

DEPARTMENT OF SPANISH, ITALIAN, AND PORTUGUESE
POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES (2-23-99)

Preamble

The Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese, in accordance with the post-tenure review policy established by the University of South Carolina, seeks to create an atmosphere that allows faculty members to achieve the professional goals they have set for themselves and that assures that they continue to make a contribution to the Department's mission of teaching, research, and service. This policy document is based on the following guiding principals: 1) post-tenure review is aimed toward faculty development, not accountability; 2) 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 addressing 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 or several of these areas, so a holistic assessment of that individual's overall contribution to the Department's mission must be part of the review. The outcomes of the procedures outlined below are intended to recognize and to reward superior performance, assure that all faculty maintain a satisfactory level of contribution, and provide improvement opportunities for those faculty whose performance is rated unsatisfactory.

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The general procedures for post-tenure review described below are in accordance with the post-tenure review policy outlines 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 the initial date of tenure, the earliest date being reviewed first. 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. 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.

In order to complete the initial six-year cycle in a timely fashion, two tenured-faculty members per year (1/6 of our tenured faculty) for the six-year period will be evaluated. Beginning with the most-senior appointments, our suggested order is as follows:

1999-2000	Fryer('74), Aylward ('78)
2000-2001	Shirley ('80), deOliveira ('83)
2001-2002	Hill ('85), Pauluzzi ('86)
2002-2003	Lagos ('91), Lopes ('92)
2003-2004	Charlebois ('94), Fleak ('95)
2004-2005	Bernal ('96)

This order will be adjusted annually to take into consideration retirements, resignations, promotions or tenuring, or special advancements or retention in a higher position.

III. Post-Tenure Review Criteria

<i>DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA</i>	<i>UNIVERSITY POST-TENURE CRITERIA</i>
OUTSTANDING	SUPERIOR: The candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is above the departmental minimum norm of GOOD as indicated on the DSIP tenure and promotion criteria.
VERY GOOD	
GOOD	SATISFACTORY: The candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is at the departmental minimum norm of GOOD as indicated on the DSIP tenure and promotion criteria.
ACCEPTABLE (ONLY DURING TRIAL PERIOD)	UNSATISFACTORY: The candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is below the departmental minimum norm of GOOD as indicated on the DSIP tenure and promotion criteria.
UNSATISFACTORY	

For purposes of post-tenure review, **Superior** levels mean performance taken as a whole which exceeds relevant unit post-tenure criteria review standards in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. These post-tenure criteria are in line with the current unit policies on Retention/ Promotion, Annual Performance Review, and Third-Year Review criteria.

For purposes of post-tenure review, **Satisfactory** levels mean performance taken as a whole which meets the relevant unit post-tenure criteria review standards in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. These post-tenure criteria are in line with the current unit policies on Retention/ Promotion, Annual Performance Review, and Third-Year Review criteria.

For purposes of post-tenure review, **Unsatisfactory** levels mean performance taken as a whole which falls below relevant unit post-tenure criteria review standards in teaching, research/creative activities, and service. These post-tenure criteria are in line with the current unit policies on Retention/ Promotion, Annual-Performance Review, and Third-Year Review criteria.

IV. Post-Tenure Review Procedures

For our purposes within the department of DSIP, there will be three committees needed to handle the processing of each faculty member (evaluee) being considered for post-tenure review in order to comply with the guidelines developed by the administration:

1. **Evaluation Committee(s)**: In **April** of each year, following annual actions on the Faculty Performance Review (FAR) for the DSIP, the departmental Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (RTP), which consists of all the tenured faculty members in the department, will appoint a three-member Evaluation Committee to handle the post-tenure review process for the department during the following academic year. The three members will be of a rank equal to or higher than that of the evaluatee(s) under consideration during the next academic year. If three members of the DSIP of appropriate rank are not available to serve, the RTP will seek members at the appropriate rank qualified to review the data from outside the DSIP in order to fill out the committee. The Evaluation Committee(s) will receive the data submitted by the evaluatee(s) by **October 15** of the next academic year. The responsibility of the committee is to prepare a written summary report of the evaluatee(s), including a rating of Superior, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory agreed upon by a majority (2/3 in this case) vote of the committee and to present it to the evaluatee for discussion. Following that discussion, the Evaluation Committee(s) will submit their final report to the evaluatee(s) by **November 15** of that academic year. This written report will also be distributed to RTP Committee Members and the Chair of the DSIP by **December 1** before going to the Dean or the Appeals Committee.

