

**POST-TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS and PROCEDURES
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA-COLUMBIA**

Post-tenure review is a systematic process for the periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members with permanent tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research and service. The goals of the post-tenure review are (a) to promote and support faculty development and (b) to evaluate faculty productivity. The post-tenure review process respects the basic principles of academic freedom and does not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action described in the Faculty Manual.

The post-tenure review process is not a duplication of the Tenure and Promotion process. The outcome of the post-tenure review process is meant to encourage and promote continued growth and development of tenured faculty who demonstrate their capacity and willingness to perform at appropriate standards or to improve. For tenured faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory, and who fail to improve based on recommendations that are made following the post-tenure review, the result may be the initiation of the tenure termination process as described in the Faculty Manual.

The post-tenure review process must recognize that the nature and extent of responsibilities of tenured faculty change over time; this is particularly true for full professors. The post-tenure review process must, in turn, take into consideration the changing nature of the roles and responsibilities of tenured faculty during the period under review. In general all tenured faculty are expected to be productive in scholarship, teaching, and service throughout their career at the University of South Carolina. In preparing the file for any given cycle of the post-tenure review process, full professors are encouraged to clarify the nature and extent of their responsibilities in each of the foregoing areas (scholarship, teaching, service) and to indicate those areas where the greatest emphasis has been placed during the review period. Recognition and consideration will be given to those areas identified as the areas of greatest concentration.

One of the goals of post-tenure review for tenured Associate Professors in the School of Public Health is to encourage continued growth toward promotion to full professor. However it is possible to receive a 'satisfactory' post-tenure review at the Associate Professor level without making progress toward promotion. In all cases the post-tenure review process is designed to encourage continued growth and development toward new and higher goals for all tenured faculty.

All reviews will be designated as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Faculty with superior post-tenure reviews will be recognized in appropriate ways for their outstanding contributions.

I General Procedures.

The procedures described below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review as established in the *Faculty Manual*. In cases of potential conflict, regulations specified in the *Faculty Manual* take precedence.

II Post-Tenure Review: Faculty Manual Regulations.

A. Eligibility.

1. 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 has been advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., dean, chaired professorship, promotion to full professor, etc). [Faculty Manual, 1998]

2. Post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing of planned retirement within three years of the next scheduled review. [Faculty Manual, 1998]

B. Content.

1. The post-tenure review file must incorporate annual performance reviews accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review. [Faculty Manual, 1998] In all cases, annual performance reviews from the most recent 6 years are to be included.

2. The post-tenure review file must include (a) peer and student evaluations of teaching, (b) evaluation of research/creative activities performed by peers outside the unit (but not necessarily outside the University), (c) an evaluation of service activities, and (d) a current vita. [Adapted from the Faculty Manual, 1998]

3. The post-tenure review file must include detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period.

III The Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Ad Hoc Committees representing the School of Public Health Tenure and Promotion Committee are jointly appointed by the Chair of the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Associate Dean's Office and are responsible for carrying-out the post-tenure review for individual faculty under review. Ad Hoc Committees consist of 3 members; at least 1 member is from the department of the faculty member under review. The remaining members are from other departments within the SPH. Chairs of the Ad Hoc Committees for post-tenure review are selected jointly by the Chair of the TPC and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The chair of the Ad Hoc Committee must be a full professor. Ad Hoc Committees assigned to review full professors consist of full professors only; Ad Hoc Committees reviewing associate professors must include at least

one full professor.

IV Post-Tenure Review: Standards for Full Professors.

The post-tenure review is not meant to be identical to pre-tenure review processes either in procedure or in purpose. Tenured faculty can and should have some level of independence in determining the focus of their activity. They are also required to articulate future goals and directions.

A. General Procedures. Post-tenure review of Full Professors, with minor exceptions, follows current guidelines for Tenure at Full Professor. The evaluation areas parallel those in the tenure and promotion process: teaching, scholarship/research, and service. Tenured full professors are expected to show productivity in all three areas but may present evidence to support the importance of greater activity in one area than **another**.

B. Organization of the Post-Tenure Review File.

The file should include a personal statement and review of the post-tenure review period. The personal statement should address the following:

1. Retrospective Summary. The personal statement should include, in narrative form, a description of the activities undertaken in teaching, research/scholarship, and service in the previous 6 years. An encapsulated, thoughtful overview of the contribution of these activities to the goals and/or functions of the Department, School, University and/or the specific discipline of the faculty member under review (as appropriate) is an important part of the retrospective summary.

