

**Post-Tenure Review, Department of Geological Sciences, 1999
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 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.

I Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review.

Every tenured faculty member in the College shall be reviewed every six years in accordance with university policies. Beginning in the Fall 1999, approximately one-sixth of the unit tenured faculty, in order of seniority according to date of tenure, will be reviewed each year. Exceptions are granted for faculty successfully reviewed for advancement to or retention in a higher position. Thus, faculty promoted to full professor, a chaired professorship, 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 unit chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review.

II. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The evaluation of faculty members shall begin in the faculty member's department. Faculty members holding joint appointments in programs or institutes shall follow established Tenure and Promotion procedures. Each department will appoint a Post Tenure Review Committee. The membership of the 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, acting as a sub-committee of the 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 the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Committee will elect a new chair for that year. 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 five faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the Department Chair, will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from other appropriate units within the College that do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a committee of five voting members.

The College seeks to use the post-tenure review to help faculty members identify weaknesses and improve performance and thus maximize the number of its faculty who are working constructively to achieve the College'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. 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 activity that contains at least the following material:

- A. Teaching
 - 1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous five years;
 - 2. A quantitative listing and all student comments of the student course evaluations for each of the courses listed;
 - 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 selected copies, of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous five years.
- C. Service
 - 1. A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous five years.
- D. Annual Evaluations
 - 1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations accumulated since the initial tenure review 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 a reasonable number of peer-reviewed publications in major journals in the past six years and/or a reasonable number of grant proposals funded during this same period shall be deemed 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 Tenure and Promotion Committee and by the Department Chair. The Chairman of the Tenure and Promotion 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 as determined by a majority vote of the committee. The Department Chair shall consider the Tenure and Promotion 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 Tenure and Promotion Committee letter and the Chairman's letter, and the 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 requires a Superior rating in at least two of the three categories with at least a satisfactory rating in the third.

Post-Tenure Review rankings may be appealed by the faculty member to the department Tenure and Promotion committee. 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”.

An Overall Unsatisfactory Post Tenure Review requires the establishment of a Development Plan that details activities that the faculty member must undertake to improve performance. This plan shall be established through discussions between the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, and the faculty member involved. The plan shall contain specific performance criteria that the faculty member must meet in order to have the Unsatisfactory ranking removed. The Plan should identify both the activities and the timeframe during which the Plan shall remain in effect. Normally the time frame will be not less than one year or greater than three years. The department Chair, in consultation with the faculty member shall assess progress on the plan, at least once per year. A copy of the letters and development plan must be sent to the Provost.

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 Tenure and Promotion Committee and Department Chair on the Development Plan, then he/she may appeal the plan to the department Advisory Committee. The proposed plan and the justification for the appeal should be provided to the chair of the Advisory Committee. The committee may meet in private to discuss the appeal and shall meet with the faculty member involved to further discuss the issue. The Advisory 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 with additional performance criteria during the Annual Review process if the faculty member is found to perform Unsatisfactory 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 in research. 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 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. Consistent satisfactory rankings on Peer Review of teaching.
2. Consistent satisfactory rankings 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. A consistent record of undergraduate research supervision
5. Graduating an average of 1 MS student and/or 0.5 Ph.D. student per year as primary Thesis/Dissertation 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 satisfactory performance in categories 1 and 2 as well as a satisfactory performance in at least one of the remaining categories.

II. Research Criteria:

Faculty members are expected to maintain an active research 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 such contributions, which should be considered such as:

- local, national or international awards or prizes,
- significant numbers of papers published in the leading refereed journals in the field
- significant impact as measured by citations to the persons work,
- invitations to present research and scholarship at national and international meetings and seminars and colloquia at leading research universities.
- and by the ability to attract grant funding from sources outside the university to support the research.

While precise values for such measures will vary by discipline, a Satisfactory rating will generally require:

- A. Publication of approximately one paper per year in major peer-reviewed journals during the past six years. Also, publication of chapters or papers in referred special volumes, or publication of research monographs or graduate-level textbooks may be viewed as sufficient contributions if fewer than one paper per year in mainstream journals have been published
- B. Consistent submission of formal proposals to government, industrial or foundation sources for sufficient funds to support the faculty member's research program.
- C. Receipt of sufficient external funding from government, industrial or foundation sources to support research expenses.

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 papers per year in major peer-reviewed journals 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 department committees.
 2. Regular participation and attendance in departmental seminars and faculty meetings,
 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 department or college.
- 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 international or national scientific meetings
 2. Editorships of major journals. Review manuscripts for major journals, averaging at least three papers per year.
 3. Service on proposal review panels for funding agencies. Review of proposals for funding agencies averaging at least three proposals per year.
 4. Service to the K-12 education system and/or the state business/industry community.

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 one of the above areas and Satisfactory service in other areas. A Superior performance in service will need to be supported by documented written input from the recipients of the service/outreach activity.