

April 23, 2018

**School of the Earth, Ocean and Environment  
Post-Tenure Review Criteria and Procedures  
2018**

**I. General Procedures and Calendar**

The procedures given below are in compliance with the post-tenure review policy outlined in the University *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the policies set forth in the University *Faculty Manual*, the university *Faculty Manual* shall take precedence.

The post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

**II. Time Period**

Every tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, will be reviewed every six years in accordance with university policies. As noted in the *Faculty Manual*, tenured faculty in administrative positions will be reviewed by their immediate supervisors. The Director will be evaluated by the College of Arts & Sciences Dean in consultation with the unit. Exceptions are granted for faculty who were reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position during the previous six-year period. This includes promotion to full professor, a chaired professorship or a competitively advertised deanship. Extensions of Post-tenure reviews may be granted only through formal requests following University and College policies. 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.

**III. Criteria**

Tenured faculty are to maintain their contributions in three general areas: teaching and mentoring; research and scholarship; and professional/university service. Post-tenure review is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. The primary function of post-tenure review is faculty development. The SEOE encourages our faculty to pursue the professional path that best suits their evolving interests. Thus, the SEOE Criteria are intended to allow for the broad range of paths that our faculty may choose to follow as their professional career evolves rather than impose a strict list of quantifiable measures. Faculty should meet the minimum expectations in two of the three areas to receive a **satisfactory** rating. A **superior** rating is given if faculty meet expectations in all three areas and significantly exceed the minimum expectations in two of these areas. An **unsatisfactory** rating is given to faculty who do not meet the minimum expectations in at least two of these areas.

## **A. Teaching and Mentoring.**

Teaching performance should be evaluated in three areas:

Classroom Teaching, assessed by:

1. Ratings on classroom peer reviews of teaching.
2. Rankings on student evaluations of teaching.
3. Receipt of competitive award(s) for teaching.

Student Mentoring, assessed by:

1. Mentoring and research supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate students.

Educational Improvement, measured by:

1. Organization of programs to improve the quality of undergraduate and/or graduate instruction.
2. Receipt of external funding for teaching improvement or development programs.

Minimum expectations, resulting in a Satisfactory rating, in this category include:

Consistently rated Good or above in Overall Performance in Peer Reviews of Teaching.  
Usually rated within one standard deviation of average student evaluations in comparable courses.

A Superior rating may be obtained by meeting the minimum expectations and demonstrating outstanding performance in two of the three categories in Teaching and Mentoring.

Outstanding performance can be demonstrated by:

Classroom Teaching: Receipt of a competitive teaching award.

Research Supervision: Graduation as major advisor of approximately one graduate student per year during the review period. Disciplines within the SEOE with active, large graduate programs may give preference to PhD degrees. Supervision of undergraduate students who complete a written senior thesis, submit a paper for publication in a peer reviewed journal [or similar professional achievement], or present a paper at a national meeting may be considered in lieu of the graduate student production.

Educational Improvement: Evidence of multiple instances of the two measures during the review period.

## **B. Research and Scholarship.**

Measures of scholarship can include:

1. Publication of refereed journal articles, book chapters or other scholarly works. The impact of the contribution to the discipline (citation indices, active paper presentations at regional, national or international scholarly meetings) is additional evidence that can be used to demonstrate scholarly contribution.
2. Extramural grant activity where appropriate.
3. Local, national or international awards or prizes.
4. Invitations to present research and scholarship at national and international meetings and seminars, colloquia or workshop participation at research universities, research centers, or government labs.

A **satisfactory** rating will require regular publication of scholarly works, and/or documented progress on longer research monographs/case studies, and/or presentations at regional, national, or international scholarly meetings, and/or demonstration of high citation rates over the review period for publications, and/or extramural grant activity where appropriate. At least some activity in categories 3 and 4 is anticipated.

A **superior** rating in scholarship will require consistently outstanding performance in categories 1 and 2 (as appropriate to the field) and in at least one of the remaining categories.

Outstanding performance in each category may be demonstrated by:

Category 1: Publications in refereed journals at a rate of 1.5 publications per year and/or one or more major research monographs/case studies.

Category 2: Continuous external funding (where appropriate) during the review period.

Category 3: Receipt of a local, national or international award or prize.

Category 4: Invited presentations meeting the criteria on an annual basis.

## **C. Professional/University Service.**

Measures of professional/university service can include:

1. Participation in University, College, and School governance, committee service, administration, student recruitment, etc., commensurate with rank.
2. Demonstrated professional service activity at the regional, national or international level, including:
  - a. Election or appointment to committees or offices of professional societies, research consortia or other national or international organizations, including the organizing of international or national scientific meeting or workshops.