2. Prospective View. The personal statement should also provide, in narrative form, the faculty member's future goals as well as developmental needs, and the support that may be needed to assist the faculty member in addressing those needs and goals.

3. Annual Reviews. A copy of the annual reviews for the most recent six years should be included and placed at the back of the file.

4. Sabbatical Report. A report including detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period must be included and should be placed at the end of the file.

V Post-Tenure Review: Standards for Associate Professors.

A. General Procedures. Post-tenure review of Associate Professors follows current guidelines for Tenure at Associate Professor. Copies of Annual Reviews since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review should be

included along with a detailed report of the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period.

B. Organization of the Post-Tenure Review File.

The file should include a personal statement and review of the post-tenure review period. The personal statement should address the following.

1. Retrospective Summary. The personal statement should include, in narrative form, a description of the activities undertaken in teaching, research/scholarship, and service in the previous 6 years. An encapsulated, thoughtful overview of the potential contribution of these activities to the goals and/or functions of the Department, School, University and/or the specific discipline of the faculty member under review (as appropriate) is an important part of the retrospective summary.

2. Prospective View. The personal statement should also provide, in narrative form, the faculty member's perspective of future goals as well as developmental needs, and the support that may be needed to assist the faculty member in addressing those needs and goals.

3. Annual Reviews. A copy of the annual reviews for the most recent six years should be included and placed at the back of the file.

4. Sabbatical Report. A report including detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the pre-review period must be included and placed at the end of the file.

VI Criteria for Evaluating Productivity.

Criteria for evaluating productivity are similar to those established for awarding tenure at the appropriate rank (full or associate professor).

A. Teaching Productivity.

The following must be included in post-tenure review materials:

1. a list of courses taught and number of students involved for at least the past 3 years;
2. a peer review of classroom performance by a faculty member external to the department of the individual under review;
3. a summary by an outside reviewer of student responses to teaching performance; and
4. number of advisees (undergraduate, masters, doctoral);

5. number of master's projects, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations chaired;
6. number of practica and residencies directed;
7. number of master's projects, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations served on as committee member;
8. information from as many of the following categories as appropriate:
 - a. presentation of course syllabi and other course materials for 2 or more courses;
 - b. evidence of student learning in the form of papers, theses, etc.;
 - c. teaching-related service;
 - d. awards/honors for outstanding teaching
 - e. new courses developed;
 - f. new laboratory or class manuals developed;
 - g. revision of courses, etc.

B. Scholarship/Research Productivity.

The following evidence of scholarship/research productivity must be addressed in the retrospective narrative and included in post-tenure review materials:

1. publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals;**
2. publication of (1) professional articles in high level field-appropriate journals; (2) book(s) or edited series within the post-tenure review period;
3. funding of research grants during the post-tenure review period;
4. submission of research grants during the post-tenure review period;
5. presentation of research at regional, national or international meetings;
6. facilitating/supporting the development of the research potential of junior faculty;

7. in addition, other research-related activities (activities that stimulate research within the department, school and/or university) should be included.

Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- a. serving on a board or consortium whose focus is to develop and support opportunities for research within the University community;
- b. organizing interdisciplinary groups with an emphasis/interest in research in a specific field with the purpose of promoting development and submission of research grants;
- c. reviewer for peer-reviewed publications and/or grant proposals for journals and/or agencies of high level quality;
- d. awards/honors recognizing outstanding research activity.

**Refereed publications or other reviewed research/creative activities may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit. [Faculty Manual, 1998]

C. Service.

The guidelines established for tenure at the level of full professor in the School of Public Health provide the general basis for the evaluation of service productivity in the post-tenure review process. In the service category, full professors may select 2 of the 3 subcategories as the primary focus for service review. The subcategories include: (a) service to the University, School and Department, (b) service to or in professional activities, and (c) service in or to the community. The standards for each of the subcategories are given below: Associate professors are to address all three categories.

