

**COLLEGE OF NURSING
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on 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 College 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 or retained in a higher position (e.g., Dean or a chaired professorship). However, College-level 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; and any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor during the past five years.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The membership of the College Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full professors on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, acting as a sub-committee of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenured full professors who are having a post-tenure review conducted will be excluded from Committee membership that year. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be elected by that committee. The dean is not eligible to vote or to serve on the Committee.

In the event that there are fewer than five College faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the Dean of the College 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:

1. Current, USC formatted curriculum vitae which includes scholarship, teaching, and service activities.
2. Tenure and Promotion Annual Performance Review for past five years.
3. Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire Summary Sheets, Student Evaluations and Peer Teaching Evaluations for past five years.
4. A copy of the official report of Sabbatical activities (if one was taken during the review period).
5. OPTIONAL: A one to three page personal statement addressing the Tenure and Promotion Criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service for rank.

V. Committee Procedures

- A. The chair of the Committee will ensure that peer reviews (from within the College) of the faculty member's teaching, and peer reviews (from outside the College) of scholarly activities are included. It should be noted that the publication of refereed articles, presentation of refereed abstracts, and funded peer-reviewed extramural research grants are 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 of the faculty member's record. The reviewers will rate the faculty member's performance in four areas: teaching, scholarship, service, and overall performance. In each of the four 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 within the College.
 2. 'Satisfactory performance' means performance that meets the expectations of the College.
 3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' means performance, taken as a whole, which fails to meet relevant College standards.

- 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 areas defined in V. B. A majority evaluative rating is achieved when 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 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 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 Tenure and Promotion Committee, faculty member, and 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 Provost.
- G. If the performance rating for each evaluation area defined in V. B. of the faculty member 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 rate 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 rating 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 a

satisfactory level. The Committee will serve as the Development Committee. The Committee may recommend the inclusion of additional members from outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.

2. The Dean of the College, in consultation with the Committee and the faculty member, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member. 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 College Tenure and Promotion Committee and Dean of the College of Nursing. This evaluation will include in writing whether or not the Development Committee believes the goals of the development plan have been met.
4. The Dean of the College 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 Dean will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports 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 College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The finding of the College 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.

- 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 adequacy of an appealed development plan.

February 16, 1999