- b. Membership on editorial boards or editorship of major journals, or review of manuscripts for major journals.
- c. Service on proposal review panels for funding agencies.
- d. Service to the K-12 education system and/or the state business/industry community.
- e. Solicited testimony or consultation based on scholarly work for legislative bodies, agencies, non-governmental organizations, etc.
- f. Media interviews, publication of op-eds, blogs or other public dissemination of scholarly work.

A **satisfactory** rating will require a consistent record of service in any combination of the above categories.

A **superior** rating in service will require a substantial record of service in one of the above areas and satisfactory service the other area. Such a rating should be supported by written documents.

#### **IV. Procedures.**

##### **A. Creating the Post-tenure Review file**

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 s/he believes to be pertinent, the file must include specific material for the entire period since the previous post-tenure review (or qualifying promotion, professorship, chairmanship, or deanship) including any approved extension of the review. Under normal circumstances, the period covered is the previous six years. The specific material required is:

- 1. Curriculum vitae.
- 2. Official sabbatical reports, if applicable.

Teaching:

- 3. A listing of all courses taught in the previous six years.
- 4. Copies of teaching evaluations.
- 5. Peer evaluations of teaching for the previous six years.

Scholarship:

- 6. A listing of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous six years.

Service:

- 7. A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous six years.

Optional:

- 8. Personal statement not to exceed three pages.

The SEOE (or academic unit if previous review documents are held there prior to the SEOE becoming a tenure home) will provide the following to the post-tenure review file:

- 9. Copies of annual performance evaluations and activity reports.
- 10. Copies of previous post-tenure reviews, if applicable.

11. Copies of previous development plans, if applicable.

### **B. Review Committee**

The evaluation of faculty members shall begin in SEOE. Faculty members holding joint appointments with other units shall follow procedures established in the University *Faculty Manual* and College policies. The post-tenure review will be conducted by the Director and the SEOE Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee. The T&P Chair will make the file available to all tenured faculty of the appropriate rank (Associate and Full Professors for evaluation of Associate, Full Professors for evaluation of Full) in the school and solicit input from them. In the remainder of this document, the term “committee” refers to the subset of the SEOE T&P Committee who are eligible to participate in the review. The committee chair is the T&P Committee Chair.

The committee will examine the candidate’s file for supporting documentation. The committee chair shall write a letter to the SEOE Director providing the committee’s assessment of the faculty member’s performance relative to the evaluation criteria. The letter shall give recommended ratings in Teaching, Research and Service and an Overall rating as determined by a majority vote of the committee. The SEOE Director shall consider the committee’s assessment and write a letter to the Dean making a final determination of the Overall rating of the faculty member. The faculty member will be given copies of both the committee letter and the Director’s letter and the letters will be permanently retained by the office of the SEOE Director and the office of the Dean.

## **V. Outcome**

### **A. A Superior Review**

A superior evaluation will be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file if the Dean concurs with the assessment.

### **B. A Satisfactory Review**

A satisfactory evaluation will be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file if unit or the dean assesses the faculty member’s performance as at least satisfactory.

### **C. An Unsatisfactory Review**

If the committee determines, by a simple majority vote, that the overall performance of a faculty member is unsatisfactory, the committee must prepare recommendations that could help restore the faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level. The committee report and recommendations shall be shared with the faculty member, who may appeal by submitting a written statement outlining the basis for disagreeing with the review or recommendations. The committee report, any recommendations, and any faculty statement shall be forwarded to the Dean through the SEOE Director. If the Dean concurs with the unsatisfactory evaluation, it will be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file. The faculty member will then be subject to the procedures set forth in the Faculty Manual:

Following consultation with the faculty member and with the faculty member's concurrence, the unit shall establish a development plan designed to restore the faculty member's overall performance to a satisfactory level. The plan shall include the appointment of a unit development committee to assist the faculty member in improving performance. The unit chair following consultation with the faculty member shall appoint the unit development committee prior to development of the overall plan. This development committee will have the responsibility for developing the plan in consultation with the faculty member. The members of the unit development committee must hold a rank equal to or higher than the faculty member. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored.

In the event that the faculty member consults with the unit development committee but does not concur with the development committee's proposed development plan, both the faculty member and the unit development committee shall submit proposed development plans to the dean for final determination of the plan. In the event that the faculty member refuses to consult with the unit development committee in designing a development plan, the unit development committee will write the plan and forward the plan to the dean.

After the implementation of a development plan and until the dean determines that the faculty's member's overall performance has been restored to a satisfactory level, the faculty member's annual review will include an assessment by the unit chair and the development committee of the progress that the faculty member has made under the development plan. This assessment will be forwarded to the unit tenure and promotion committee. The unit tenure and promotion committee will review the assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. The assessment and the unit tenure and promotion committee's response 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.

*Approved by a vote of the tenured faculty with tenure homes in the School of the Earth, Ocean & Environment on April 19, 2018. 11 faculty voted yes, 1 no, 1 abstain, and 1 faculty member did not vote.*