

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR
POST TENURE REVIEW**

March 1999

**Banking, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate Area
The Darla Moore School of Business
University of South Carolina**

Post Tenure review in the Banking, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate Area (hereafter, the Area) will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the *Faculty Manual* and the criteria and procedures defined in this document. In the event of a conflict, the *Faculty Manual* will govern. The post tenure review will be based on a tenured faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The specific criteria and definitions pertinent to the areas of teaching, research, and service are specified in greater detail in the remainder of this document.

CRITERIA

For purposes of the review, performance will be rated by the Post Tenure Review Committee as either superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the performance categories of teaching, research, and service. In addition, the Post Tenure Review Committee will provide an overall performance rating of superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

A faculty member will be considered superior overall if he/she is rated superior in any two of the teaching, research, and service categories and at least satisfactory in the remaining category. A faculty member will be satisfactory overall if he/she is rated at least satisfactory in teaching and at least satisfactory in either research or service (and does not meet the definition for a superior overall rating.) In order for performance to be unsatisfactory overall, a faculty member must either be rated unsatisfactory in teaching or if satisfactory in teaching, unsatisfactory in research and service. In addition, for a finding of unsatisfactory overall to be made, it is necessary that the Post Tenure Review Committee adjudge that taking into consideration all relevant factors--including the degree to which performance is superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in the three categories of performance--such a conclusion is warranted.

In judging performance for each performance category, the Post Tenure Review Committee will utilize the following definitions:

- Superior - performance at the very highest level commensurate with the faculty member's rank.
- Satisfactory - performance that, commensurate with the faculty member's rank, meets the expectations/standards of the Area.
- Unsatisfactory - performance that, commensurate with the faculty member's rank, does not meet the expectations/standards of the Area .
- Unsatisfactory overall - means performance taken as a whole that, commensurate with the faculty member's rank, fails to meet the Area's expectations/standards in teaching, research, and service.

Teaching Definitions and Specifications

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that is composed of classroom teaching; working with students and student organizations outside the classroom; advising students; and developing courses, curricula, and teaching materials.

Evidence of a candidate's contribution to teaching includes, for example, the following: (1) evaluations of a candidate's teaching performance by students (summaries of student evaluations are not sufficient); (2) peer evaluations of a faculty member's teaching performance; (3) honors and awards for one's teaching; (4) development of instructional material and methods including, but not limited to, textbooks, work books, cases and exercises, visual media, and computer software that are

directly related to the teaching mission; (5) chairing of dissertation committees; (6) service on dissertation and thesis committees; (7) involvement with students in non-dissertation research projects; (8) supervision of masters level consulting projects; (9) publications and presentations that deal with pedagogy, curricula, or similar educational issues; (10) student counseling and advisement; (11) developing new courses and curricula; and (12) faculty advisor for student organizations.

Much of the decision making process in applying these criteria is subjective in nature. Faculty members are evaluated to determine whether their performance is either superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory with respect to the expectations/standards of the Area. Superior performance would be at the highest level and include substantial evidence of positive performance of the types listed in the preceding paragraph. In general, the Area's expectations for a satisfactory level of performance are a commitment to teaching and acceptable performance in the classroom. Unsatisfactory performance would not meet the minimum expectations specified for a satisfactory rating.

Research Definitions and Specifications

Academic research in Banking, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate assumes a variety of forms and represents contributions in the theoretical, conceptual, methodological, or empirical domains. Research contributions include generating theories or methods, and reporting substantive empirical findings; validating theories or testing methods; and analyzing and synthesizing existing knowledge.

Quality is defined in terms of (1) importance of the information revealed, (2) conceptual/theoretical sophistication, and (3) methodological rigor. Original breakthroughs in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods are considered of higher quality than works exhibiting minor variations or those repeating familiar themes in the literature.

