

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR POST TENURE REVIEW

April 8, 1999

Management Area The Darla Moore School of Business University of South Carolina

Post Tenure Review in the Management Area will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Manual and the procedures defined in this document. In the event of a conflict, the Faculty Manual will govern. The Post Tenure Review will be based on a tenured faculty member's performance in the areas of Research, Teaching and Service.

Criteria

For the purposes of Post Tenure Review, performance will be rated as Superior, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory in each of the performance categories of Research, Teaching and Service, commensurate with rank and position. In addition, an Overall rating of Superior, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory will be given. A Faculty Member will be Superior Overall if he/she is rated Superior in any two categories of performance, and at least Satisfactory in the third category. In order for performance to be Unsatisfactory Overall, a Faculty Member must be rated Unsatisfactory in any two of the three categories of performance. In addition, for a finding of Unsatisfactory Overall to be made, the degree to which performance is Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in the several categories of performance must be taken into consideration. A determination that performance is either Superior or Unsatisfactory, whether on a particular performance category or Unsatisfactory Overall, must be reached by an affirmative vote of a two-thirds majority of the Post Tenure Review Committee described below. Failing a two-thirds majority vote for a finding of either Superior or Unsatisfactory, the finding will be that performance is Satisfactory.

In judging performance on each performance category the following definitions of terms, which are based on the definitions contained in the Faculty Manual, will be utilized.

Superior means performance at the very highest level.

Satisfactory means performance that meets the expectations of the Area.

Unsatisfactory as to a category of performance means performance that does not meet the expectations of the Area as to that category of performance.

Unsatisfactory Overall means performance that, taken as a whole, fails to meet the Area's Post Tenure Review expectations in Research, Teaching and Service.

Evidence of Performance

Evidence of performance in the various categories of performance will be as follows.

Research. Research is the generation of knowledge and theories, validation of theories, analysis of existing knowledge, and application of theories and knowledge to practical problems. Both quantity and quality of a Faculty Member's research are important. For the purposes of evaluation, quality is defined in terms of the importance of the information revealed and the creativity of the thought processes and the rigor of the methods utilized; original breakthroughs in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods being considered of higher quality than works exhibiting minor variations or those repeating familiar themes in the literature. Further evidence of quality is publication in the highest rated academic journals.

Evidence of a Faculty Member's contribution to Research includes, but is not limited to, the following: publication of articles in refereed journals, with greater emphasis placed on the highest quality journals; publication of scholarly books; publication of book chapters or monographs that specifically deal with research; acquisition of research grants and contracts from outside the University, particularly grants obtained from agencies that employ a peer review process; publications of refereed proceedings; presentation of research papers at meetings of academic societies or associations; publication of articles in non-refereed or professional journals; chairing research sessions and discussing research papers; and, receiving honors and awards for one's research.

Teaching. Teaching is a multifaceted activity that is composed of classroom teaching, working with students outside the formal classroom setting, advising students, and developing courses, curricula and teaching materials.

Evidence of a Faculty Member's contribution to Teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following: recognition as having made a substantial contribution to his or her academic specialty area in teaching; amount of teaching as reflected by course load (number of courses taught per year), course level (undergraduate, masters or doctoral), number of students (class size), and number of different courses taught; evaluations of a Faculty Member's teaching performance by members of the faculty and students; development of instructional material and methods including, but not limited to, text books, workbooks, cases and exercises, visual media, and computer software that are directly related to the Faculty Member's teaching; chairing of dissertation and thesis committees; service on dissertation and thesis committees; involvement with students in non-dissertation research projects; publications and presentations that deal with pedagogy, curricula, or similar educational issues; student counseling and advisement; developing new courses and curricula; participation in student organizations; receiving honors and awards for one's teaching; consistent attendance of classes; and, conducting teacher evaluations.

Service. As professionals committed to governance by peers, there are activities that must be performed in order to maintain the operations of the institution and one's professional discipline. Faculty members are also expected to make their professional skills available to other institutions and the public at large. Thus, there are many types of service contributions one can make.

Evidence of a Faculty Member's contribution to Service includes, but is not limited to, the following. For the University of South Carolina and the State: performance on committees at the University, School, and Area levels; continuing education programs; administrative responsibilities and functions; and, special projects for the University and agencies of South Carolina state government. For the profession: leadership roles in the administration of professional organizations; editorial and review work for academic publications; book reviews; reviews of papers for academic organizations; service on government committees or task forces; and, service as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure decisions at other colleges and universities. For business and not-for-profit organizations: programs for the Daniel Management Center, Riegel and Emory Center, Small Business Development Center, and other units of the Darla Moore School of Business; presentations to business and professional groups; and, consulting that contributes to the Faculty Member's professional growth and development (e.g., conducting organizational assessments or interventions, serving as an arbitrator or expert witness, etc.).

Documentation of Performance. Documents regarding performance to be considered in the Post Tenure Review will include all available annual administrative reviews and peer reviews given during the review period. In addition, the Faculty Member who is being reviewed will submit a file to the Post Tenure Review Committee. While the Faculty Member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the Faculty Member must include, for the review period, the following in the submitted file: (1) lists of all classes taught and class sizes; (2) all available student course evaluations and peer evaluations; (3) a listing of research and scholarship activities, (4) a listing of service activities; (5) a report of accomplishments during any sabbatical leave, and (6) a current vita. Research is to be evaluated by peers outside the Management Area; refereed publications or other reviewed research may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit. The review period will be the period since the Faculty Member's tenure, last Post Tenure Review, or event that provided him/her with the option not to engage in a previously scheduled Post Tenure Review (e.g., review or advancement to a higher position such as Chaired or Distinguished Professor, Full Professor, Associate Professor, Dean, or Associate Dean), whichever is the shorter period.

