

COLLEGE OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

1998

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 to 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 within the previous 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 the chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the Chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Committee will elect a new chair for that year. The dean is eligible neither to vote nor 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:

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 the Dean's Office);
3. A copy of a peer teaching review conducted in accordance with the College'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 College'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 College's Tenure and Promotion Criteria under the heading "Service: Sources ."

D. Annual Evaluations

1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the Dean and/or the College Tenure and Promotion Committee 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).

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 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 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. Superior performance is performance meeting the definition of "superior" or "excellent" for any given evaluation area in the College policy Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion.
 2. 'Satisfactory performance' means performance that meets the expectations of the College. Satisfactory performance is performance meeting the definition of "good" or "fair" for any given evaluation area in the College policy Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion.
 3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' means performance, taken as a whole, which fails to meet relevant College standards. Unsatisfactory performance is performance meeting the definition of "unsatisfactory" for any given evaluation area in the College policy Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion.
- 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee will recommend in writing to the Dean of the College whether they believe the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in any particular.
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, in general or in any particular. The findings 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 the adequacy of an appealed development plan.

Commentary to Accompany the Post-Tenure Review Procedures of the College of Library and Information Science

The following is a description of the logic used in formulating the post-tenure review policy of the College of Library and Information Science (CLIS). The components of the policy are divided into three categories: those required by the post-tenure review sections of the *Faculty Manual*; those recommended by the Provost's Office for clarity of procedure; and, those that are the option of the local unit. Before going through the document section by section it should be noted that this commentary is provided strictly as a collegial sharing of information, not as a prescriptive format for other units. The CLIS sought, in as many cases as possible, to make the most use of current College policies and procedures rather than to create an entirely new set of procedures.

The reference numbers refer to sections of the CLIS Post-Tenure Review Procedures document as approved by the faculty of the College and the Provost.

Section I. General Procedures and Calendar

This section is recommended by the Provost's Office as a guard against the inadvertent inclusion of a unit procedure contrary to the *Faculty Manual*.

Section II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.

Section III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

This section is a local unit option section. The faculty of the CLIS decided that direct faculty participation in the review process was necessary but that it was not desirable to establish a new standing committee to effect this end. By using a sub-committee of the CLIS Tenure and Promotion Committee as the review committee, the idea was to both emulate the tenure and promotion process and to protect faculty members who in rank or tenure status are less than tenured full professors from having the duty of reviewing colleagues who may be asked to vote in future judgement of an application for promotion or tenure. The faculty also believed that it was necessary to establish a minimum number of members on the review committee, again, emulating the tenure and promotion process in this regard.

Section IV. File Documentation

Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review. The CLIS did elaborate on the possible sources of documentation in these areas by using the definitions already established in the College tenure and promotion policy.

Section V. Committee Procedures

- A. Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
- B. The *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review requires that an evaluation be conducted in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The CLIS added a fourth area – overall performance.
- C. The *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review establishes the three rating terms: superior, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. It also provides the meaning of the terms. However, it is a local unit option to decide what set of definitions will be used to guide the rating. The CLIS chose to use the definitions already extant in the College's tenure and promotion policy. The faculty believes that the use of these definitions will allow the review committee to fairly evaluate the changing nature of a faculty member's career progression, while giving the faculty member being reviewed guidance on what standards he/she is being measured against.
- D. This is a local unit option to cover the mechanism of how votes are to taken and counted. With a three rating system, it was recognized that the possibility of a non-majority vote could be cast. The default rating in such a circumstance is designed to be "satisfactory", duly noted as a non-majority opinion.

The last sentence in this sub-section (concerning members on leave) is recommended by the Provost's Office to avoid possible confusion on eligibility.

- E. Most of this sub-section is a local unit option regarding the contents of the written review and the disposition of the individual ballots. The sentence which includes the wording: "and sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her growth and development," is from the *Faculty Manual*.
- F. Taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.

- G. This sub-section is a local unit option and sets forth the mechanism for concluding the review, unless the result is an unsatisfactory review of the faculty member.
- H.1. The sentence that includes the wording: “must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level,” is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review. The remainder of the sub-section is a local unit option. The CLIS decided that there should be a development plan and that the review committee would also be the development committee since those faculty members would be the most familiar with the circumstances of the initial unsatisfactory review.
- H.2. The mechanism for a development plan timetable is a local unit option and is elaborated here. The College decided to include a maximum and minimum timetable to both ensure some uniformity but also to give the dean some flexibility depending on the nature of the unsatisfactory review.
- H.3 This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
- H.4. This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
- H.5 This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on Academic Grievance Procedures.

Section VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. This sub-section is taken from the *Faculty Manual* section on post-tenure review.
- B. This sub-section is a local unit option, which gives the faculty member an administrative appeal mechanism for the proposed development plan.