

**Department of Statistics
College of Science and Mathematics
Post-Tenure Review**

General Procedures and Calendar:

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review established by the University *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the regulations given in the *Faculty Manual*, the *Faculty Manual* will take precedence.

The Department of Statistics post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

I. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Every tenured faculty member in the Department shall be reviewed every six years in accordance with University policies. Beginning in the Fall 1999, approximately one-sixth of the Department's tenured faculty, in order of seniority according to date of tenure, will be reviewed each year. Exceptions are granted for faculty who are reviewed and advanced to, or retained in, a higher position. Thus, faculty promoted to a higher professorial rank, reviewed for a chaired professorship or renewal, or a competitively advertised dean position in the previous six years need not have a post-tenure review prepared. Post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the Department Chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review.

II. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The evaluation of Statistics faculty members shall begin in the Department of Statistics. Faculty members holding joint appointments in other programs or institutes shall follow the established procedures for Tenure and Promotion review for those appointments. The Department Chair will appoint a Department Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Department Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full professors on the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee, except that tenured Full Professors who are having a post-tenure review conducted will be excluded from Committee membership that year. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will be required to have a minimum of three voting members. A Chair of the Committee will be elected each year by the Committee, and the Department

Chair will forward the name of the Committee Chair to the Dean, as well as to the faculty member(s) undergoing review. The Department Chair may participate in the proceedings, but is not eligible to vote. The Dean is not eligible to serve on the Committee or to vote.

In the event that there are fewer than three Statistics faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the Department Chair will recommend to the Dean a sufficient number of faculty members from other appropriate units within the College of Science and Mathematics that do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a committee of three voting members.

The Department adopts the post-tenure review policy to recognize and reward faculty for superior performance and to assure that each faculty member's contribution is at least satisfactory and each is working constructively to achieve the Department's goals. Each faculty member will be evaluated in the three categories of teaching, research, and service/outreach.

III. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Committee Chair by the deadline date specified by the Dean. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member must include an up-to-date curriculum vitae, a personal statement not to exceed three pages, and a file covering the previous six years' activities that contains at least the following material:

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous six years.
2. For each of the courses listed, a quantitative summary and comments from the student course evaluations prepared by the faculty member under review and verified by the Committee Chair.
3. Copies of peer reviews of teaching conducted on any of the listed courses in accordance with the policy on peer teaching review.

B. Scholarship

1. A listing and appropriate copies of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous six years.

C. Service

1. A listing of all service and outreach activities conducted during the previous six years.

D. Annual Evaluations

1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations accumulated since the initial tenure date or since the last post-tenure review.

E. Sabbatical Reports

1. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities (if one was taken during the review period).

Note: The existence of peer-reviewed publications in major journals in the past six years and/or grant proposals funded during this same period may be deemed by the Committee to satisfy the requirement of external peer review. Otherwise, the Committee will select at least two external referees from whom to request evaluations of the faculty member's research quality and quantity. If the faculty member has produced *no* scholarly works in the review period, the area of research will be viewed as "unsatisfactory" and no outside evaluations will be solicited at that time.

Overall Post-Tenure Review Rating

The Post-Tenure Review files will be evaluated independently by the Post-Tenure Review Committee and by the Department Chair. The Chairman of the Committee shall write a letter to the Department Chair providing the committee's assessment of the faculty member's performance relative to the evaluation criteria. The letter shall give recommended ratings in Teaching, Research, and Service and an Overall rating. The Department Chair shall consider the Committee's assessment and write a letter to the Dean making a final determination of the Overall rating of the faculty member. The faculty member will be given copies of both the Committee letter and the Department Chair's letter, and copies of these letters will be permanently retained by the office of the Department Chair and the office of the Dean.

An overall Satisfactory Post-Tenure Review rating generally requires a Satisfactory rating in Teaching, Research, and Service. A Superior rating overall generally requires a Superior rating in at least two of the three categories with at least a Satisfactory rating in the third. In all cases, the performance rating in each of the three categories and the overall rating will be decided by vote of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A Superior rating or an Unsatisfactory rating in any category, or as the Overall rating, must be supported by at least a two-thirds vote by the Committee, with abstentions not allowed.

Post-Tenure Review ratings may be appealed by the faculty member to the appropriate departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee as defined by the Statistics Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures. According to University regulations: "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".

In the case of an Overall Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review, the Post-Tenure Review Committee (which will be the "Development Committee") will make specific recommendations to remedy deficiencies or 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 Development Plan in which the faculty member must annually demonstrate substantial progress toward meeting the criteria specified by the Plan for improved performance within three years of the review date. Copies of Overall Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost. During each of the specified three years, the Department Chair will inform the Post-Tenure Review Committee of the results of the annual performance review of the faculty member with respect to the performance criteria given in the Development Plan. The Committee will review the Chair's assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. Copies of the Development Plan and all annual performance documents will be sent to the Dean. At the three-year anniversary of the Overall Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review, the faculty member will again be evaluated by the Post-Tenure Review Committee in the same manner as the usual Post-Tenure Review to determine whether satisfactory progress has been made toward improvement as detailed in the Development Plan.

Although the goal of the Development Plan is to restore the faculty member's performance to a Satisfactory level, in some cases it may be appropriate to use the Development Plan to define how an individual faculty member can best contribute to the department's goals and to outline criteria by which that contribution can be measured.

