

POST-TENURE PEER REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

A. STATEMENT OF GENERAL PURPOSE

To carry out its principal missions the Department of Mathematics requires a faculty comprised of individuals who together embody a wide array of knowledge, talent, abilities, and personal skills. This faculty, working together, must be able to provide instruction leading to an assortment of undergraduate and graduate degrees; it must be able to foster the advance of mathematics, to conserve the best fruits of those advances, and to disseminate mathematics and facilitate its applications. This faculty, working together, must also do its part in supporting the University and the profession.

The purpose of the in-depth peer review of faculty performance is to help ensure that the faculty, as a whole, is able to carry out the mission of the Department, to recognize and reward faculty members whose performance is of exceptionally high quality, and to identify weaknesses and offer assistance to faculty members whose performance is in need of improvement.

Individual faculty members contribute differing abilities to the Department's pool of talent. The success of the Department depends on being able to make appropriate effective use of all these differing individual abilities in teaching, research and service. Over the course of an individual faculty member's career these abilities change, as does the distribution of time and effort the faculty member might best devote to the various aspects of his or her position. The criteria for satisfactory performance have been framed to accommodate this wide variation—a variation not only to be expected, but one the Department needs in order to carry out its principal missions.

Nothing in this document shall be construed to constrain the academic freedom of individual faculty members to pursue their research or scholarly enterprises in the directions and by the means they choose according to their own best judgment. Nor should anything here be construed to constrain the academic freedom of individual faculty members in their roles as teachers.

These procedures and criteria for post-tenure peer review of faculty performance will be consistent with, and incorporate, the regulations and procedures of the University, as described in the Faculty Manual, and of the College of Science and Mathematics.

B. FACULTY SUBJECT TO REVIEW

The performance of every tenured member of the faculty of the Department of Mathematics will be reviewed in-depth at least once every six years, except that such a performance review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the Department Chair in writing of retirement or resignation within three years of the next scheduled review. In the event that the Department Chair comes under in-depth review according to the six-year time table, the in-depth review will not be carried out according to the procedures in this document, but will instead be performed by the Dean of the College in consultation with the Department. In this case, the Chair of the In-Depth Peer Review Committee will notify, in a timely fashion, both the Dean and the Department Chair that the Department Chair is due for an in-depth peer review.

For the purposes of determining the year in which a faculty member's next post-tenure review will occur, the performance reviews involved in candidacies for promotion and for tenure, which have been supported at the unit level, as well as those for appointment or retention as a chaired professor are in-depth performance reviews.

When a tenured faculty member is considered for promotion to full professor, the appropriate unit Tenure and Promotion Committee will also make a determination of whether the candidate's performance is superior or satisfactory according to the criteria in this document. In the event of a finding of "superior" or "satisfactory" performance, these findings will be forwarded to the Department Chair to be acted on further as described in this document. In the event that neither of these findings is made by the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the in-depth peer review process will be deemed incomplete, and the faculty member will be considered further for in-depth peer review at the time and in the manner described in this document.

The performance reviews for appointment or retention as a chaired professor are in-depth performance reviews.

Beginning in the Fall of 1999, roughly one sixth of the tenured faculty, in order of seniority since their most recent in-depth performance review, will be reviewed each year.

C. CRITERIA

The performance of a faculty member will be evaluated in each of the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service.

CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

Superior: A finding of superior performance in teaching (including advising students) is appropriate in a variety of circumstances.

At the undergraduate level such a finding could be based on any of the following:

- Highly effective classroom teaching.
- Sustained and well-regarded work as a mentor of undergraduates. A few examples of such mentor roles include involvement in Preston College, in the Honors College, with *IME*, and coaching teams of undergraduates in regional and national competitions.
- Public recognition of excellent teaching. Such recognitions may take the form of nominations for or the actual achievement of an award for teaching or advising.

At the graduate level such a finding may be based on any of the following:

- Sustained organization and operation of a research seminar for graduate students.
- Thesis or dissertation supervision of several graduate students simultaneously.
- Supervision of a Ph.D. dissertation which has attracted national recognition.