1. **Service to the University, School, and Department.** The individual should **provide evidence of** the service provided and its impact on the University, School or Department (whichever is appropriate). The following are some examples of service in this category.
 - a. contributions to Departmental, School and University Committees;
 - b. special responsibilities at the University, School and Department levels;

- c. honors or awards for outstanding contributions in the field;
- d. general mentoring and development of junior faculty;
- e. providing student advice and counseling beyond the regular demands for registration;
- f. contributing to cross-departmental program development or implementation.

2. Service to or in Professional Groups/Activities. The individual should provide evidence of the service provided to professional groups/organizations and its impact on the profession, University, School, or Department (whichever is appropriate). The following are examples of professional service activities that may be included.

- a. service as an officer in state, regional, national or international professional organizations;
- b. honors or awards for outstanding contributions in the field;
- c. presentation of non-research workshops, institutes, seminars etc. for professionals in related fields;
- d. participation in planning activities of professional societies and scientific meetings;
- e. consulting with appropriate professional groups;
- f. assistance in the development of educational programs in other institutions.

3. Service in or to the Community. The individual should provide evidence of the service undertaken and its impact on the community, University, School, or Department (whichever is appropriate). The following are some examples of community service that may be included.

- a. non-paid consultation service to government, business, industry and community agencies;
- b. honors or awards for outstanding contributions in the field;
- c. service on advisory boards, commissions, accrediting groups, etc.;

d. speaking to community groups, holding clinics etc in the area of the individual's professional interest and expertise;

e. conducting ongoing services for specific community needs (e.g. programs for the elderly, for children, etc.).

VII Standards for Superior, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory Reviews.

A. Superior Performance. *Superior performance means performance at the highest level for the current rank of the individual under review and is defined as 'Excellent' by the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the School of Public Health.*

B. Satisfactory Performance. *Satisfactory performance is performance that meets the expectations of the School of Public Health for the current rank of the individual under review and is defined as 'Good' by the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for the School of Public Health.*

C. Unsatisfactory Performance. *Unsatisfactory performance is performance, taken as a whole, that fails to meet accepted standards of the School of Public Health for the current rank of the individual under review and is defined as 'Poor' by the current Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the School of Public Health.*

PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING THE POST-TENURE REVIEW
School of Public Health
University of South Carolina

I General Procedures.

A. The post-tenure review occurs early in the spring semester of each academic year. Faculty are reviewed on activities for the previous 6 years.

B. One-sixth of all tenured faculty (exceptions noted previously) undergo post-tenure review each year. Those with the longest period of non-review (regardless of rank) enter the cycle first.

C. A disk with the post-tenure review form is provided to each departmental administrative assistant; this form must be used in submitting information for the post-tenure review. The form is based on the School of Public Health Post-Tenure Review guidelines. (See Appendix A)

II Time line and Notification of Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review.

A. Faculty are notified by the Office of the Dean at least six months in advance that the post-tenure review file is due to the Department Chair on a specified date;

B. Faculty submit files in the spring of the 7th+ year after the previous review;

C. Files are transferred from the Department Chair's office to the office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs within two weeks after the original due date;

III Formulation and Responsibilities of Ad Hoc Committees.

A. Ad Hoc committees for each faculty under review are jointly appointed by the Chair of the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; Ad Hoc Committees are responsible for carrying out the post-tenure review;

B. Ad Hoc committees consist of 3 members; at least 1 member is from the department of the candidate being reviewed; the remaining members are from other departments within the SPH;

C. Chairs of the Ad Hoc committee for post-tenure review panels are selected jointly by the Chair of the TPC and the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; the Ad Hoc committee chair must be a full professor;

D. Ad Hoc committees assigned to review full professors consist of full

professors only; Ad Hoc committees reviewing associate professors must include at least one full professor. *Note, in the case of a full professor under review with no full professor from the home department available to serve on the Ad Hoc committee, a tenured Associate Professor from the department of the individual under review shall be appointed to serve on the committee;*

E. The Ad Hoc Committees have a minimum of two weeks to review assigned files; it is the responsibility of the Ad Hoc Committees to report the outcomes of their reviews to the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee;

F. Integral to all reviews is a working knowledge of the SPH Post-Tenure Review guidelines;

G. The Ad Hoc Committee reviews the file of assigned faculty and by a two-thirds vote indicates superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory for each of the areas of research, teaching and service. The Ad Hoc Committee formulates a draft document (prepared in writing by the Ad Hoc Committee Chair) which describes the performance of the faculty member in each area under review; if the review is poor or unsatisfactory in any one or more areas under consideration, a specific plan to support and promote development in that area (s) must be included;

