

DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES
POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review established in the University *Faculty Manual*. In the eventuality of a discrepancy between the procedures given in this document and the regulations given in the University *Faculty Manual*, the University *Faculty Manual* will take precedence.

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

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions, will be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six year period, the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., Dean or a chaired professorship). However, Department-level 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; and any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

The membership of the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of three faculty members including the Department chair. Only tenured full professors will be eligible to serve on the Committee for other tenured full professors; where possible, the Committee may have representation at both the rank of full professor and associate professor. If the Department chair is not eligible to serve on the Committee because of rank, then s/he will serve as a fourth Committee member in an advisory and non-voting role. The Committee chair shall be the Department's Tenure and Promotion chair. If the Department's Tenure and Promotion chair is being evaluated for post-tenure review or is otherwise unable to serve, the Committee shall elect its own chair.

In the event that there are fewer than three Department faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the Dean of the College will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from other units within the University to make up a committee of three voting members.

IV. File Documentation

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 he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member *must* include the following material in the file:

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous five years;

2. A descriptive summary of the student course evaluations to be prepared by the Department Chair or the Department Chair's designee.
 3. Peer teaching reviews conducted in accordance with the Department's policy.
- B. Scholarship
1. A listing of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous five years. Scholarly activities are those listed in the Department's Tenure and Promotion documents.
 2. Copies of all relevant items listed above.
- C. Service
1. A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous five years. Service activities are those listed in the Department's Tenure and Promotion documents.
- D. Annual Evaluations
1. A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the Department Chair in accordance with Departmental policies accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.
- E. Sabbatical Reports
1. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.
- F. Current Curriculum Vitae

V. Committee Procedures

- A. The chair of the Committee will ensure that peer reviews (from within the Department) of the faculty member's teaching and peer reviews (from outside the Department) of scholarly activities are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship is considered as having fulfilled the peer review of scholarly activities requirement.
- B. After review of the faculty member's file, each member of the Committee will complete a written evaluation form for the faculty member. The form will rate the faculty member's performance in the four areas: teaching, scholarship, service, and overall performance. In each of the four areas the Committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as either superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.
- C. For purposes of post-tenure review, the following definitions will be used:
1. 'Superior performance' means performance at the very highest level. In order to receive a superior evaluation in teaching, research/scholarship, or service the faculty member must significantly exceed the standards as set forth in the Department's Tenure and Promotion documents. Teaching, research, or service awards from beyond the Department are examples of the type of recognition that gives evidence of superior performance.

2. 'Satisfactory performance' is performance that meets the standards for the faculty member's rank as set forth in the Department's Tenure and Promotion documents.
 3. 'Unsatisfactory performance' is performance that clearly fails to meet the standards for the faculty member's rank as set forth in the Department's Tenure and Promotion documents.
- D. In a meeting of the Committee, the chair of the Committee will collect the performance evaluation forms from the Committee members and tally the ratings in each evaluation area defined in V.B. A majority evaluative rating is achieved when fifty-one percent of all eligible Committee members have cast a ballot with the same rating. In the event that a majority of Committee members do not rate the performance of a faculty member the same in a given area, the committee report will give a performance rating of "satisfactory, lacking a majority opinion".

A Committee member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the Department Chair of a desire to do so before the beginning of the leave.

- E. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the Committee, the chair of the Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include at minimum the Committee's rating of the performance for each of the evaluation areas defined in V.B., and sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development. Individual vote counts in each evaluation area will not be revealed, but the individual written evaluations must be kept by the Committee chair when a development plan is put into effect or in case of an appeal.
- F. A copy of the Committee report must be sent to the faculty member, the Committee members, and to the Department Chair for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, a copy of the Committee report and development plan must also be sent to the Dean of the College.
- G. If the performance rating for each evaluation area defined in V.B. is either "superior" or "satisfactory", the evaluation of the faculty member is concluded with the distribution of the report. If the Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is satisfactory, but that his/her performance in either teaching, scholarship, or service areas is unsatisfactory, a development plan is not called for but the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level in that area.

H. An Unsatisfactory Review

1. If the Committee determines that the overall performance evaluation rating of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory", the Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The Committee will also act as the faculty member's Development Committee. The Committee may recommend the inclusion of additional members to the Development Committee from outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.
2. The chair of the Committee in consultation with the Committee and the faculty member, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member. The timetable is at the discretion of the Committee depending on the nature of the development plan, but in no case will the development plan timetable be

less than one year nor more than three years in duration. Copies of unsatisfactory reviews and the associated development plans will be sent to the Dean of the College and the Provost.

3. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the Development Committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the Dean of the College through the Department chair stating in writing whether the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in any particular.
4. The Dean of the College will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the development plan, and whether or not further measures may be necessary. The Dean will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports to the Provost.
5. 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.

VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommended development plan may appeal to the Faculty Grievance Committee. The findings of the Faculty Grievance Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Dean for final determination of the evaluation.
- B. If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Dean of the College, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.