

Approved: November 19, 1998

Revised and Approved: February 11, 1999 and February 26, 1999

Revised and Approved by Department: April 2, 2020 (final approval College of A&S April 2, 2022)

Approved by the Office of the Provost: December 20, 2022

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Preamble

The Department of Geography, in accordance with the post-tenure review policy established by the University, seeks to create an atmosphere that fosters faculty members' achievement of their professional goals, that encourages faculty members to aspire to the heights of scholarship and professional development, and that assures that faculty members continue to make contributions to the Department's missions of teaching, research, and service. This policy document is based on the following guiding principles:

- 1) Post-tenure review is aimed at faculty development, not the reevaluation of the award of tenure. The post-tenure review process may not be used to shift the burden of proof in a proceeding to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause. The post-tenure review process is meant only to assess job performance.
- 2) The post-tenure review should be conducted so as to protect academic freedom and the quality of education.

It is understood that post-tenure review involves criteria that define acceptable performance in teaching, research, and service. It is applied to tenured faculty whose careers may have emphasized one or another of these areas, so a holistic assessment of that individual's overall contribution to the Department's mission must be part of any review. For example, a faculty member may de-emphasize research and scholarship while providing valuable contributions in other areas such as teaching, professional activity, and service. Stronger involvement in one area is required to compensate for potential deficiencies in another area of the faculty member's profile. The outcomes of the procedures outlined below are intended to recognize superior performance, to assure that all faculty maintain a satisfactory level of contribution, and to provide those faculty whose performance is rated as unsatisfactory with guidance and an opportunity to improve.

I. Definitions

- A. Satisfactory performance: Performance that meets the expectations of the unit and is consistent with the mission of the Department.
- B. Superior performance: Performance that substantially exceeds Departmental expectations and that demonstrates an extraordinary level of excellence, innovation, talent, dedication, and/or enthusiasm.

- C. Unsatisfactory performance: Performance that, taken as a whole, fails to meet the Department's minimum standards in teaching, research activities, or service. In keeping with the Department's mission to conduct post-tenure reviews in a manner that protects the academic freedom of its faculty, the expression of unpopular ideas, theories, or opinions will not result in an unsatisfactory review.

II. General Procedures and Calendar

The general procedures for post-tenure review described below are in accordance with the post-tenure review policy outlined in the *Faculty Manual*. The post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established by the Office of the Provost.

Tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments, and whose primary unit is the Department of Geography, will undergo post-tenure review according to the criteria and procedures of the Department of Geography described in this document. Input from appropriate evaluators (e.g., faculty, chair, dean) of the secondary unit, including performance reviews and teaching evaluations, and service summaries, will be solicited by the Department in reaching their determination. Tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments where the primary unit is not the Department of Geography will undergo post-tenure review according to the criteria and procedures of their primary unit.

III. Time Period

The timing for post-tenure review is based on date of tenure. Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, 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, chaired professorship, or a higher professorial rank). 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. For the first cycle of reviews, the relevant time period under examination is from the date of tenure or date of last promotion until the present. During this initial review, particular emphasis will be placed on faculty performance during the previous six years. Subsequent reviews will be done on a six-year cycle.

IV. Criteria

Tenured faculty are to identify their contributions in three general areas: teaching and student mentoring/advising; research and scholarship; and professional/university service. Faculty should meet the minimum expectations in at least two of the three areas to receive a *satisfactory* review. An *unsatisfactory* rating is given to faculty who do not meet the minimum expectations in two or three of these areas. A *superior* evaluation is given if faculty meet expectations in all three areas and significantly exceed the minimum expectations in at least two of these areas.

The minimum expectations for satisfactory performance are described below:

Teaching and mentoring: an average score of 3.5 or better on student course evaluations, positive peer reviews of teaching, and successful mentoring of graduate students (as thesis/dissertation committee Chair or committee member) and/or undergraduate students.

Research and scholarship: a diverse collection of scholarly works and outputs, compiled during the review period, that indicates active and consistent engagement with at least one research area.

Professional/University service: Consistent, substantive engagement over the review period in professional leadership or service activities at the Department, College, University, regional, national, or international level.

V. Evidence in support of Criteria

A. Teaching and Mentoring

Teaching and mentoring effectiveness may be demonstrated by the following: commitment to teaching (e.g. number of courses); student course evaluations; written peer reviews of teaching; the successful supervision of graduate theses and dissertations and/or undergraduate theses or research; awards for teaching by the college or university; national or regional recognition of teaching effectiveness or contributions to educational leadership; leadership in curriculum changes and innovations at the department or collegiate level; and articles published on pedagogical topics.

B. Research and Scholarship

Quality of scholarship may be demonstrated through the following: publications in peer-reviewed journals and/or respected academic presses; successful acquisition of research funding; citations of one's work; published reviews of one's work (e.g., book reviews); selection of work for re-publication and/or reprinting; awards for papers, presentations, or books; and/or invitations to participate in panels or to serve as discussant at regional, national, or international scholarly meetings.