2. **An Appeals Committee** is a committee of the whole of the RTP of DSIP, whose responsibility is to review the appeal of the evaluatee(s), and then to confirm or reverse the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee(s) after reviewing the relevant materials. A rating of either Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory, if the evaluatee does not concur, may be appealed to this committee, with the results of this appraisal ultimately sent to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and to the Chair of the DSIP. All votes taken by this committee must be done by secret ballot. The Appeals Committee will complete their review by **January 31** of that academic year.

3. **A Development Committee**, an ad hoc committee of two (2) members of the RTP of DSIP appointed following the decision of an Unsatisfactory rating for the evaluatee(s), has the responsibility to work out a plan of development in consultation with the evaluatee(s). The committee's purpose is to assist in improving the performance of the evaluatee assigned to it. This written plan, as completed and adopted, is the basis on which the evaluatee will be judged until satisfactory performance is restored. Any problem or non-agreement with the plan between the development committee and the evaluatee will be resolved by the RTP Committee as a whole. The Chair of DSIP will receive a copy of the written plan of development for the evaluatee by **April 1** of that academic year. Copies of both the unsatisfactory review and the associated development plan will also be sent to the Office of the Provost at this time.

After one academic year, at the time of the next annual review (**April 1 of next academic year**), the evaluatee's Development Committee and the Chair of DSIP will together make a written assessment of his/her progress, which will be then forwarded to the DSIP RTP Committee. This committee will review the Development Committee's assessment and will state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. Both the Development Committee's assessment and the written response of the DSIP RTP will be forwarded to the Chair of the DSIP and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and copies of both will be provided to the evaluatee.

Included in the candidate's dossier will be the following:

- A. An up-to-date curriculum vitae
- B. Final reports relating to sabbatical leave projects, and
- C. The following data dealing specifically with the areas of teaching, research, and service:

TEACHING

1) Peer Observation- the evaluatee must include at least one (1) peer evaluation which has been conducted during the three most recent years of review. This observation is to be carried out by a tenured member of the DSIP at the same or higher rank. No evaluatee who is currently under review may be required to carry out a peer observation during that same academic year.

2) Student Evaluations- all the evaluation forms from the previous six (6) years will be included. A statement from the evaluatee himself/herself regarding that performance may be included.

3) Relevant information on the evaluatee's teaching (e.g., the Chair's annual evaluation statements or RTP annual evaluation statements) for the past six years will be included.

All this data will be reviewed and summarized by the evaluatee's ad hoc evaluation committee and an evaluation level assigned.

RESEARCH

1. Previously Reviewed Materials

The evaluatee should provide photocopies or offprints of all materials published in the previous six (6) years. In cases where this is not feasible, the evaluatee may present letters of acceptance for articles about to be published, for accepted articles from refereed journals, for published reviews of published materials or creative works, or other documentation of previously reviewed materials. These materials will be submitted to the evaluatee's Evaluation Committee which will use them and the overall record over the past six years to prepare a written summary of the faculty member's research/ creative performance using the DSIP RTP criteria.

2. Unreviewed Materials

For any scholarly/ research materials not previously refereed outside U.S.C., the evaluatee must submit the manuscript of the proposed book, chapter, translation, article, publication, sabbatical product or creative work to the designated committee, a sub-committee or individuals from outside the unit, but not outside the university, appointed by the evaluatee's Evaluation Committee. In the case of the most members of the DSIP, these sub-committee members will be comprised of members of the French or German departments; in certain cases, the reviewers will be selected from the departments and programs in the University considered by the Evaluation Committee to be the most appropriate to judge the evaluatee's materials(e.g., Anthropology, Art, Education, GINT, History, Media Arts, Philosophy, Linguistics, or Comparative Literature). This group will use the DSIP RTP criteria for research as their basis for evaluation.

SERVICE

The Faculty Member's Review Committee will use all documentation provided by that faculty member and the annual FAR evaluations to prepare a written summary of the quantity and quality of the his/her service performance over the previous six years using the DSIP RTP Criteria.

FACULTY MEMBER'S FINAL POST-TENURE EVALUATION

Based on the evaluatee's performance over the past six years in the area of Teaching, Research/Creative Works, and Service, the appropriate level of overall performance of Superior, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory (See chart, p. 2) will be assigned by the Evaluation Committee in all matters according to the existing criteria for promotion and tenure for the DSIP.