

Post-Tenure Review

1. Introduction

A post-tenure review will be conducted for each tenured faculty member during the sixth year since her/his previous extra-departmental review.

2. Preparation and Submission of the Faculty Member's Packet

a. A faculty member shall submit to his/her Department Chair by the announced deadline a packet of material that must include.

- (1) A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.
- (2) Curriculum vitae.
- (3) Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals.
- (4) Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.
- (5) Annual performance evaluations by the department chair during the period under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead.
- (6) Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship. The evidence must include two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate's teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must also include at least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally

evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

- (7) A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.

3. Recommendations by the Department Chair and the Dean

The packet will be reviewed by the department chair during the fall semester of the sixth year. The chair will recommend a rating for the candidate's performance. In the event that the chair recommends an "unsatisfactory" rating, he/she will add a substantive evaluation letter to the packet, explaining his/her reasons for the rating. A departmental post-tenure review panel will be convened only in the case of post-tenure review of the department chair. When the department chair herself/himself is up for post-tenure review, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the chair) will convene, and chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty members (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department according to seniority. When necessary to complete the panel, additions will be drawn, following the same criteria, from departments with related areas of study. The panel may not include chairs from external departments. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the department chair's candidacy that the chair exercises in all other cases. This departmental panel will also review all other cases coming up for post-tenure review at the same time as the department chair.

The department chair (or the departmental panel) shall forward to the candidate's dean by the announced deadline, typically mid-December, the candidate's packet with either a brief letter of acknowledgement of the chair's (or panel's) concurrence with the candidate's self-evaluation or a detailed negative letter to the candidate's dean. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate. Should the rating of the chair (or departmental panel) be lower than the candidate's self-rating, the candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal to his/her dean and

his/her department chair no later than five days before the first day of the beginning of the Spring Semester. The Deans will review packets and forward recommendations, but will not normally review satisfactory recommendations, but will do so at the request of the candidate.

Should the department chair (or the departmental post-tenure review panel) and/or the dean of the candidate's school recommend a superior rating when the candidate seeks only a satisfactory rating, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will consider a superior rating only with the permission of the candidate.

4. Recommendations to the President
 - a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations to the Provost by the announced deadline, typically at the end of February. Normally, the committee will not review a "satisfactory" recommendation unless the candidate requests the committee to do so. The Provost may make a recommendation and shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.
 - b. The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department chair (or the departmental panel chair), the appropriate Dean, the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year.¹ In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by him/her, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the department chair (or departmental panel chair), in writing, of his/her decision.
5. Deferments
 - a. Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances,

¹ Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.

exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member's chair and dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the Post-Tenure Review Committee regarding deferments may be appealed to the Provost within one week of the candidate's notification. The Provost's decision shall be final.

- b. A faculty member who announces his/her decision to retire within three years of their scheduled time for post-tenure review (by submission of a letter to the dean of his/her school and the Provost) may choose not to undergo that review. However, if a faculty member postpones the announced time of retirement for more than one year, he/she will be evaluated in the year of that announcement.
- c. A faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review in a given year will not have to undergo that review if he/she petitions for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor that same year or announces (in writing) his/her intention to do so during the following academic year. However, if the promotion process is postponed, a post-tenure review will take place no later than one year after the originally scheduled time for post-tenure review.
- d. Administrators, such as Deans, rejoining the ranks of the faculty will undergo post-tenure review within three years of their return to faculty status.
- e. If a faculty member takes a sabbatical leave or a leave of absence in the same academic year he/she is scheduled for post-tenure review, the post-tenure review will take place during the following academic year, unless the faculty member decides to undergo the review at the originally scheduled time.
- f. All petitions for a deferment or a waiver of post-tenure review due to an announced retirement must be addressed to the Post-Tenure Review Committee. All official communications regarding postponement or waivers of review will be issued by said committee.

6. Rating of Candidates

a. Ratings of a candidate will take one of three forms:

(1) Superior Rating

The superior rating is awarded to candidates who continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the Faculty/Administration Manual. Only faculty members holding the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible for a superior rating, except that tenured Assistant and Associate Professors who lack a terminal degree but who otherwise meet the standards of promotion to the rank of Professor are also eligible for superior ratings.

(2) Unsatisfactory Rating

Candidate has exhibited evidence of habitual neglect of duty, which means consistently and regularly failing to fulfill the terms and conditions of appointment, as laid out in the Faculty/Administration Manual's section on "Termination of Tenured Faculty Members 'for Cause' and Termination Procedure."

(3) Satisfactory Rating

All other candidates.

b. Merit Increase for Superior Rating

Whenever the President assigns a rating of superior, such a rating must be accompanied by a permanent merit increase in pay effective the academic year following the year of evaluation.

c. Remediation Plan for Unsatisfactory Rating

Whenever a candidate receives a rating of "unsatisfactory" from the President, the case will be remanded to the existing departmental post-tenure review panel, or a new one convened for the purpose (in the latter case, including the department chair and two other tenured departmental faculty members), to devise a remediation plan in consultation with the candidate. This plan must be

submitted to the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee for approval within twenty-one days of the President's final determination of an unsatisfactory rating. The Post-Tenure Review Committee must approve or, in consultation with the departmental panel, modify the plan within fifteen days.

(1) Appeals

A candidate wishing to appeal an unsatisfactory rating must submit a written appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee within ten days of notification of an unsatisfactory rating. The rating may only be appealed when the faculty member alleges the rating was based upon:

- (a) Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon the race, religion, sex, national origin, color, age, or handicap; or
- (b) Violation of academic freedom as it relates to freedom of expression; or
- (c) Violation of due process as provided in the College's published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

(2) Ratification of remediation plan

Ultimate ratification of satisfactory completion of a remediation plan rests with the college-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee, as constituted at the time of the deadline originally assigned for completion of remediation. In the event that the Committee concludes that the candidate has failed to complete the remediation plan to its satisfaction, the Committee will notify the candidate, the department chair or panel, the

Provost, and the dean of the candidate's school that the Committee has concluded that proceeding for revocation of the candidate's tenure ought to be instituted, in accordance with the guidelines of the Faculty/Administration Manual.

d. Presumption of Satisfactory Performance

The Post-Tenure Review Committee operates on a presumption of satisfactory performance. That is, the burden of proof (clear and convincing evidence) for a superior performance lies with the candidate, and the burden of proof for an unsatisfactory performance lies with the department chair (or department post-tenure review panel). The Post-Tenure Review Committee can request additional information at any time during their deliberations.

e. In the event that a candidate who has applied for a rating fails to receive that rating, a different rating must be assigned at each level of review.

f. Appealing a Satisfactory Rating

A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating when having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in Art. VII.B.

If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is incorrect due to reasons other than those outlined in Art. VII.B, a formal appeal is not allowed. However, upon the candidate's request, the candidate will be allowed to undergo one "successive" post-tenure review the following year and to modify the packet so as to better document the case for a superior rating. The candidate is allowed to modify statements on teaching, research and service, to include additional or different peer letters, and, generally to strengthen the packet with the kinds of evidence outlined in Art. VII.B. However, other than the fact that the vita included in the packet shall be current, the evidence in the packet shall cover the same six-year period that was covered in the prior year's review. A candidate's post-tenure review cycle does not change as the result of

undergoing a successive post-tenure review, and no further reviews covering the same six-year period are allowed.