

1 **ARTICLE 8D: POST-TENURE REVIEW**

2
3 Article 8D establishes procedures for post-tenure reviews for faculty.

4
5 **Section 1. Purpose of Faculty Reviews**

6
7 Through Post-Tenure Faculty Reviews the University considers whether a faculty member performs to the
8 standards of the University during tenure. Post-tenure reviews occur at regular intervals after the award of
9 tenure. Post-tenure reviews provide an opportunity to: 1) reflect on post-tenure accomplishments and
10 professional growth; 2) receive feedback; 3) identify professional development opportunities; and 4)
11 improve performance, when necessary.

12
13 Post-tenure reviews occur every three years for Associate Professors and every five years for Full
14 Professors.

15
16 **Section 2. Standard for post-tenure faculty**

17
18 Achievement of the standards associated with each type of review is an academic judgment made by
19 Personnel Review Committees (Divisional and, if appropriate, University), Deans, Provost, and the
20 President.

21
22 Standard for Post-Tenure Review: The acceptance of the University's award of tenure commits the
23 faculty member to continued active engagement in teaching, scholarship and service. In any given
24 year, post-tenure faculty may elect to concentrate their energies on one area more than another but
25 is expected to continue to meet the expectations of a tenured faculty member in their overall
26 performance in all three areas.

27
28 **Section 3. Resources for Faculty with Tenure**

29
30 The University supports faculty in understanding expectations and procedures, and in planning for and
31 documenting their accomplishments in pursuit of continued post-tenure excellence.

- 32
33
- 34 • The Division Chair, or designee, will assist faculty in finding answers to questions they have
about expectations and procedures related to review;
 - 35 • Each year, tenure-track faculty submit an Annual Faculty Report to their Division Chair by
36 June 30. Annual Faculty Reports include, at a minimum, an updated CV, a summary of
37 accomplishments during the past year, a summary of progress towards meeting previously
38 stated goals, and new goals for the coming year.
 - 39 • The Division Chair will review the Annual Faculty Report and use it to support faculty in
40 meeting teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service requirements.
- 41

42 **Section 4. The Faculty Review File and Evidence Presented for Faculty Review**

43
44 Tenured faculty are responsible for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service, and are expected to
45 provide, in their Faculty Review File, evidence of accomplishment in each area.

46
47 **A. Contents of Faculty Review File**

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93

All Review Files must, at a minimum, include:

- A current Curriculum Vitae (CV);
- Annual Faculty Reports since the previous review period;
- A report from at least one peer observation of classroom or online teaching for the most recent review period;
- Data from the mutually agreed upon student course evaluation instrument (SCEI*), provided by the University.
- For Library Faculty review files, peer and supervisor evaluations in core areas of librarianship should be submitted instead of the peer observation report and SCEI data.

B. Evidence Presented for Faculty Review

1. Evidence of effective teaching includes:

- List of classes taught by term during review period;
- Teaching Philosophy;
- Presentation of and reflection on sample syllabi from a range of courses over time (including content, organization and methods of evaluation) to demonstrate evolution of approach;
- Exams, major assignments and other assessment methods from a range of courses;
- Original instructional materials;
- Contributions to course design, development, or improvement;
- Examples of curriculum redesigns and refinements over time;
- Reflections on evidence of teaching effectiveness (i.e., impact of teaching on student learning and achievement);
- Peer and supervisor evaluation and observation reports;
- Comparative data from the mutually agreed upon student course evaluation instrument (SCEI), provided by the University;
- Professional development and updating skills and knowledge related to instruction;
- Reflections on mentoring and oversight of student scholarship or service learning;
- Additional evidence of instructional success.
- *Any survey not mutually agreed upon, along with any results/data derived from such questions and surveys, is not to be used for purposes of official review unless a member chooses to include it.

2. Evidence of effective librarianship includes:

- Peer and supervisor evaluations in core areas of librarianship;
- Programmatic documents and contributions to library products and services;
- Sample instructional materials;
- Data from student or faculty ratings of performance in core areas of librarianship;
- Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on student learning and academic success;
- Reflections on evidence of impact of librarianship on faculty scholarship;
- Evidence of professional development and updating of skills and knowledge;
- Personal philosophy of librarianship;
- Examples of innovations and improvements in provision of library services and products over time.

