

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

**Approved by CEHD Dean's Council
August 2, 2011**

**Approved by the Dean of Faculties Office
October 4, 2011**

These guidelines are in accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.M1, *Post-Tenure Review* and govern tenured faculty members in the College of Education and Human Development. Much of the language in this document was taken verbatim from the University's document with some modifications to fit the context of the CEHD.

Post-tenure review is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity.

A. POST-TENURE ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted for all faculty members and must result in a written document stating the department head's evaluations of performance in scholarship, teaching, service, and other assigned responsibilities. In addition, the expectations for the ensuing evaluation period for each faculty member, commensurate with his or her rank and seniority, must also be in the document. In order for the annual review to be an integral part of post-tenure review, it will have the additional characteristics:

1. In each department, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in annual review will be established by departmental faculty and approved by department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. The categories to be established may range from "most meritorious, meritorious, satisfactory, unsatisfactory" by departmental standards. Criteria for each of the four categories must be established for teaching, scholarship, service, and other assigned responsibilities. A rating of "unsatisfactory" must have a written plan for improvement.
2. The department process will clearly state how peer evaluations of performance are incorporated in the annual review. Departments may have peer committees to advise the department head for annual reviews, or departments may gather specific elements of external or internal evaluations by peers of the work of the faculty member. An example would be an internal or external evaluation of one's teaching, scholarship, service, or other assigned responsibilities.
3. An annual review in which an unsatisfactory performance in any of the areas of review is determined shall state the basis for the ranking in accordance with the departmental criteria.

4. A report to the dean of unsatisfactory performance in any of the areas of review will be accompanied by a written plan for improvement.

B. PROFESSIONAL REVIEW PLAN

A professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the professional review process. The following will guide the professional review:

1. The purposes of professional review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
2. The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
3. The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of professional review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio; a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work; and evidence of service activities.
4. The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. The faculty member has the right to review and provide a written response to any material added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any material at any time during the review process.
5. The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The professional review will result in one of three possible outcomes:
 - a. No deficiencies identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the review committee's report,

- b. Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean,
- c. Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a professional development plan (see section 4) acceptable to the dean.

C. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

1. Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will include the following:
 - a. specific deficiencies to be addressed;
 - b. specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
 - c. an outline of the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
 - d. time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
 - e. specific criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
 - f. resources to be committed by the department in support of the plan.
2. Annual Assessment. The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies, and a progress report will be forwarded to the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.
3. Completion of the Plan. When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to

which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the College community. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

D. APPEAL

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4 *Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights*. If the faculty member wishes to contest the professional review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a professional development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee.