

Department of Theatre, Speech and Dance
Post-Tenure Review Policies
February 26, 1999

Procedures

All tenured members of the Department, regardless of rank and including those in Department administrative positions, will undergo a post-tenure review every six years unless:

1. During the previous six year period the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position.
2. The faculty member has notified the Department Chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review.

Those faculty who are to be evaluated will be notified by the Department Chair that they will be considered during the next academic year.

Faculty who are to undergo post-tenure review will prepare a file of their activities during the past five years in three areas: teaching, scholarly/artistic achievement, and service to the University and profession. In each category the process must identify those faculty members whose performance is superior.

The post-tenure review file must include a *curriculum vitae*, peer and student evaluations of teaching as well as research/creative endeavors that are evaluated by peers outside the unit (but not necessarily outside the University).

Refereed publications or other reviewed research and/or creative activities may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the Department.

Annual performance reviews issued by the Chair as well as Sabbatical Reports will be part of the file.

Other documentation may be included.

The post-tenure review files will be evaluated in a timely fashion by a five-member Post-Tenure Review Committee elected by the faculty and composed of tenured faculty within the Department who are not undergoing post-tenure review. Associate Professors will be reviewed by those who hold at least the rank of Associate Professor. Full Professors will be reviewed by those who hold at least the rank of Professor. If a five-member Post-Tenure Review Committee cannot be constituted within the Department, then members outside the Department at the appropriate rank will be invited by the dean to join the Committee.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will evaluate the post-tenure file by adjudging the person's performance as "Superior," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory." The committee will support its evaluation with a written justification. A vote of three of the five members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee is required to endorse an action.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will forward the results of its evaluation to the Chair who will then take the appropriate action as outlined below. A copy of the evaluation will be sent also to the person evaluated.

Criteria and Outcomes

For purposes of post-tenure review, the following performance rating terms will be used.

Superior Performance means performance at the very highest level. Superior performance is an evaluation of quality, quantity, and effort which concluded that the work compares favorably with the best work of equivalent faculty at peer institutions/programs.

A superior evaluation will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file. 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. The merit increase shall be in addition to any annual raise.

Satisfactory Performance means performance that meets the expectations of the Department. Satisfactory performance is an evaluation of quality, quantity, and effort which concludes that the work compares favorably with the work of other equivalent faculty at peer institutions/programs.

The satisfactory evaluation will be noted the recipient's personnel file.

Unsatisfactory Performance means performance, taken as a whole, which fails to meet relevant Department standards for Satisfactory Performance. Unsatisfactory performance is an evaluation of the quality, quantity, and effort which concludes that the work compares unfavorably with the average performance of other members of the Department.

An unsatisfactory review will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file and forwarded to the dean, together with recommendations for restoring performance to the satisfactory level.

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation of any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee's findings 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.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee in consultation with and concurrence of the faculty member will establish a Development Plan lasting not less than one year but no more than three years. A copy of the plan will be sent to the Provost.

The Development Plan will include the appointment by the Department Chair of a

Development Committee composed of three members to assist the faculty member in improving performance.

The Development Plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored.

If the faculty member does not agree with the Development Plan, the matter will be referred to the Department Chair who will constitute a new Development Committee composed of three faculty outside the Department but in the College of Liberal Arts.

If there is still non-agreement, the matter will be referred to the Dean, College of Liberal Arts, for appropriate action.

At the next annual review, the Chair and the Development Committee will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. The evaluation will be forwarded to the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee. This Committee will review the forwarded assessment and state in writing its concurrence or dissent in general or in any particular.

The Chair/Development Committee assessment and the Tenure and Promotion Committee response will be forwarded to the Dean and copies provided to the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination on progress or lack thereof, and whether or not further measures may be necessary.