

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

1999

I. General Procedures and Calendar

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

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

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions (other than the Dean), 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, Department-level post-tenure review will be waived for: any faculty member who has a retirement agreement within the next three years of the scheduled review approved by the Dean; and any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The membership of the Department of Physical Education Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured faculty members in the department regardless of rank. Tenured faculty who are being reviewed in the Post Tenure Review process will be excluded from serving on their own review, but may serve to review other tenured faculty in a given academic year. The Post-Tenure Review process of a full professor must include at least one full professor. In the event that a full professor is not available from the Department of Physical Education, one will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Education from another unit of the college in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee chair. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be the chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee is being

evaluated for post-tenure review, the Committee will elect a new chair for that year. The Department Chair is eligible neither to vote nor to serve on the Committee.

In the event that there are fewer than five tenured faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the Chair of the Committee will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from other units within the University that do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a committee of five voting members.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Committee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member must include at least the following material in the file:

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous five years;
2. A numerical and descriptive summary of the student course evaluations for each of the courses listed (to be prepared by a departmental faculty member);
3. A peer teaching review conducted in accordance with the Department's policy on peer teaching review.

B. Scholarship

1. A listing, and relevant copies, of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous five years. Scholarly activities are defined as those listed in the Department's Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Definition of Scholarship."

C. Service

1. A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous five years. Service activities are defined as those listed in the Departments Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Service".

D. Annual Evaluations

1. A copy of all annual review performance evaluations conducted by the Department Chair and/or the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee accumulated over the last five years 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).

F. Current vita

1. A copy of the faculty member's current vita.

V. Committee Procedures

- A. The chair of the Committee will ensure that peer reviews (from within the Department) of the faculty member's teaching and of scholarly activities are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship is considered as having fulfilled the peer review of scholarly activities requirement.
- B. After review of the faculty member's file, each member of the Committee will complete a written evaluation form for the faculty member. The form will rate the faculty member's performance in four areas: teaching, scholarship, service, and overall performance. In each of the areas, the committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as either: superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.
- C. For purposes of post-tenure review, the following performance rating terms will be defined as:
 1. 'Superior performance' means performance at the very highest level. Superior performance is performance meeting the definition of "superior" for any given evaluation area in the Department Policy Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion (a score of 5).
 2. 'Satisfactory performance' means performance, taken as a whole which meets Department standards. Satisfactory performance is performance meeting the definition of "good" or "fair" for any given evaluation area in the Department policy Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion (a score of 3 or 4).
 3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' means performance, taken as a whole which fails to meet relevant Department standards. Unsatisfactory performance is performance meeting the definition of "Unsatisfactory" for any given evaluation area in the Department Policy Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion (a score of 1 or 2).
- D. In a meeting of the Committee, the Chair will collect the performance evaluation forms from the Committee members and tally the ratings in each evaluation area defined in Section V.B of this document. A majority evaluative rating is achieved

when at least fifty-one percent of all eligible Committee members have cast a ballot with the same rating. In the event that a majority of Committee members do not rate the performance of a faculty member the same in a given performance evaluation area, the committee report will give a performance rating of satisfactory, lacking majority opinion.

A Committee member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the dean of a desire to do so before the beginning of the leave.

- E. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the Committee, the chair of the Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include at minimum the Committee's rating of the performance for each of the four evaluation areas defined in Section V.B. and sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development. Individual vote counts in each evaluation area will not be revealed, and individual written evaluations will be destroyed by the Committee chair after the report is approved by the Committee.
- F. A copy of the Committee report must be sent to the faculty member, to the Department Chair and to the Dean of the College for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event of an unsatisfactory review a copy of the Committee report and development plan must also be sent to the Dean of the College and to the Provost.
- G. If the performance rating of the faculty member for each evaluation area defined in Section V.B. is either "superior" or "satisfactory," the evaluation of the faculty member is concluded with the distribution of the report. If the Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is satisfactory, but that his/her performance in either teaching, scholarship, or service areas is unsatisfactory, the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level in that area. A review that results in an overall performance rating of satisfactory, but includes an unsatisfactory rating in one of the other areas does not require a development plan.
- H. An Unsatisfactory Review
 - 1. If the Committee determines that the overall performance evaluation of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory," the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to an effective level. The Committee will also act as the faculty member's Development Committee. The Committee may recommend the inclusion of additional members to the Development Committee from outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.

2. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Committee and the faculty member, will produce a developmental plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member. A copy of the developmental plan will be sent to the Provost. The timetable is at the discretion of the Committee depending on the nature of the development plan, but in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year nor more than three years in duration.
3. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the development committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will recommend in writing to the Department Chair whether they believe the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in any particular.
4. The Department Chair will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the development plan, and whether or not further measures may be necessary. The Department Chair will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports with the Dean of the College and with the Provost.
5. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination.

VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, in general or in any particular. The findings of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean of the College for final determination of the evaluation.
- B. If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Dean of the College he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.



FREDERIC J. MEDWAY, PH.D.
INTERIM DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Peter Werner *M.*
FROM: Frederic J. Medway
RE: Post-Tenure Review Policies and
DATE: Procedures February 8, 1999

The Office of the Provost has not approved the Department of Physical Education's recommended procedures for Post-Tenure Review. Their concerns are written on the enclosed document. Please revise the departmental procedures and if possible resubmit them to me within the next fifteen days.

gdp

Attachment

c: Dr. Karen French