

**POST-TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS
AND PROCEDURES
FOR
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING**

1999

I. General Procedures and Calendar

The procedures given below are meant to be in compliance with the regulations on the post-tenure review established in the University *Faculty Manual*. If any conflict 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 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, 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, the 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.

Chairs of departments and associate deans will be evaluated by the Dean in consultation with the faculty members in the appropriate department.

III. Post-Tenure Review Departmental Committees

A Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee (referred to hereafter as the Departmental Committee) will be formed in each department. The committee for a faculty member being reviewed will consist of all faculty members of equal or higher rank with tenure in that department. If there are fewer than five tenured eligible faculty members in a department, the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the other tenured faculty members in that department of the same or higher rank as the faculty member being reviewed, will select a sufficient number of faculty members from outside the department to have a committee of at least five members. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will be elected by the members of the Departmental Committee.

A Departmental Committee member on sabbatical leave may participate in the review process, if written notification is provided to the Dean prior to the review.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed must submit a post-tenure review file. The faculty member will include at least the following material in his/her file.

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught in the previous six years.
2. Student course evaluations for each of the courses listed.
3. Peer evaluation of teaching.

B. Scholarship

A listing of all scholarly activities and information about proposals written and research funding received during the previous six years, and research/creative activities evaluated by peers outside the unit (although not necessarily outside the University). Refereed publications or other reviewed research/creative exercises may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit.

C. Service

A listing of all service activities conducted during the previous six years.

D. Annual Evaluations

A copy of all annual performance reviews accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.

E. Sabbatical Reports

A copy of the faculty member's official sabbatical leave activities report and detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the previous six years.

F. Curriculum Vita

V. Departmental Committee Procedures

- A. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will ensure that the meetings of the Departmental Committee are held in a timely manner sufficient to meet the post-tenure review calendar set by the Provost.

- B. Each member of the Departmental Committee will perform a review of the faculty member's file and complete a written evaluation of the faculty member's overall performance. This evaluation will rate the faculty member's performance as either superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
- C. The above performance rating terms are defined as follows:
 - 1. Superior performance means performance at the very highest level.
 - 2. Satisfactory performance means performance that meets the expectations of the unit as outlined in current unit criteria for tenure.
 - 3. Unsatisfactory performance means performance, taken as a whole, which fails to meet expectations as outlined in current unit criteria for tenure.
- D. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will collect and tally the performance evaluations from the Departmental Committee members. A superior or unsatisfactory overall performance evaluation must be supported by at least two-thirds of the evaluations by the Departmental Committee.
- E. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will prepare a report of the post-tenure review which will include a written evaluation from each member of the Departmental Committee with a summary assessment of the faculty member's performance and suggestions to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development. The report must be approved by a majority of the Departmental Committee.
- F. A copy of the Departmental Committee report will be given to the faculty member and will be retained permanently by the Chair of the Department and the Dean of the College of Engineering.
- G. If the overall performance rating of the faculty member is either superior or satisfactory, the evaluation of the faculty member will be concluded with the distribution of the report. If the Departmental Committee determines that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, the faculty member in consultation with the Departmental Committee must produce a development plan.
- H. An Unsatisfactory Review
 - 1. An unsatisfactory review will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file and forwarded through the Chair of the Department to the Dean, together with recommendations for restoring

performance to the satisfactory level. The time line will normally be not less than one year or more than three years.

2. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the Department Chair in general or in any particular. The findings of the Departmental Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded through the Chair of the Department to the Dean for final determination of the evaluation.
3. The faculty member will establish a development plan in consultation with and with the concurrence of the Departmental Committee and the Chair of the Department. If a development plan cannot be established, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean of the College of Engineering. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member.
4. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, a copy of the Departmental Committee report and development plan will also be sent to the Provost.
5. At the next annual review, the Departmental Committee will review and the Chair of the Departmental Committee will prepare a written assessment of the progress of the faculty member. This evaluation will be forwarded to the Chair of the Department who will review the Departmental Committee's written assessment and state in writing his/her concurrence or dissent, in general or in any particular. The Chair of the Department's written review and the Departmental Committee's written assessment will be forwarded to the Dean and copies will be provided to the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination on progress or the lack thereof, and whether or not further measures may be necessary.

March 5, 1999