

Department of Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Languages and Literatures

Post-Tenure Review Guidelines

Draft 2-23-99

0. Introduction

The Department of Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Languages and Literatures, in accordance with the post-tenure review policy established by the University, seeks to create an atmosphere that allows faculty members to achieve the professional goals they have set for themselves and assures that faculty continue to make a contribution to the Department's missions of teaching, scholarship, and service. This policy document is based on the following principles: 1. Post-tenure review is aimed at faculty development, not accountability; 2. The post-tenure review should be conducted so as to protect academic freedom *and* the quality of education; and 3. The system of post-tenure review must be periodically evaluated as to its effectiveness in enhancing faculty development and redressing faculty performance.

It is understood that post-tenure review involves expectations that define acceptable performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. It is applied to senior faculty whose careers may have emphasized one or another of these areas, so a holistic assessment of those individuals' overall contribution to the Department's mission must be part of any review. The procedure outlined below is intended to recognize superior performance, assure that all faculty maintain a satisfactory level of contribution, and provide those faculty whose performance is rated unsatisfactory an opportunity to improve.

1. General procedures and calendar

The general procedures for post-tenure review described below are in accordance with 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.

2. Time period

The timing for post-tenure review is based on the date of tenure. Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, will be reviewed every six years unless, during the preceding six year period (including the current year), the faculty member has been 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 year of the next scheduled review. For the first cycle of reviews, the relevant time period under examination is from the date of tenure or the date of last promotion up to the present. During this initial review, particular emphasis will be placed on faculty performance during the preceding six years. Subsequent reviews will be done on a six year cycle.

3. Criteria

Tenured faculty are to discharge the duties associated with their position conscientiously and with professional competence. Their contributions will be evaluated in three main areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. In keeping with a holistic approach, it is anticipated that some candidates will have greater contributions in one area than the other two. There must be some flexibility in the evaluation of the separate areas. General evaluations must thus take the overall contribution of each candidate into account. This being said, let it be noted that each candidate is expected to perform well in the area of teaching.

The minimum Departmental standards in each area are as follows:

Teaching: positive student course evaluations and peer reviews of teaching.

Scholarship: a record of publication appropriate for the candidate, depending upon field of specialization, rank, and service assignments.

Service: service commensurate with rank, teaching responsibilities, and scholarship.

4. Evidence of performance

4.1. Teaching

Teaching effectiveness is to be demonstrated with student course evaluations and written peer reviews of teaching. Other evidence may include undergraduate or graduate advising and mentoring, successful supervision of theses or dissertations, awards for teaching, development of new courses, or leadership in curriculum changes.

4.2. Scholarship

Quality of scholarship is assessed through the peer review process, most notably publications in peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed presses. Such publications are considered to be evidence which has been reviewed outside the unit. Other activities constituting scholarly activity include editing of scholarship, development of instructional materials, creative work, and literary or other translation. Presentations at regional, national, or international scholarly conferences are also to be taken as evidence of scholarly activity. Published reviews of one's work, awards for papers, presentations, or books show quality in scholarship.

4.3. Service

Service activity takes a variety of forms and may benefit the Department, interdepartmental programs, the College, the University, the profession, or the community. Service to the profession

may take the form of membership on editorial boards and editorship of journals; work for state, regional, national, or international scholarly associations; and active participation at professional meetings. Service to the community entails a broad range of activities related in some way to the profession.

5. Procedure

5.1. Post-tenure review file

The materials to be submitted document performance for the preceding six year period (including the current year to the extent possible).

1. Current curriculum vitae
2. Annual reports
3. Annual performance evaluations
4. Summaries of student course evaluations
5. Peer evaluations of teaching (minimum of two)
6. Copies of publications
7. Optional personal statement
8. Sabbatical Report

5.2. Review committee

The post-tenure review will be conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTR committee). The committee will consist of three tenured faculty members at the rank of full or associate professor elected by a vote of all tenured faculty members each year. Candidates may be evaluated only by colleagues of equal or higher rank. One member to be elected by the committee will serve as the committee chair. The Department chair cannot be a member of the committee. When there is an insufficient number of full professors in the Department to constitute a PTR committee for a given candidate, the tenured faculty, in consultation with the candidate, will assemble a list of five potential PTR committee members from other departments within the College of Liberal Arts. The Department chair will make the final selection of PTR committee members from the list.

5.3. Assessment

The PTR committee will examine the candidate's file. The committee will provide a written evaluation, indicating superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory overall performance and evaluations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The review should be sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development. The Department chair will receive the committee's review and all materials submitted by the candidate. The Department

chair will make a separate written evaluation and may request that the committee reevaluate the candidate. The committee is under no obligation to change its evaluation.

6. Outcome

Candidates will be rated overall and in the three areas of performance, according to Departmental standards (see above). The overall evaluation is to be determined independently of the evaluations in the individual areas. In case of disagreement, the majority's opinion will be reflected in each evaluation. No evaluation can be recorded without a majority. Overall evaluations and evaluations in each of the three areas, by both the PTR committee and the Department chair, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

6.1. Superior review

Performance truly above and beyond Departmental standards will receive a superior rating. Any faculty member who receives a superior evaluation in a post-tenure review may receive a permanent merit increase to base pay as determined by the provost, in addition to any annual raise.

6.2. Satisfactory review

Performance generally in line with Departmental standards will receive a satisfactory rating. Any faculty member receiving a satisfactory rating is to be congratulated on a job well done. It is expected that most faculty members will receive this rating overall and in the individual areas.

6.3. Unsatisfactory review

Performance considered to be significantly below Departmental standards will receive an unsatisfactory rating. It is possible to appeal an unsatisfactory evaluation overall or in any area (see below). If an unsatisfactory rating is upheld, it entails the formulation of a development plan to improve the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level (see below).

7. Appeal

Candidates must address the appeal of an unsatisfactory review to the PTR committee and it must be delivered within one month of receipt of the decision. The chair will mediate all appeals cases.

The appeal must be considered and a response must be sent within one month of receipt. In case of a second unsatisfactory evaluation, candidates may appeal to the chair, and only then to the dean of the College. Intent to appeal to the dean must be preceded by written notice given to the De-

partment chair. The evaluation of the PTR committee and the chair will accompany the appeal to the dean.

8. Development plan

If an unsatisfactory review has been upheld, a development plan to rectify the situation must be formulated by the individual under review in consultation with a single representative of the PTR committee. The representative is to be proposed by the committee and approved by the candidate. If no acceptable candidate is available within the Department, the committee in consultation with the candidate will seek a suitable colleague from outside the Department. The chair has final approval over the selection. The plan must be submitted to the committee for approval. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the provost.

The plan must contain specific criteria for improvement to meet the goals established for the candidate's rank, in accordance with the terms of employment. These criteria must be realistic, and a clear time frame for accomplishment of the goals must also be specified. The time frame is to be no less than one year, but no more than three years, depending on the type of improvement specified in the plan. Progress toward these goals will be evaluated in subsequent annual performance reviews.