Evidence of a faculty member's contribution to research includes, for example, the following: (1) publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals, with emphasis placed on the highest quality journals; (2) publication of scholarly books; (3) publication of scholarly book chapters or monographs; (4) acquisition of peer-reviewed research grants/contracts from outside the University; (5) publication of refereed proceedings; (6) scholarly interaction with other faculty and students; (7) presentation of research papers at meetings of academic societies or associations; (8) publications of articles in non-refereed journals; and (9) chairing research sessions and discussing research papers at conferences. Also, weight is attached to professional service activities that are related to research (see "Service Definitions and Specifications" below.)

With respect to the application of these criteria, the quality and quantity of contributions are important. Research activities are evaluated by peers outside the program area (although not necessarily outside the University); refereed publications or other reviewed research exercises may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the area. Superior performance would be at the highest level and include evidence of positive performance, considering quality and quantity, well beyond what is required for satisfactory performance. In general, the Area's expectations for a

satisfactory level of performance are acceptable achievements in research activities such as those listed in the previous paragraph. Unsatisfactory performance would not meet the minimum expectations specified for a satisfactory rating.

Service Definitions and Specifications

Service may take many forms. Evidence of a faculty member's contribution to service, for example, includes the following:

For the University of South Carolina and the broader community: (1) performance on committees at the University, School, and Area levels; (2) adult continuing education programs; (3) administrative responsibilities and functions; (4) special projects for the University and agencies of South Carolina government; (5) testimony before governmental bodies; and (6) presentations to business and professional groups.

For the profession: (1) leadership roles in the administration of professional organizations; (2) editor for academic and professional journals; (3) editorial board membership and review work for academic and professional journals; (4) reviews of papers for academic organizations; (5) service on government committees or task forces; (6) service as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure decisions at other colleges and universities; and (7) book reviews.

With respect to application of these criteria, faculty members are evaluated to determine whether their performance is superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory with respect to Area expectations/standards. Superior performance would be at the highest level of Area expectations and include evidence of highly significant service to the University, School or Area; and/or the profession. In general, the Area's expectations for a satisfactory level of service are acceptable service such as that listed earlier in this section. Unsatisfactory performance would not meet the minimum expectations specified for a satisfactory rating.

PROCEDURES

General Procedures and Calendar

The procedures described in this document are in compliance with the procedures on post tenure review established in the *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the procedures stated in the *Faculty Manual*, the *Faculty Manual* will govern. The Area post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

Faculty Participating in Post Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions will be reviewed every six years with the following exceptions:

- Faculty members who have been reviewed for promotion and/or tenure or in connection with a chaired professorship during the previous four years.
- Faculty members serving in dean or associate dean positions. (Following a dean or associate dean's conversion to full-time faculty status after service in an administrative position, the timing of post-tenure review will be influenced by the length of the administrative appointment. Service of three or fewer years in the administrative appointment will defer review for three years; service of more than three years will defer review for six years.)
- Faculty members scheduled for review who notify the Dean of the School in writing that they will retire within three years of their scheduled post tenure review. This three year period begins at the end of the fiscal year in which the post tenure review would have taken place.

The post tenure review process will be initiated annually by a notice from the Dean to the faculty members scheduled to be reviewed and to the Area Post Tenure Review Committee. This notice will be given no later than September 1 of the year in which the reviews are to take place. Faculty members will be selected for post-tenure review based on the length of time since being granted tenure (beginning with those tenured the longest time) or the time since their last review under the post-tenure review procedure described in this document, whichever is longer. If a faculty member normally scheduled for post tenure review opts to be excluded from post tenure review due to being in one of the excluded categories listed above, this will not affect the review schedule of other faculty members.

The Post Tenure Review Committee

The Area Post Tenure Review Committee will be elected and consist of three tenured full professors in the Area. All tenured faculty in the Area are eligible to vote and all tenured full professors are eligible for election. Faculty on leave (e.g. sabbatical, medical, or any other type of approved leave) are eligible to vote on the selection of the Committee and to serve on the Committee, provided they can be present for Committee meetings. The three faculty members receiving the largest number of votes constitute the Committee. The Chair of the Area Tenure and Promotion Committee will not necessarily be a Committeemember. The Program Director of Banking, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate is not eligible for election to the Committee. If there are fewer than three professors in the Area, all tenured professors in the Area will elect from full professors in other areas of the Darla Moore School of Business a sufficient number of members to bring the Committee up to three members. The Committee will elect a chair. Voting will occur during the spring semester, concurrently with the election of the Chair of the Area Tenure and Promotion Committee for the academic year beginning in the fall.