H. If two of the three areas under review are unsatisfactory, the overall review is considered unsatisfactory and a copy of the review is forwarded to the provost's office; if only one area is unsatisfactory, the overall review is considered 'satisfactory with qualifications' and is maintained within the School of Public Health;

I. At the time of the first subsequent annual review, progress toward meeting the goals of the developmental plan will be assessed; final evaluation of the achievement of goals of the developmental plan will take place during the second or third annual review process depending upon the evidence of progress to date. If at the time of the second or third annual review (whichever is appropriate), satisfactory accomplishment of the goals of the developmental plan has not been demonstrated, either of the conditions described in H above may lead to recommendation for termination of tenure. See Section VII-D-9, 10.

IV Post-Tenure Review Meeting.

A. A post-tenure review meeting for the Tenure and Promotion Committee is set by the Chair of the TPC and the Associate Dean;

B. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee presents the draft summary letter to the

appropriate membership of the TPC in the form of a detailed summary;

C. After review and commentary by members of the TPC, the summary letter may be revised; revisions are carried-out by the Ad Hoc Committee chair ;

D. After the summary letter is approved by the TPC, a copy of the letter and the post-tenure review file is forwarded by the Chair of the TPC to the Dean and to the Department Chair.

V The Dean and Department Chair Reviews.

A. The Chair, independent of the Dean, reviews the summary letter and the post-tenure review file and indicates in writing concurrence or disagreement;

B. The Dean reviews the summary letter and the post-tenure review file and indicates in writing concurrence or disagreement;

C. In the case of disagreement, the Dean, Department Chair, Ad Hoc Committee Chair, and Chair of the SPH TPC shall discuss areas of disagreement and resolve differences; the Dean makes the final decision as to the content of the summary letter and developmental plan.

VI Superior and Satisfactory Reviews.

A. If the outcome of the post-tenure is superior or satisfactory, a copy of the document is forwarded to the faculty member and a copy is placed in the faculty's personnel file;

B. The form of recognition for achieving superior review is finalized;

C. The process is then complete.

VII Unsatisfactory Reviews.

A. If the review is unsatisfactory and the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations, he/she may appeal to the local TPC in general or in any particular (Faculty Manual, 1998);

B. The findings of the TPC, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member, is forwarded to the dean for final determination of the evaluation (Faculty Manual, 1998);

C. A copy of the unsatisfactory review and the associated developmental plan are also forwarded to the Office of the Provost (Faculty Manual, 1998);

D. In general the following procedures are pursued:

1. The Chair of the TPC forwards a copy of the final post-tenure review summary letter and developmental plan to the Chair of the Department;
3. The Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, reviews and discusses the 'development' plan. The discussion must (1) specify the steps to be taken to move to a satisfactory review; (2) provide information about how support will be provided for taking those steps; and (3) indicate the time line (*generally 1 to 2 years and in no case to exceed 3 years*) for meeting the recommended steps in the plan;
4. At the time of subsequent annual reviews, a follow-up review which involves an assessment of the progress of the faculty member in meeting the developmental plan is completed by the TPC; the outcome of this review is forwarded to members of the School of Public Health's TPC, to the Dean and to the Department Chair;
5. The Department Chair indicates in writing the following: (a) agreement or disagreement with the follow-up review by the TPC; (b) specification of whether or not additional time is required to comply with the plan; and (c) indication of whether or not some modification needs to be made in the plan and if so what that modification should be. This letter is forwarded to the Dean, the TPC and the faculty member;
6. If the faculty member does not agree with the follow-up review, he/she may request a consultation with the Dean;
7. The Dean makes the final determination on progress or lack thereof and whether or not further measures may be necessary (Faculty Manual, 1998);
8. If the plan has been fully complied with, the performance of the faculty member is deemed satisfactory, and a letter from the Dean to this effect is forwarded to the faculty member and a copy is placed in the faculty member's personnel file;
9. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination of tenure (Faculty Manual, 1998-1999);
10. If proceedings for termination of tenure are recommended, standards and procedures for termination of tenured faculty, as described in the Faculty Manual (1998), are followed.

2/25/99