Level 1, as defined) is necessary for the evaluatee to qualify for an **overall** Satisfactory rating.

\*\* A rating of Level 3 in Scholarship is necessary for the evaluatee to qualify for an **overall** Superior rating.

The same scale will be used for the computation of the final overall ratings:

Superior	3.00 - 2.67
Satisfactory	2.33 - 1.33
Unsatisfactory	below 1.33

The three members of each Evaluation Committee will then meet to average their respective scores and determine the final overall rating of the candidate's performance, first horizontally to calculate the final overall rating in each area (T, Sch., Serv.), then vertically to determine the **composite final overall rating** that will be sent forward from the committee. Some examples:

#1: One [T=0] rating or one [Sch=0] rating = Overall Satisfactory:

	Eval. #1	Eval. #2	Eval. #3	Total Points	Avg. Points	Final Rating	
Tchg	2	0	2	4	1.33	Sat.	[= 2]
Sch	2	2	2	6	2.00	Sat.	[= 2]
Serv	2	2	2	6	2.00	Sat.	[= 2]
						-----	
						6 pts	2.00 = Sat.

Tchg	2	2	2	6	2.00	Sat.	[= 2]
Sch	2	0	2	4	1.33	Sat.	[= 2]
Serv	2	2	2	6	2.00	Sat.	[= 2]
						-----	
						6 pts	2.00 = Sat.

#2: Two [Serv =0] ratings = Overall Satisfactory:

	Eval. #1	Eval. #2	Eval. #3	Total Points	Avg. Points	Final Rating	
Tchg	2	2	2	6	2.00	Sat.	[= 2]
Sch	2	2	2	6	2.00	Sat.	[= 2]
Serv	2	0	0	2	0.67	Uns.	[= 0]
						-----	
						4 pts	1.33 = Sat.

#3: Two [T=0] or [Sch=0] ratings = Overall Unsatisfactory:

	<b>Eval. #1</b>	<b>Eval. #2</b>	<b>Eval. #3</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	<b>Avg.</b>	<b>Final Rating</b>	
Tchg	0	0	3	3	1.00	<b>Uns.</b>	<b>[= 0]</b>
Sch	3	2	3	8	2.67	<b>Sup.</b>	<b>[= 3]</b>
Serv	2	2	2	6	2.00	<b>Sup.</b>	<b>[= 3]</b>
-----							
0* = <b>Uns.</b>							
Unsat. in Teaching							
Tchg	2	2	3	7	2.33	<b>Sat.</b>	<b>[= 2]</b>
Sch	0	0	3	3	1.00	<b>Uns.</b>	<b>[= 0]</b>
Serv	2	3	3	8	2.67	<b>Sup.</b>	<b>[= 3]</b>
-----							
0* = <b>Uns.</b>							
Unsat. In Scholarship							

\* A rating of at least Satisfactory in Teaching (Level 1) and Satisfactory in Scholarship (Level 1, as defined) is necessary for the evaluatee to qualify for an **overall** Satisfactory rating.

## VI. PTR Committee Procedures

- A. After the review of the evaluatee's file, each member of the PTR Committee will complete a written evaluation form consisting of the ratings described in Section V and a written justification of those ratings.
- B. PTR Committee will meet, tally the ratings, and assign performance levels (Superior, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) according to the formula in Section V.
- C. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the evaluatee and to the tenured faculty of the Department, the Chair of the PTR Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include at a minimum the PTR Committee's rating of each performance area, the overall rating, and sufficient comments to aid the evaluatee in his/her professional growth and development. (Such narrative must always be constructive in tone and design rather than punitive.) The report must be approved in its entirety by the PTR Committee by majority vote. Individual ratings 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.

## VII. Post-Review Procedures and Appeals

- A. If the overall performance rating of the evaluatee is “satisfactory,” the PTR evaluation is concluded with the distribution of the report. A copy of the report will be sent to the Chair of the Department and to the Dean of the College.
- B. If the overall performance rating of the evaluatee has been rated as “Superior,” a copy of the report will be sent to the Chair of the Department and to the Dean of the College. Notice of Superior performance will be forwarded by the Chair of the Department to the Dean for possible merit salary increase.
- C. The evaluatee who receives an overall performance rating of Satisfactory or Superior may (for any reason) attach a response to the PTR Committee report within one week of receipt of the report.
- D. An uncontested Unsatisfactory review will be noted in the evaluatee’s personnel file and forwarded to the Dean of the College. An evaluatee who receives an overall performance rating of “Unsatisfactory” and disagrees, in general or in particular, with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations contained therein, may appeal in writing to the Department’s elected T&P Committee. The findings of this committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the evaluatee, will be forwarded to the Dean of the College for final determination.
- E. If the evaluatee receives a confirmed overall performance rating of “Unsatisfactory,” a Development Committee shall be formed consisting of the Chair of the evaluatee’s PTR Committee and a member of the Department T&P Committee (of equal or higher rank) selected in consultation with the evaluatee. A third member may be added, in consultation with the evaluatee, in order to provide expertise. The Development Committee, in consultation and concurrence with the evaluatee and the Chair of the Department, will produce a Development Plan designed to restore the evaluatee’s performance to the satisfactory level. Such plan must include a timetable determined at the discretion of the Development Committee, but which in no case will be less than one year or more than three years in duration.
- F. If the evaluatee disagrees with the Development Plan produced by the Development Committee in concert with the Chair of the Department, he/she may appeal specific provisions to the Dean.
- G. If the evaluatee fails to agree to a reasonable Development Plan established in good faith, the Chair of the Department and the Development Committee will place a letter to that effect in the evaluatee’s personnel file and will forward the plan to the Dean of the College.

for further determination. The resulting Development Plan will form the basis for the Faculty Performance Review of the evaluatee until Satisfactory performance is restored.

- H. At the next annual review, the Chair of the Department and the development committee, if any, will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. The evaluation will be forwarded to the elected 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 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 the lack thereof, and whether or not further measures may be necessary.