Satisfactory: Satisfactory teaching includes effective instruction in the classroom and during office visits by students.

Unsatisfactory: A record of repeated and continuing ineffective teaching will be deemed unsatisfactory.

CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Superior: A finding of superior performance in research and scholarship is appropriate in a variety of circumstances.

Superior research accomplishments will generally have attracted the acclaim of the national or international community of mathematicians working in the same area as the faculty member under review. Work that is well regarded, widely known, and cited often in the literature by other members of such a community should be deemed superior. A few indicators of superior research accomplishment include the following: judgment of external evaluators, international or national awards or prizes, the award of external funding for research, selection for national or international fellowships, invitations to address international conferences, and invitations to speak at research institutions.

Some indicators of superior scholarly accomplishments in mathematics include the publication of widely used textbooks, the publication of widely read expository books or articles, and invitations to give expository addresses at national conferences or at colleges and universities.

- Satisfactory:** A faculty member's performance in research and scholarship will be deemed satisfactory on the basis of a demonstrated record of sustained effort to broaden and deepen the faculty member's grasp of mathematics and to advance the frontiers of knowledge. Indicators of satisfactory performance in research and scholarship include research and expository publications, award of external funding to support research or scholarship, participation in research seminars, addresses given at conferences, colloquium and seminar presentations, teaching courses on topics of current research interest, and other activities that indicate that the faculty member has a sustained, deep, and vital command of a substantial part of mathematics.
- Unsatisfactory:** A faculty member's performance in research and scholarship will be deemed unsatisfactory if the record fails to demonstrate a sustained effort to develop a broader or deeper understanding of mathematics, or fails to demonstrate a sustained effort to communicate such an understanding.

CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

- Superior:** A finding of superior performance in service is appropriate in a variety of circumstances. For service within the University such a finding could be based on any of the following:
- appointment or election to positions of trust or of authority or ones demanding heavy commitments of time and effort.
 - Innovative service that displays initiative and persistence, and effectively supports the mission of the University.
- For professional service outside the University such a finding could be based on any of the following:
- Service on editorial boards.
 - Service on national panels.
 - Service on the committees of or as officers of the several professional organizations of mathematicians.
 - A sustained record of service on the organizing or program committees of national and international mathematical conferences.
 - A record of organizing effective programs aimed at promoting mathematics in the larger community.
- Satisfactory:** A faculty member's performance in service within the University will be deemed satisfactory if the faculty member willingly takes on assigned service roles and carries them out reliably and effectively.
- Unsatisfactory:** A faculty member's performance in service will be deemed unsatisfactory if that member's record shows repeated unwillingness to carry out assigned service roles, or if the record shows repeated unreliability or ineffectiveness in these roles.

D. FILES

Every faculty member subject to in-depth peer review will assemble a file to submit to the In-Depth Peer Review Committee. The file must contain a cumulative curriculum vitae prepared by the faculty member

which summarizes that member's professional career. In addition, the file should have separate sections devoted to the faculty member's teaching, research and scholarship, and service. These sections may be cumulative for the whole career of the faculty member, but they should focus on the period since the last in-depth peer review. Each section should begin with a summary. The section on teaching should include all the teaching evaluation summaries for the period since the last in-depth review. Copies of all publications, except those of book length, for the period since the last in-depth review should be included in the section on research and scholarship. The faculty member may include any other evidence or information in the file which may be relevant to the review process.

After it is submitted to the In-Depth Peer Review Committee, the file shall be held confidential.

The In-Depth Peer Review Committee shall insert into the file all the following documents on record in the Department for the period since the last in-depth review:

- all annual peer review letters,
- all joint letters concerning teaching by tenured full professors that have been prepared according to the Department's Peer Review of Teaching Policy,
- all administrative reviews, and
- all reports of the results of sabbatical leaves.

In order to clarify its evaluation, the In-Depth Peer Review Committee may, at its discretion, seek letters from external reviewers to assess the mathematical research and scholarship of a faculty member under review. In all cases where the faculty member under review has not had a significant record of refereed publications in print or in press since the last in-depth review, the In-Depth Peer Review Committee will solicit such letters. In the event that the In-Depth Peer Review Committee seeks letters, they must be sought from at least two different external reviewers. These letters will be included in the file.

