

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

POST-TENURE REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Preamble

The History Department, in accordance with the University's post-tenure review policy, seeks to encourage faculty members to achieve their professional goals and contribute to the Department's missions of scholarship, teaching, and service.

This document is based on the following principles: 1) post-tenure review is a collegial process the chief goal of which is faculty development; 2) the review process should be conducted so as to protect academic freedom and the quality of education; and 3) post-tenure review must be periodically reevaluated to assess its effectiveness in enhancing faculty performance and development.

It is understood that post-tenure review evaluates faculty performance in scholarship, teaching, and service. It is applied to senior faculty whose careers may have emphasized one or another of these areas. Any review, therefore, must take a holistic approach to assessing individual contributions to the department's mission. The procedures outlined below are intended to recognize superior performance, assure that all faculty maintain a satisfactory level of performance, and provide those faculty whose performance is rated unsatisfactory an opportunity to improve.

I. General Procedures and Calendar

Post-tenure review will follow the post-tenure review policy outlined in the University's *Faculty Manual*. The post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established by the Office of the Provost.

II. Time Period

Date of tenure determines post-tenure review timing. 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 or a chaired professorship). However, 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 follow in a six-year sequence.

III. Expectations

Tenured faculty are expected to maintain a record of high quality scholarship, teaching, and service.

A. Scholarship. The department expects that tenured faculty will continue to demonstrate a commitment to serious scholarship, resulting in refereed publications or comparable presentations of their work in appropriate professional settings.

B. Teaching. The department expects that tenured faculty will continue to:

1. Prepare courses with discrimination and skill
2. Formulate course objectives responsibly and clearly, and devise imaginative and effective ways of achieving these objectives
3. Command the attention of students, stimulate their interest, and improve their thinking
4. Set high standards and grade all work thoroughly, fairly, and with reasonable promptness.

C. Service. The department expects that tenured faculty members will continue to evince a responsible willingness to do their share of service work within the department and university and to involve themselves, where practicable and feasible, in activities to enhance the well-being and reputation of the profession.

IV. Procedures

A. Creating the post-tenure review file.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to put his/her own file together. The file should demonstrate performance in each of the three critical review areas. The overall contents of that file are up to the individual, but each file must contain the elements listed below. Those with an asterisk (*) are the faculty member's responsibility to provide.

1. curriculum vitae*
2. peer and student teaching evaluations
3. evidence of peer-reviewed scholarly activity*
4. sabbatical reports*
5. annual activity reports*
6. annual performance evaluations

In addition, a faculty member may wish to submit a personal statement.

B. Review Committee

Post-tenure review committees, which will be comprised of three persons at the faculty member's rank or higher, will be appointed by the Chair of the department in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

C. Report

The Chair and the post-tenure review committee will produce a majority report based on presented materials and provide the faculty members with a copy. Copies of all reviews will be permanently retained by the office of the department Chair and the office of the Dean.

V. Outcome

Post-tenure review outcomes will be measured based on expectations outlined in Section III A, B, C.

A. Superior Performance

A superior performance evaluation, which is defined as performance at the very highest level, will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file and will be forwarded to the Dean of CLA and the Provost for possible consideration for a merit increase in base pay.

B. Satisfactory Performance

A satisfactory performance evaluation, which is defined as performance that meets unit expectations, will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file.

C. Unsatisfactory Performance

If the Committee determines that the overall performance of a faculty member is unsatisfactory, which means that, taken as a whole, the faculty member fails to meet department expectations for satisfactory performance the Committee will include recommendations that could help restore the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The Chair, in consultation with the Committee, the Dean, and the faculty member will establish a development plan. The plan may include the appointment of a development committee to assist the faculty member in improving performance. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored. The timetable is at the discretion of the committee but will normally from one to three years in duration.

At the next annual review, the Chair will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. The evaluation will be forwarded to the Department's Tenure and Promotion committee. The T&P committee will review the Chair's assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. Post-tenure review committee members on the Tenure and Promotion Committee will withdraw themselves from this process. The Chair's assessment and the T&P committee's response will be forwarded to the Dean and copies provided to the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination on progress or lack thereof, and whether or not further measures are necessary.

VI. Appeal Procedures

A faculty member who disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the voting members of the Department's Tenure and Promotion committee, in general, or in any particular. Post-tenure review committee members on the Tenure and Promotion committee will withdraw themselves from this appeal process. The findings of the T&P committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Dean.

If the Faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review disagrees with the development plan, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Dean of the College. The Dean, in consultation with the Provost, will make the final determination of the adequacy of the appealed development plan.