Procedures

Initiation of Process

The Post Tenure Review process will be initiated annually by a notice from the Dean to the Faculty Members scheduled to be reviewed and to the Program Director. This notice will be given no later than September 1 of the academic year in which the reviews are to take place. Tenured faculty, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions other than dean or associate dean, will be scheduled for review every six years. Faculty Members who have served as Dean or Associate Dean for four or more years, or have held a Chaired or Distinguished Professor position, will be subject to Post Tenure Review no sooner than three years after leaving that position. The Program Director will be reviewed by the Dean in consultation with the Management Area Post Tenure Review Committee.

Option not to be Reviewed

Faculty Members scheduled for review may opt not to be reviewed if, within 30 days of receipt of notice that review is going to take place, they notify the Dean in writing that they are exercising this option for one of the following reasons: (1) They: (a) have been promoted to Full Professor or Associate Professor within the previous six years; (b) have been appointed or reviewed and retained as Dean or Associate Dean within the previous six years; (c) hold a Chaired or Distinguished Professor position; or, (2) They will retire within three years of the date of their scheduled Post Tenure Review. The three-year period for purposes of planned retirement begins at the end of the fiscal year in which the Post Tenure Review would have taken place. Faculty Members who opt not to be reviewed based on their review and advancement or retention in a higher position within six years will next be scheduled for a review six years after the event that provided them with that option. If a Faculty Member opts out of Post Tenure Review in a particular year this will not affect the review schedules of other faculty members.

Post Tenure Review Committee

Reviews will be conducted by a Post Tenure Review Committee composed of all tenured faculty in the Area who are at or above the rank of the person being reviewed,, including those on leave and the Program Director. The Committee shall elect a chair annually. In order to vote with respect to the evaluation of a Faculty Member, a member of the Post Tenure Review Committee must be present either at the meeting in which a vote is taken or, if the vote is to follow meetings in which discussion of the merits of the evaluation takes place, at the last meeting prior to the vote, unless absent for good cause as determined by the Committee. Reviews will be completed by the end of the fiscal year in which they are begun. In no event shall a Faculty Member who is under review serve

as a member of the Post Tenure Review Committee when it is reviewing that Faculty Member.

Post Tenure Review Committee's Report

At the conclusion of its review, the Post Tenure Review Committee will provide to the Faculty Member a written report giving specific evaluative information on the Faculty Member's performance in each of the categories of performance. The evaluation on each category will have been arrived by the method of voting set out above under "Criteria." If the evaluation is either Superior or Satisfactory Overall, this result will be noted in the Faculty Member's personnel file and reported to the Program Director and the Dean.

Procedure When Evaluation is Unsatisfactory Overall

An evaluation of Unsatisfactory Overall will be placed in the Faculty Member's personnel file and forwarded to the Dean, together with the Post Tenure Review Committee's Report. The Post Tenure Review Committee's Report will include recommendations for restoring performance to a Satisfactory level.

A Faculty Member who receives an Unsatisfactory Overall evaluation may, within 30 days after his/her receipt of a Post Tenure Review Committee Report of that finding, appeal this evaluation to the Area Promotion and Tenure Committee, which for this purpose shall not include the Faculty Member being reviewed or the Program Director. The Area Promotion and Tenure Committee as so constituted shall rule on this appeal and notify the Faculty Member of its decision within 30 days of its receipt of the appeal. This decision must be forwarded to the Dean, along with its recommendations and, where one is provided by the Faculty Member, a statement by the Faculty Member, for final determination by the Dean.

Where a Faculty Member is finally determined to receive an Unsatisfactory Overall evaluation a Development Plan will be put together by the Post Tenure Review Committee in consultation with, and with the concurrence of, the Faculty Member. In the event that the Faculty Member and the Post Tenure Review Committee are unable to agree on the content and time frame of the Development Plan, the Dean will make this determination.

Where it is judged to be appropriate, the Post Tenure Review Committee will appoint a Development Committee to assist the Faculty Member in improving his/her performance. The Development Plan will form the basis for evaluation of the Faculty Member's performance until satisfactory performance is achieved in the judgment of the Post Tenure Review Committee and the Dean. Normally, the time line will be not less than one year and not more than three years. The Dean will forward Unsatisfactory Reviews and the associated Development Plans to the Provost.

At the next annual review following the year in which performance has been judged to be Unsatisfactory Overall, the Program Director and the Development Committee, if any, will make an Assessment of the progress of the Faculty Member and forward a report of this to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the Assessment of the Program Director (and Development Committee, if there is one) and state in writing its concurrence or dissent. The Program Director's Assessment and the response of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be sent to the Dean for final determination as to the Faculty Member's progress and whether further measures are necessary. Copies of the Post Tenure Review documents, including Committee decisions, recommendations, Faculty Member statements and Development Plans, Assessments, Committee responses, and determinations, will be permanently retained in the offices of the Dean and Program Director. This process should be engaged in annually during the period of the Development Plan.

Review of Procedures

These Criteria and Procedures for Post Tenure Review will be periodically reviewed, updated and revised based upon the Area's experience with their administration.