94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140

3. Evidence of scholarship

In the spirit of Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), one’s “scholarship” may be manifested in one or more of the following venues:

- Scholarship of discovery — investigative research and creative work of faculty in liberal, visual and performing arts;
- Scholarship of integration — scholarship connecting within and between disciplines;
- Scholarship of application — study of real world or societal problems;
- Scholarship of teaching — instructional and classroom research;

Regardless of the type of scholarship, all members’ work is carefully assessed, with intellectual rigor and excellence, the yardstick by which all four types of scholarship are measured.

While scholarship can look quite different across members, it cannot be absent as it is the core of academic life. All members must be knowledgeable of developments in their fields, remaining professionally active. All members will be held to the highest standards of integrity in every aspect of their work.

- a. The *Scholarship of Discovery* refers to the search for new knowledge and answers the questions: “What is to be known? What is yet to be found?”

Evidence for this type of scholarship may include scholarly and creative activities that involve clear goals, preparation, appropriate methods, results, and presentation on the part of the faculty as indicated by: a published book, scholarly monograph, article, book review, or essay, performed work or practice in the fine arts; a paper presented at a scholarly meeting at regional, national or international levels; creation of a process, machine, composition that leads to a patent; creation of a scholarly, artistic or scientific procedure or method; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; and positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

- b. The *Scholarship of Integration* refers to serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together and bring new insight to bear on original research including interdisciplinary connections.

Evidence for such scholarship may include interpretation of original research; the authoring or coauthoring of peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, and integrative reviews of the literature; interdisciplinary grant awards or presentations; policy papers designed to influence organizations and governments; first research at the boundaries where field converge; and the illumination of knowledge into a larger context including the education of non-specialists.

- c. The *Scholarship of Application* moves the scholar towards engagement answering the question - How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?

Evidence for such scholarship may include the application of one’s academic expertise to problems affecting individuals, institutions, or society; peer-reviewed

141 publications of research, case studies, or technical applications, grant awards in support of
142 practice; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner; and
143 professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials.

- 144
145 d. The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* involves planning, assessing, and modifying one's
146 teaching and applying to it the same exacting standards of evaluation that are used in
147 research.

148
149 Evidence for such scholarship may include peer-reviewed publications of research
150 related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes; case studies related to teaching-
151 learning; learning theory development; and development or testing of educational models or
152 theories; accreditation or other comprehensive program reports; successful applications of
153 technology to teaching and learning; state, regional, national, or international recognition as a
154 scholar in an identified area; published textbooks or other learning aids; grant awards in
155 support of teaching and learning; outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
156 presentations related to teaching and learning.

157
158 4. Evidence of service

159
160 Service refers to both institutional service (collegiality, service, and leadership within the
161 department, college, and/or institution) and professional service (engagement and leadership
162 within the community, government, or private organizations as well as professional
163 organizations). All faculty are expected to be involved in institutional service and to demonstrate
164 such accomplishments.

165
166 **Section 5. Preparation and Submission of Faculty Review File**

167
168 Reviews are initiated by the faculty member's timely submission of their Faculty Review File as described by
169 this Article. Faculty are responsible for preparing and submitting their Review Files according to University
170 and Division procedures. Review Files must address the standard for post-tenure review (Section 2 above),
171 and provide evidence of performance and accomplishment (Section 5 above).

172
173 Members with assignments in more than one academic Division are responsible for Review File submission
174 in all areas of assignment. All records relevant to consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including
175 recommendations, will be sent to the member's primary tenure home DPRC, which will act in accordance
176 with the provisions of this Article. The recommendation of the member's primary division will prevail.

177
178 Members are responsible for submitting files to their Division Chair by the 4th Friday in February.

179
180 Extension of the post-tenure review deadline may be granted by the appropriate college dean upon written
181 request. If an extension is granted, the due date of the Review File from the DPRC to the Dean will be
182 delayed to no later than the second Friday in February.