If the faculty member cannot reach agreement with the Post-Tenure Review Committee and Department Chair on the Development Plan, then he/she may appeal the Plan to a special Post-Tenure Appeal Committee appointed by the Dean. The proposed plan and the justification for the appeal should be provided to the chair of the Post-Tenure Appeal Committee. That committee may meet in private to discuss the appeal and shall meet with the faculty member involved to further discuss the issue. The Post-Tenure Appeal Committee shall issue a decision on resolution of the appeal. If the faculty member still does not agree to the Development Plan, the issue shall be forwarded to the Dean of the COSM for

resolution. The Plan may be amended during the Annual Performance Review process if the faculty member is found to be performing Unsatisfactorily relative to the Development Plan.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

I. Teaching Criteria

The faculty member's teaching will be evaluated in the three categories of introductory courses, advanced courses and the mentoring of graduate students and undergraduate students. A faculty member may elect to specialize in one or more of these areas but should be proficient in at least two areas.

Teaching performance shall be evaluated taking into consideration both the quality (effectiveness) and quantity of the teaching. Other important activities are the development of new courses, new instructional materials, new programs or new methods of delivery of instruction such as developing distance education courses.

Faculty on sabbatical leave are not expected to participate in teaching activities during the period of their leave and should not have the duration of their leave included in calculating any average course loads. New faculty or others granted teaching exemptions or load reductions should not have the semesters in which these variances exist included in calculating any average course loads. Courses taught by more than one faculty member will only count for one-half of a course for each faculty member when measuring contributions. Specific measures of teaching performance can include:

1. Ratings on Peer Review of teaching.
2. Ratings on student evaluations of teaching. Student teaching evaluations should be considered relative to other courses of similar size, level, and audience taught by other departmental faculty.
3. Receipt of a competitive award for teaching.
4. Development of new instructional materials, such as multimedia material, distance learning material, or a textbook.
5. Production of graduate degrees as the primary advisor.
6. Organization of programs to improve the quality of undergraduate and/or graduate instruction.
7. Receipt of external funding for teaching improvement or development programs.

A Superior rating in teaching will require a consistently outstanding performance in categories 1 and 2 above and in at least one of the remaining categories. A Satisfactory performance will require at least a consistently Satisfactory performance in categories 1 and 2, as well as Satisfactory performance in at least one of the remaining categories.

II. Research Criteria

Faculty members are expected to maintain an active research and scholarship program throughout their careers. The measure of the quality of a faculty member's research program ultimately will depend on the impact of the research on the field. There are various measures of scholarly contributions which should be considered, such as:

- local, national or international awards or prizes,
- papers published in mainstream refereed journals in the field,
- impact as measured by citations to the person's work,
- invitations to present research and scholarship at national and international meetings and seminars and colloquia at leading research universities,
- and the attraction of grant funding from sources outside the University to support the research.

While precise standards for such measures are difficult to assign, a Satisfactory rating will generally require:

- A. Publication of approximately one paper per year in mainstream peer-reviewed statistics journals during the past six years. Also, publication of chapters or papers in refereed special volumes, or publication of research monographs, graduate-level textbooks, or refereed works in interdisciplinary journals are important and may be viewed as sufficient contributions if fewer than one paper per year in mainstream statistics journals is published during the review period.
- B. Consistent submission of formal proposals to appropriate government, industrial or foundation sources for sufficient funds to support the faculty member's research program during the previous six years.
- C. Receipt of sufficient external funding from government, industrial or foundation sources to support research activities.

A Superior rating will generally require receipt of external funding for significant periods during the past six years, plus the publication of an average of two or more publications per year as described in item A or the

receipt of a national or international competitive award or citation for research accomplishments.

III. Service/Outreach Criteria

Departmental faculty members are expected to effectively serve the department, University, and their professional community. This service can take many forms. Some examples of such service/outreach activities are:

- A. Service to the department:
 - 1. Effective service on departmental committees or in department leadership/administrative positions (such as Undergraduate Studies Director, Statistical Laboratory Director, Department Chair, Graduate Director, etc.).
 - 2. Active participation in departmental seminars, faculty meetings, and other department functions.
 - 3. Recruitment and outreach efforts, field trips and other programs intended to enhance graduate and undergraduate enrollments and educational experiences.

- B. Service to the COSM and the University:
 - 1. Effective service on COSM or University-wide committees.
 - 2. Effective service in an administrative position in the college.
 - 3. Effective statistical consulting to support research and training of students, faculty, and staff within the College and/or University.

- C. Service to the professional community:
 - 1. Election or appointment to committees of professional societies, research consortiums, and other national or international organizations, including the organizing of national or international scientific meetings.
 - 2. Editing activities for mainstream statistics journals. Regular review of manuscripts for mainstream statistical and related journals.
 - 3. Service on review panels. Review of proposals for funding agencies.
 - 4. Service to the K-12 education system and/or the state government or business/industry community (for example, statistical consultation with business/industry/government agencies).

A Satisfactory rating can be achieved through a consistent record of service in any combination of the above categories. A Superior rating requires a substantial record of service in at least two of the above areas and

Satisfactory service in the other. A Superior performance in service will need to be supported by appropriate written documentation.

Amendment of the Post-Tenure Review Procedures and Criteria

This document may be amended at any time by at least two-thirds vote of the tenured faculty of the Department of Statistics; the amended document is subject to approval by the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics and the Provost. A Statistics faculty member may choose to be reviewed under the Post-Tenure Review document in effect at the time of his/her upcoming review or under any previous Post-Tenure Review document in effect since that faculty member's last such review.