

Post Tenure Review

Approved by the Department of Philosophy, December 10, 1998.
Approved as amended by the Department of Philosophy, February 4, 1999

Procedures

- 1) Following University policy all tenured faculty are required to have a post tenure review (or a promotion review) at least once every six years. This review will be conducted by the post tenure review committee, and, in cases where that committee proposes an unsatisfactory determination, by the committee of all tenured faculty in the Department. In no circumstance shall the person being reviewed serve on a committee doing the review. The policies that follow work in conjunction with policies set out in the *Faculty Manual*, which in any case of dispute takes priority.
- 2) Post tenure review follows the calendar established by the Provost's Office. Faculty undergoing post tenure review, do not also undergo annual review; post tenure review serves in place of annual review during that year.
- 3) The post tenure review committee shall consist of all Full Professors (minus the person being reviewed) and the Chair sitting Ex-Officio (i.e., present for discussions, but not voting).
- 4) The post tenure file will include the following items:
 - a) Current CV
 - b) Previous five years annual reviews, including
 - i) Activities reports
 - ii) Teaching summaries
 - iii) Representative course syllabi, examples of examinations and handouts used in their classes
 - iv) Subcommittee reports (if any)
 - v) Chair reports
 - c) Copies of all publications during the previous six years
 - d) Sabbatical reports from any sabbatical taken during the previous six years
 - e) At least one peer evaluation of teaching report [NB: an adjustment will be made to the Department's peer evaluation policy, to wit: all untenured faculty must be peer evaluated at least once a year; all tenured Assistant or Associate Professors must be evaluated at least once every two years; everyone must be peer evaluated at least once in the three years preceding post tenure review.]
- 5) The post tenure review committee shall discuss and vote by secret ballot for one of three possible determinations, "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," and "superior." If the outcome receiving the most votes is "superior" or "satisfactory," then this will be the committee's determination. If the outcome receiving the most votes is "unsatisfactory," then the case will be taken to all tenured faculty members in the Department (minus the person being reviewed). In the event of a tie, the Chair of the Department breaks the tie by choosing between the tied alternatives.
- 6) In those cases where all tenured faculty (minus the person being reviewed) are convened to make a determination, the faculty member being reviewed shall be

offered the opportunity to present his or her case to this committee before they vote. They then shall vote by secret ballot. If two-thirds or more of all votes are for “unsatisfactory,” this shall be the committee’s determination. If less than two-thirds of all votes are for “unsatisfactory,” a second vote shall be taken by secret ballot. On this second vote, a determination of “superior” or “satisfactory” shall be made by simple majority.

- 7) For any of the three possible outcomes, the post tenure review committee shall be responsible for writing a report assessing the faculty member’s work, and justifying the evaluation, unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior. This report will be forwarded to the Chair, and, if unsatisfactory, by the Chair to the Dean.
- 8) In the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the faculty member shall be allowed to respond in writing. If he or she disagrees with the unsatisfactory evaluation, this response, along with the report shall be forwarded on to the Dean for final arbitration.
- 9) In the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the post tenure review committee along with the faculty member shall draw up a development plan, which may include the appointment of a development committee. If the faculty member does not agree with the development plan drawn up by the post tenure review committee, the full committee of all tenured faculty in the Department shall be convened to develop by majority vote a development plan. If the faculty member still disagrees with the development plan, he or she will be invited to write a justification for this disagreement and that and the proposed development plan shall be forwarded to the Dean for final arbitration.
- 10) The development plan shall set out a time line for improved performance which shall be not less than one year but not more than three years.
- 11) Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will be sent to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and to the Provost.

Criteria

- 1) Post tenure review assesses performance in three areas, teaching, research and service. As a general rule, the Department expects satisfactory performance in all three areas for a satisfactory post tenure review. At a minimum, satisfactory performance in two of the three areas of teaching, research and service—one of which must be teaching—is necessary for an overall satisfactory post tenure review evaluation.
- 2) In all cases, the Department requires satisfactory performance in teaching for a satisfactory post tenure review.
- 3) Relevant sources of evidence for the determination of a faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, research and service are spelled out below. The post tenure review committee (or in cases where the post tenure review committee proposes an unsatisfactory evaluation, the committee of all tenured faculty in the Department—minus the person under review) shall consider all the evidence in all three areas and reach a determination of unsatisfactory, satisfactory or superior for the faculty member’s whole record.
- 4) Guidelines for unsatisfactory and superior performance in each area are given below. In general, satisfactory performance is performance that is neither unsatisfactory nor

superior. These are to serve as guidelines only. The committee charged with making the assessment shall have the job of making an overall determination based on the whole available record—teaching, research and service.

