

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES*

1999

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*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the regulations given in the *University Faculty Manual*, the *University Faculty Manual* will take precedence.

The Anthropology post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions (other than the department chair or a chaired professorship), 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 chair professorship). However, 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 Anthropology Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full professors on the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenured full professors who are having a post-tenure review conducted will be excluded from Committee membership that year. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be the chair of the unit Tenure and Promotion Committee. [If the Chair of the unit Tenure and Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Committee will elect a new chair for that year.] **If the Chair of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, or cannot participate in a review for other reasons, then the Dean will appoint a new chair for that particular review.** The **Department** Chair is eligible neither to vote nor to serve on the Committee.

*This document is an adaptation of procedures adopted earlier by the College of Library and Information Science.

In the event that there are fewer than [three] **five** faculty members eligible to serve on the Committee, the chair of the Committee, with the approval of the Dean, will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from other units, within the University that do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a committee of five voting members. This will be done in consultation with the faculty member under review.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member under review will submit a file to the Committee. This file may contain any pertinent information the faculty member wishes, but must include evidence of the quality and quantity of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service drawn from existing documents as follows:

1. Copies of the annual reports submitted by the faculty member for the previous five years. These must include a listing of all courses taught with enrollments, citation of all publications and other scholarly activities and a listing of all public, university, and professional service activities.
2. A summary of student course evaluations to be provided by the Department Chair's office.
3. Copies of all peer-teaching reviews.
4. Copies of sabbatical reports.
5. [A summary of all Department Chair's annual evaluations of the faculty member to be prepared by the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.] **Copies of the Department Chair's annual evaluations for the past five years.**
6. A curriculum vitae.

V. Committee Procedures

- A. The Chair of the Committee will ensure that peer reviews of the faculty member's teaching 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 three areas: teaching, scholarship,

and service. In each of the three areas, the committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as either: superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. These ratings will be established using the same criteria and definitions employed in the Department of Anthropology's Tenure and Promotion Progress Evaluation Procedure (Attached) used in determining faculty annual evaluations by the Department Chair. **Committee members will look carefully at a record in which the Department Chair has rated a faculty member below satisfactory. In coming to a conclusion the committee should take the entire 5 year record into account, along with how far below standard the ratings were and the faculty member's efforts to improve. They should ask whether the Chair followed departmental criteria and guidelines and how consistent the Chair's application of these criteria were from year to year.**

1. Superior performance for teaching shall be defined as an evaluation of 3.5 points or more for the years under review. For scholarship (research) superior shall be defined as a rating of 5 points or more for the years under review. For service a superior rating requires a rating of 2 points for the years in question.
 2. Satisfactory performance shall be equated with "Standard Performance" as defined in the T&P Progress Evaluation Procedure; 2 points for teaching, 3 points for scholarship and 1 point for service.
 3. Ratings lower than those defining satisfactory performance requires a rating of unsatisfactory.
- D. In a meeting of the Committee, the Chair will collect the performance evaluation forms from the Committee members and tally the ratings in each evaluation areas 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 performance evaluation area, the committee report will give a performance rating of "satisfactory, lacking majority opinion." If a majority of the valuations rate the faculty member as superior in at least two of the three areas and the rating in the third is at least satisfactory, the Chair of the Committee shall rule that an oval rating of superior has been achieved.
- 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 four 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, and individual written evaluations will be destroyed by the Committee chair after the report is approved by the Committee.

- F. A Copy of the Committee report must be sent to the faculty member and to the Chair of the Department 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 Provost.
- G. If the performance rating for each evaluation are defined in V.B. of the faculty member 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, 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. A review that results in an overall performance rating of satisfactory, but includes an unsatisfactory rating in one of the other areas does not require a development plan.
- 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 the additional members to the Development Committee from outside the unit with a particular expertise that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/here development goals.
 - 2. The Chair of the Department, 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.
 - 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 College of Tenure and Promotion Committee. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee will recommend in writing to the Department Chair whether they believe the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in particular.
 - 4. The Chair of the department 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 Chair will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports with the Dean.

5. Failure to make substantial progress towards 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

If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the Chair of the Department, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. The Dean will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.

Print Date: 02/20/01

ATTACHMENT

TENURE AND PROMOTION PROGRESS EVALUATION, February, 1999

Available Performance Points:

Research	7
Teaching	5
<u>Service</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	15

Research: 3 points = Standard Performance
7 points = Best Possible Performance

Research Evaluation: Visible signs of ongoing, scholarly contribution through research that is planned or in progress, manuscripts planned or in preparation, successful pursuit of minor funding sources such as faculty leaves, junior faculty development awards, publication subventions, travel awards, etc., and the presentation of papers at regular professional meetings will earn an average score of 3 in this category. Individuals will receive additional points up to a total of 7 for notable contributions and accomplishment. Tenured faculty are often engaged in long term innovative projects, sometimes requiring retooling, that may take time to come to fruition. For some faculty, productivity is cyclical and important projects may not have reached peer reviewed published form at the time of the Post Tenure review. The long term trajectory of the research of the person being evaluated will be considered in addition to the actual published work. Faculty may receive points above the standard for retooling and new directions they have taken, demonstrated impact of the work upon intellectual conversations in the various disciplines where it is important, and progress towards publication in appropriate venues. Works in press, accepted for publication, or under consideration may be awarded points above the standard.

Teaching: 2 points = Standard Performance
5 points = Best Possible Performance

Teaching Evaluation: Effective and creative classroom teaching is among the most basic responsibilities of a university professor. Because of this, competent teaching of a standard load of courses (including undergraduate departmental service courses such as introductory-level classes) will receive an automatic 2 points in this category, provided that it is documented by teaching evaluations. Extra points to a total of five will be awarded for special teaching achievements [such as teaching awards, unusually good teaching evaluations, unusual contributions to undergraduate education, higher than usual course loads, number of undergraduate major or Honors advisees, developing and teaching a new course, teaching especially large classes without assistance; or, unusual effort in graduate education (as evidenced, for instance, by work on a greater than average number of dissertation committees or frequent

participation in graduate core courses)].

Service: 1 point = Standard Performance
3 points = Best Possible Performance

Service Evaluation: Normal service, defined as “standard” effort in at least two of the categories listed [Department, University, Discipline, Public] will be assigned one point. Additional effort in any of the above categories may earn up to two extra points. Unless clearly outstanding, extra points will not be awarded for service that is compensated by course reduction or salary supplement, such as Graduate Director.