E. THE IN-DEPTH PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE

The In-Depth Peer Review Committee shall consist of five tenured faculty members, three of whom must hold the rank of full professor. By the end of each Spring semester, the tenured members of the faculty of the Department shall elect a Chair for the In-Depth Peer Review Committee, who must be a tenured full professor, and such other members of the tenured faculty as needed to serve as the members of the In-Depth Peer Review Committee. Except in the first year of operation, the term of service on the In-Depth Peer Review Committee will be two years. In the first year of operation, the Committee Chair and one other full professor will be elected to one year terms, while the remaining three committee members will be elected to two year terms. None of these five committee members should themselves be subject to the in-depth peer review process during their service on the committee. The Department Chair shall not serve on the In-Depth Peer Review Committee. In the event that a vacancy occurs on the committee, the Chair of the Department's Tenured Faculty shall convene a meeting of the tenured faculty to elect a replacement. Should the Department have an insufficient number of faculty members qualified to complete the committee, the Department Chair, with the approval of the Dean, shall appoint qualified members of the faculty of the College to complete the committee.

F. PROCEDURES

The In-Depth Peer Review Committee will complete each submitted file, soliciting external letters, if appropriate. Based on their review of the evidence in the completed file, the committee will determine by majority vote, no abstentions allowed, for each of the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service, whether the performance is superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory according to the criteria described above.

An overall finding of superior performance will be made if the faculty member's performance in two of the three areas has been found superior and the performance in the remaining area is at least satisfactory. An overall finding of unsatisfactory performance will be made if the faculty member's performance in teaching or in both of the other areas has been found unsatisfactory. In all other cases, an overall finding of satisfactory performance will be made.

The In-Depth Peer Review Committee will prepare a detailed written report on each faculty member who is subject to review, supporting its findings. The written report will be inserted into the file, and the complete file will be delivered to the Department Chair. A copy of the written report will be provided by the Department Chair to the faculty member who is the subject of the review. The Department Chair should discuss the report and any recommendations of the committee with the faculty member.

The Department Chair will add a statement to the file of each faculty member under review, and deliver the files to the Dean of the College.

In the event that an overall finding of unsatisfactory performance has been made, the In-Depth Peer Review Committee will make written recommendations to remedy deficiencies or address problems, and offer a plan and assistance to the faculty member under review to improve performance in the deficient areas indicated by the review. This will constitute a three year development plan in which the faculty member must demonstrate annually substantial progress. The In-Depth Peer Review Committee is expected to assist faculty members in the successful completion of those plans. After three years have elapsed, the faculty member will be required to undergo the in-depth peer review process again. During the three year period, prior to each annual peer review, the Department Chair, in consultation with the In-Depth Peer Review Committee, will assess the progress of faculty members who are following three-year development plans. The written assessment of the Department Chair will be forwarded to the unit committee for promotion to full professor. That committee, as part of the annual peer review, will review the Department Chair's assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. The Department Chair's assessment as well as the response of the Committee of Tenured Full Professors will be provided to the faculty member under review, and will also be sent to the Dean of the College.

G. APPEALS

A faculty member under review who disagrees with any portion of the review or of the recommendations of the committee may request that the unit committee for promotion to full professor consider the case. The faculty member may provide a written rebuttal, with any supporting evidence, to the unit promotion committee. The findings of the unit promotion committee, together with its recommendations for action, the Department Chair's evaluation, the proposed development plan, and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean of the College for final determination.

H. AMENDMENT OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document may be amended at any time by at least two-thirds (not counting abstentions) vote of the tenure-track and tenured faculty of the Department of Mathematics; the amended document is subject to approval by the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics and by the Provost. A mathematics faculty member may choose to be reviewed under the Post-tenure Peer Review document in effect at the time of that faculty member's upcoming review or under any previous Post-tenure Peer Review document in effect since that faculty member's last such review.

Adopted by the Department of Mathematics 1 April 1999.

Amended, without dissent, by the Department of Mathematics 11 April 2000.