- 5) Criteria for assessing teaching:
- a) At a minimum, a teacher must perform the routines of teaching adequately: meeting classes, grading and returning papers in a timely manner, and keeping regular office hours. A successful course is one that contributes to the undergraduate program or the graduate program of the Department, as determined by faculty approval and student response.
 - b) The Department of Philosophy expects the administration of a student evaluation form in every course offered in the fall and spring semesters. Normally unsatisfactory performance would be indicated by a majority of “Very Poor” or “Poor” responses on the student evaluations of the professor in question; superior performance, normally would require a majority of “Excellent” responses. But student response is only one factor in the evaluation and it is not always sufficient evidence of good or poor teaching.
 - c) The faculty member undergoing post tenure review shall have at least one class session observed by one or more tenured professors of equal or higher rank. This visitation shall occur during the three years prior to the post tenure review. Written reports from these observers will serve as one source of evidence of the faculty member’s teaching ability.
 - d) Evidence that the faculty member undergoing post tenure review has contributed significantly to the academic and intellectual development of students is an additional item relevant to an assessment of his or her teaching effectiveness. The successful performance of students in advanced courses is one such kind of evidence, as are letters from graduates.
 - e) Courses should contain adequate content, be suited to the curriculum of the Department, and be of a rigor appropriate for a given level of instruction. To assist the post tenure review committee, the faculty member undergoing post tenure review shall make available representative course syllabi and samples of examinations and handouts used in their courses.
 - f) Further evidence may include the direction of theses and dissertations as well as the direction of students in independent study. A faculty member who has directed a large number of theses, dissertations and/or independent studies successfully to completion with student satisfaction might be considered for superior performance—assuming the other aspects of his or her teaching are satisfactory or better.
 - g) Other relevant items that may be considered in an assessment of teaching include documentation of the candidate’s having developed new, appropriate, and successful courses or having introduced effective new teaching techniques, such as the development or implementation of effective and appropriate teaching software. A faculty member who has put considerable effort into developing new courses or innovative ways to improve the teaching of established courses might be considered for superior performance—assuming the other aspects of his or her teaching are satisfactory or better.

- h) If the candidate has received a teaching award he or she might be considered for superior performance—again, assuming the other aspects of his or her teaching are satisfactory or better.
- 6) Criteria for assessing research/scholarly activity:
- a) The Department draws a distinction between *major* and *minor* pieces of research, all of which are subject to external review. (Refereed publications or other reviewed research may be considered as having been peer reviewed outside the unit.) The determination between major and minor will be made by the post tenure review committee (or in cases where that committee proposes an unsatisfactory evaluation the committee of all tenured faculty in the Department). A minor piece of research typically consists in a book review, a short contribution published in a volume of un-refereed proceedings or a commentary delivered at a conference. Minor pieces of research provide a fuller picture of the candidate's interest and abilities, but on their own are not sufficient evidence of adequate scholarship. Major pieces of research provide this evidence by testifying to sustained inquiry, and by being of greater depth and/or significance than minor ones. Such major pieces of research typically consist in single or co-authored books, substantial refereed articles in journals or volumes of proceedings, or professionally significant translations. Major pieces of research address other professionals in the same area of research, or, if they address a wider professional audience or the general public, their subject matter must be of interest to professional philosophers. All major pieces of research should be presented in some public fashion.
 - b) In the case of co-authored work, when the co-authors have shared the work equally, each may receive full credit for the work.
 - c) Invited papers, edited volumes, textbooks and computer software may be judged to be either major or minor, according to their merits.
 - d) Papers read at professional meetings or at the invitation of other universities are expected to show evidence of new work on the part of the faculty member undergoing post tenure review. They will be assessed according to such criteria as the scope, depth and quality of the paper, the nature of the occasion, and other relevant factors.
 - e) The same criteria as those governing books and papers will govern pieces of research, which appear as computer software, performances, exhibitions, presentations, or activities in applied Philosophy.
 - f) Where possible, the standards used for published work will be used to assess research that does not appear as a printed publication.
 - g) To be included in the candidate's file, any piece of research must be documented in a manner amenable to its evaluation by the post tenure review committee. Copies of publications constitute appropriate documentation. In the case of presentations and commentaries at professional meetings, audio-visual presentations, computer software, exhibitions, or performances, the provision of a transcript, videotape, audiotape, disk, or catalogue may constitute adequate documentation.

- h) In order to demonstrate substantial achievement in the pursuit of their research interests, a faculty member undergoing post tenure review may provide a cover letter with other review materials.
 - i) Normally, evidence of unsatisfactory performance may be indicated by a lack of both major and minor publications in the previous six years. Superior performance might be indicated by a body of work of sufficient scope and coherence to constitute an *important* contribution to a particular field or fields of Philosophy. In general, an *important* body of work will make a sustained contribution that advances the candidate's field of expertise. Several kinds of evidence can demonstrate the importance of a candidate's research record. One is that the candidate's work should have attracted attention in the form of comments, responses and reviews in the professional literature. Another is the reputation of the candidate, as demonstrated by, e.g., invitations to deliver papers and speak at conferences, invitations to contribute to edited volumes, requests to reprint the candidate's work, etc; normally, important work is accompanied by national and/or international stature in the field in question. Other evidence is supplied by judgments of the quality of the candidate's research made by Departmental and external colleagues.
- 7) Criteria for assessing service:
- a) Examples of important service are listed below; all service will be evaluated in terms of level of responsibility and quality of work performed. Normally, service for regional, national or international academic professional organizations will count more than other kinds of service. Normally, an evaluation of unsatisfactory performance would result from a failure to provide anything but the most minimal and perfunctory service. A major time-commitment, a large degree of leadership assumed and the successful completion of service missions might indicate superior service.
 - b) The following are considered important service:
 - i) Departmental College, or University administration.
 - ii) Service on Departmental committees.
 - iii) Organizing of conferences and colloquia.
 - iv) Supervising library ordering
 - v) Service on college and university committees, especially those that are policymaking or to which the candidate can contribute his professional skills.
 - vi) Representing the Department, college, or university at university hearings of public meetings.
 - vii) Participation in professional societies; reviewing for journals, publishers, and granting agencies; membership on editorial boards.
 - viii) Development of computer software that aids and assists scholarly work.
 - ix) Student advisement.
 - x) Public service where it draws upon the candidate's professional training or where it furthers the teaching and scholarly work of the Department.
 - xi) The development and maintenance of interdisciplinary study groups.