Tenured faculty members scheduled for post tenure review will not participate in their own post tenure review but will participate in the review of other faculty members scheduled for review during the same year. If a member of this Committee is being evaluated for post tenure review, all tenured Area faculty will elect a replacement for the year.

Evidence of Performance to be Considered
By the Post Tenure Review Committee

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post tenure review file to the Post Tenure Review Committee. The faculty member being reviewed will include a current vita and any other documentation (including information required by the *Faculty Manual*) he/she believes to be pertinent concerning teaching, research, and service .

After a meeting of the Post Tenure Review Committee and review of the faculty member's file, each member will complete a written evaluation form. The form will rate the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, service, and overall. In each of these categories, Committee members will rate the faculty member's performance as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Each Committee member will provide a written justification for his/her evaluation in each performance category and sign his/her evaluation form. The chair will collect the performance evaluation forms from Committee members and tally the rating in each evaluation category. A determination by the Committee that performance is superior or unsatisfactory whether on a particular performance category or overall, must be reached by an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the Committee. Failing a two-thirds majority vote for a finding of either superior or unsatisfactory, the finding will be that performance is satisfactory.

The performance evaluation forms will be retained temporarily by the Committee chair to facilitate summarizing their content in the Post Tenure Review Report on the reviewed faculty member. A complete copy of the Post Tenure Review file along with the evaluations and the Post Tenure Review Report will be retained in the files of the Banking, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate Area.

At the conclusion of its review, the Post Tenure Review Committee will provide to the faculty member a written report giving specific evaluative information on the faculty member's performance in each of the categories of performance. If the evaluation is either superior or satisfactory overall, this result will be reported to the Program Director of Banking, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate and noted in the faculty member's personnel file. The Program Director will make his/her evaluation of the faculty member and forward this evaluation together with the evaluation of the Area Post Tenure Review Committee to the Dean of The Darla Moore School of Business.

An evaluation of unsatisfactory overall will be forwarded by the Area Program Director to the Dean together with reports from the Program Director and the Post Tenure Review Committee. The Post Tenure Review Committee Report will include recommendations for restoring performance to a satisfactory level. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory overall evaluation may, within 30 days after his/her receipt of such a Post Tenure Review Committee Report, appeal this evaluation to the Area Tenure and Promotion Committee, in general or in any particular.

When a faculty member is finally determined to have received an unsatisfactory overall evaluation, a development plan will be constructed by the Area Post Tenure Review Committee in consultation with, and with the concurrence of, the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member and the Committee are unable to agree on the content and time frame of the development plan, the Dean will make this determination. Normally the time line will be not less than one year and not more than three years. Where it is judged to be appropriate, the Post Tenure Review Committee will appoint a Development Committee to assist the faculty member in improving his/her performance. The development plan will form the basis for evaluation of the faculty member's performance until satisfactory performance is achieved in the judgement of the Post Tenure Review Committee and the Dean. The Dean will forward unsatisfactory reviews and the associated development plan to the Provost.

At the next annual review following the year in which performance has been judged to be unsatisfactory overall, the Area Program Director and the Development Committee, if any, will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member and forward a report on this to the Area Post Tenure Review Committee. (The members of this Committee, to the extent feasible, will be the same three faculty members who rendered the unsatisfactory evaluation in the previous year.) The Post Tenure Review Committee will review the assessment of the Program Director (and Development Committee, if there is one) and the chair of this Committee will state in writing the concurrence or dissent of the Committee. The Program Director's assessment and the response of the Area Post Tenure Review Committee will be sent to the Dean for final determination as to the faculty member's progress and whether further measures are necessary. The development plan needs to be completed in not more than three years.