C. Professional Activity/University Service

Evidence of professional activity and service may include the following: Membership on editorial boards; editorships of journals; service on regional, national, or international committees of scholarly associations; elected office in scholarly associations; active participation on conference planning committees; manuscript reviewing for journals and/or funding agencies; higher-level positions and committee chairpersonships at the Department level; participation on College and University committees; substantial participation in K-12 activities or other community outreach activities.

VI. Procedures

A. Creating the post-tenure review file.

The post-tenure review **must** contain the elements listed below.

1. Elements to be provided by candidate (all in digital format):

- a. Curriculum vitae
 - b. Publications from the previous six years
 - c. Any additional evidence of achievement or esteem to support the file.
2. Elements to be provided by Department (all in digital format):
- a. Annual performance reviews, post-tenure reviews, and development plans accumulated since the initial tenure decision or the last post-tenure review (for jointly appointed faculty whose primary appointment is Geography, these materials must reflect the input of the secondary unit)
 - b. Peer teaching reviews and student course evaluations accumulated since the initial tenure decision or last post-tenure review (for jointly appointed faculty whose primary appointment is Geography, the Department is responsible for requesting reviews and evaluations for non-GEOG courses)
 - c. Sabbatical reports
 - d. For jointly appointed faculty for whom the Department of Geography is the secondary unit, the Department should provide performance reviews, teaching evaluations, and other documentation as requested by the primary unit.

B. Review Committee

The post-tenure review will be conducted by a select committee of departmental faculty, of equal or higher rank to the candidate, selected by the Chair. The committee will consist of three members (the Department Chair may not be part of this committee). The committee chair must be a Full Professor. The committee will serve for one year and will handle all post-tenure reviews during that time period.

C. Committee Assessment

1. Upon completion of the review, the committee will provide a written post-tenure review report that will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance in teaching, research/creative activities, and service and will assess the faculty member's performance in each category as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The post-tenure review report must also assess the faculty member's overall performance as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Assessment requires the agreement of two out of three committee members.
2. If the committee rates the faculty member's overall performance as *superior or satisfactory*, it will provide the faculty member with a full copy of the report, to include detailed recommendations to further the faculty member's professional growth and development.
3. If the post-tenure committee has concluded that the faculty member's overall performance is *unsatisfactory*, the committee will provide the faculty member a copy of the post-tenure review

report, along with the details of a development plan for restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level.

4. If the faculty member disagrees with the unit report's unsatisfactory assessment of his/her performance or with any aspect of the unit's recommendations for a development plan, the faculty member may appeal to a committee of all full professors by submitting a written statement detailing his/her complaints with the report or recommendation. This appeal committee should consist of at least three full professors who are not on the post-tenure review committee (the Department Chair is also excluded from the appeal committee). If this is not possible, the Department Chair will consult with the Dean to identify additional committee members from outside the unit.
5. The findings of the post-tenure review committee, together with its recommendations for action from the appeals committee and any statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Department Chair and then to the Dean. The Dean will review the unit's post-tenure review report, any statement of a faculty member appealing an unsatisfactory assessment, and any recommendations of the appeal committee. The Dean will then assess, in writing, the faculty member's overall performance as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The Dean will provide the faculty member with a copy of his/her assessment.

VII. Outcome

- A. A Superior Review will be noted in a faculty member's personnel file when both Department and the Dean assess the faculty member's performance as superior.
- B. A Satisfactory Review will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file when either the Department or the Dean assesses the faculty member's performance as at least satisfactory.
- C. An Unsatisfactory Review will be noted in a faculty member's personnel file only when both the Department and the Dean assess the faculty member's overall performance as unsatisfactory. A faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation is subject to the procedures set forth in Section 5 of "Outcomes in Annual Performance Review and Post-Tenure Review" in the 2019 *Faculty Manual*.
- D. Following an unsatisfactory review, the Department Chair will appoint a development committee to restore the faculty member's overall performance to a satisfactory level according to the development plan. The members of the unit development committee must hold the rank of full professor.
- E. The faculty member must agree to the details of the development plan. In the event that the faculty member does not concur with the committee's proposed development plan, both the faculty member and the unit development committee will submit proposed development plans to the Dean for final determination of the plan.
- F. After the implementation of a development plan, and until the Dean determines that the faculty member's overall performance has been restored to a satisfactory level, the faculty member's annual review will include an assessment by the Chair and the development committee detailing

progress made under the development plan. This assessment will be forwarded to a committee consisting of all full professors in the unit, who will review the assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or on any particular element. The assessment and the response by the committee of full professors will be forwarded to the Dean and the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination on the faculty member's progress under the development plan and whether further measures are necessary to restore the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level.

VIII. Grievance Procedures

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal. Faculty members are directed to the Faculty Manual for appeal procedures.