183
184 **Section 6. Additional Procedures**

185
186 Members:

- 187
- Will receive written copies of reviews at every level in a timely fashion;

- Will meet with their divisional DPRC or its representatives to receive and discuss the review in a timely fashion;
- Have the right to provide a rebuttal to any review within 10 days of receipt of the review; the rebuttal becomes a permanent part of the file;
- Have the right to grieve violations of procedures related to post-tenure review.

Section 7. Reviews that Indicate Faculty Member Does Not Meet Expectations

If a post-tenure review finds that the faculty member does not meet expectations in any area(s) identified in Appendix G, including collegiality, the University will provide the member a written report containing explicit suggestions, guidelines and a timeframe for improvement. The Provost will provide the DPRC with copies of the deans and provost level letters. Subsequent reviews will assess whether adequate improvements have been made in the areas identified and the time frame specified.

Section 8. University Responsibilities to the Post-tenure Review Process

A. Orientation

All divisions are encouraged to provide their faculty with written guidance regarding: (1) the unique, area-specific expectations or standards for teaching/librarianship, scholarship and service within the division, and (2) any specific types of documentary evidence of performance reflecting the requirements of Section 4 above;

Early in the fall term, the Provost reviews the purpose and intent of review at each stage, the roles and responsibilities of the Personnel Review Committees, the timelines and review criteria and address questions on any of the University's faculty review policies with academic deans, division chairs, chairs and members of the various Personnel Review Committees, and representatives from the Union.

B. Convening Personnel Review Committees

1. Division Personnel Review Committee

Each academic year, each division will establish a Personnel Review Committee comprised of the Division Chair and a representative group of at least two additional tenured members. The Division Chair will serve as a voting and participating member of the DPRC, but will recuse themselves from discussion or voting on their own applications. Members who are applying for promotion must abstain from service on the DPRC in the year their own application for promotion is being reviewed. If the Division cannot seat at least three members of the DPRC, the Dean will ask the Division faculty to recommend tenured faculty from their Divisions to serve as an outside member of the DPRC. The Dean will make the final appointment of outside members to the DPRC.

C. Review and Transmission of Faculty Review Files and Recommendations

The University conducts post-tenure reviews at these levels:

235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281

- Level 1: Division Personnel Review Committee (DPRC)
- Level 2: College Dean

Each review is independent and considers the recommendations at previous level(s). At each level of review, the member receives written notification of the level's recommendation concurrent with the review's transmittal to the next level, if applicable. Applicant faculty members are notified of the final result of the review by the end of the 4th week in May of each academic year.

1. **Level 1 Review: Division Personnel Review Committee**

Review. The DPRC will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that may be provided per Section 8A and all prior recommendations at all levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship and collegiality. The DPRC will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's attainment of the standard for post-tenure review. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Review File.

Conference. Prior to transmitting the Review File to the Dean, the DPRC or its representatives will provide the member with a written copy of the review, signed by all DPRC members, and meet with the member to discuss it. The Division Chair will prepare a summary of the review conference and present it to the member within ten (10) days of the conference. This summary will be placed in the personnel file in the Provost's office and forwarded to the Dean and the Provost via the member's PRC binder. The member will sign the report to acknowledge receiving it.

Transmission of the file. The DPRC will transmit its review and the Review File to the Dean by first Friday in April.

2. **Level 2 Review: Dean**

Review. In their independent review, the Dean considers all issues relating to procedures and academic judgment. The Dean will review the Faculty Review File, in the context of divisional guidance that may be provided per Section 8A and all prior recommendations at all levels of review. The review will apply the CBA's standards for faculty performance in teaching, service and scholarship and collegiality. The Dean will write a letter that reflects upon evidence of the member's attainment of the standard for post-tenure review. The letter may: describe the member's strengths in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service; provide explicit suggestions for areas needing improvement; and assess progress made since prior reviews. The dean's letter will refer to appropriate supporting evidence provided in the applicant faculty member's Faculty Review File.

Conference. Prior to transmitting the file to the Provost, the Dean will provide the member with a written copy of the review, signed by the Dean and will meet with the member to discuss it prior to the required deadline.

282
283
284
285
286

Transmission. The Dean will transmit their review and the file to the Provost by 2nd Friday in May. The Provost files the review in the faculty member's permanent personnel records.