ARTICLE I. Purpose

In accordance with university policy, every faculty member’s performance must be reviewed by the department head on an annual basis. The outcome of the annual review that relates to the post tenure review process is a performance rating of “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” for any faculty member. This document identifies the factors essential to satisfactory performance for a tenured faculty member in the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering and establishes the procedures for the departmental post-tenure peer-review process should a tenured faculty member’s annual performance evaluation fall into the “unsatisfactory” category. Performance is deemed unsatisfactory if the preponderance of evidence shows a failure to contribute to the scholarly and academic mission of the department, college and university. Factors considered in evaluating a tenured faculty member’s performance during the annual review process are described below. This document does not define criteria relevant to promotion or to the initial granting of tenure.

ARTICLE II. Evaluation Considerations

During the review process, factors to be considered relative to teaching performance include, but are not limited to, communicating effectively in the classroom using up-to-date topics and materials appropriate to the course, motivating students and requiring an appropriate level of effort from them, and evaluating students fairly and treating them with respect. Factors to be considered relative to research performance include, but are not limited to, publications, research funding, and the direction of graduate student research.

ARTICLE III. Evaluation Ratings

For the annual review, a faculty member’s performance is assessed in terms of the three major faculty functions: teaching, research and service. For the first two areas, teaching and research, performance will be evaluated by the department head as “bad”, “poor”, “mid-range”, “good”, or “excellent.” While there are two categories above mid-range and two below, it is expected that more department faculty will exhibit performance above mid-range than those who exhibit performance below mid-range. In particular, it is expected that more faculty will exhibit “excellent” performance than will exhibit “bad” performance. Due to the lengthy lead times involved in scholarly activities (e.g., in obtaining research sponsorship and in publishing research results), the measure of performance in a given year relative to the research category will be based on accomplishments over the most recent two-year period. If a faculty member is rated “bad” in teaching and no better than “mid-range” in research, or “bad” in research and no better than “poor” in teaching, an unsatisfactory rating will be assigned—unless the faculty member’s teaching and research record is offset by “exceptional service of unusual benefit to the department.” The receipt of an “unsatisfactory” performance evaluation from the department head may, at the election of the effected faculty member, initiate a departmental Post Tenure Peer Review (PTPR).
ARTICLE IV. Departmental Post Tenure Peer Review Committee Composition

The Departmental Post Tenure Peer Review Committee will be comprised of three (3) eligible Industrial and Systems Engineering departmental faculty. To be eligible to serve on the Departmental Post Tenure Peer Review Committee, a faculty member must

1) have tenure in the Industrial and Systems Engineering Department,
2) not be the department head,
3) not be serving in an administrative position outside of the department, and
4) not have received an unsatisfactory rating during the current year or in any of the preceding four years.

ARTICLE V. Post Tenure Peer Review Procedure

If a tenured faculty member receives an “unsatisfactory” performance evaluation from the department head during an annual review process, the effected faculty member may elect any of these individual or combination of choices

1) to not contest the evaluation.
2) to appeal the evaluation to the Department Post Tenure Peer Review Committee, and/or
3) to appeal the evaluation to the Dean of Engineering

In the event the effected faculty member elects option 2 above, Departmental Post Tenure Peer Review Committee appeal, the following procedure will apply.

1) Within five (5) working days of notification of an unsatisfactory review, the effected faculty member must notify the department head in writing of the intent to appeal.
2) Within 5 working days following receipt of the written notification of appeal, the department head will initiate a formal Post Tenure Peer Review according to the following procedure:
   a. The department will maintain an “eligibility list” of tenured faculty who have not received an “unsatisfactory” rating within the last five years.
   b. The department head will select one faculty member who is eligible to serve.
   c. The effected faculty member will select one faculty member and confirm the selected member’s eligibility with the department head.
   d. Steps b and c will result in the selection of two eligible faculty members. The third member will be selected as follows:
      1. From the reduced eligibility list, the department head will provide a “ranked preference list” (a minimum of three eligible departmental faculty) to the two previously selected members.
      2. The effected faculty member will provide the two selected committee members with a ranked “preference list” comprised of a minimum of three names of faculty members whose eligibility has been confirmed by the department head.
3) The previously selected members will merge the two lists and attempt to select the third member by identifying the eligible faculty member who has the highest combined ranking on the two lists. In the event that a third member does not result from this process, the two previously selected members will jointly select the third member. After the third member is selected, the previously selected members will confirm the newly selected member’s eligibility with the department head.
ARTICLE VI. Post Tenure Peer Review Committee Organization

The Department Post Tenure Peer Review Committee’s protocols are enumerated below:

1) Each member will be a full voting member.
2) The committee will meet in a closed session to select the committee chair. The date of this meeting will become the “reference point in time” from which the remaining deliberations will be measured. At the conclusion of this meeting, the committee will be considered “formally structured.”
3) The procedure of selecting the committee and the chairperson is to be completed within ten (10) working days after the department head receives notification of the appeal.

ARTICLE VII. The Department Post Tenure Peer Review Procedure

Once a Department Post Tenure Peer Review Committee (PTPRC) is formed, these procedures will govern:

1) Within 3 working days following the formal structuring of the committee, the department head will supply the committee with the faculty member’s annual report, current resume, and other documentation used by the department head to reach his/her evaluation of the effected faculty member’s performance. The department head may (optionally) provide the PTPRC with a written statement as to the reason(s) for the unsatisfactory performance evaluation. All material provided to the committee must be provided, at the same time, to the effected faculty member.
2) The effected faculty member may, at his or her discretion, supply the PTPRC with a rebuttal statement within 5 working days following the effected member’s receipt of the department head’s documentation.
3) During any deliberations of the PTPRC, all members must be present.
4) Committee decisions require a “majority” (2/3 or higher) concurrence.
5) Votes taken by the PTPRC in order to fulfill its responsibilities may be by secret ballot.

ARTICLE VIII. Department Post Tenure Peer Review Committee Findings

Within 10 working days of the committee’s formal structuring, the PTPRC shall prepare a written report and submit it to the department head with a copy provided to the effected faculty member. The report will summarize the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses based on the evidence contained in the materials described in parts VII-1 and 2, and will present the PTPRC’s conclusion that, for the purpose of post tenure review, conclude that

1) the faculty member’s performance meets the departmental criteria of satisfactory performance, or
2) the faculty member’s performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory.

The reasons for either concurrence or non-concurrence with the department head’s evaluation will be stated in the report.

If the PTPRC concurs with the department head’s performance evaluation of the faculty member, then the department head transmits an unsatisfactory annual performance evaluation notification to the Dean’s Office.

In the event that the PTPRC does not concur with the department head’s performance evaluation of the faculty member, the faculty member’s performance is deemed “satisfactory” for the purpose of the post tenure review process and the outcome of the faculty member’s annual performance evaluation is reported to the Dean’s Office as satisfactory.
ARTICLE IX.  PEER REVIEW POST TENURE PLAN

A post tenure peer review occurs every six years for all tenured faculty members. In most cases, a departmental PTPRC performs the peer review; however, at the request of the reviewed faculty an external PTPRC may be formed. This peer review is independent of the Department Head’s Annual Review. The six-year period resets each time the faculty member goes through a promotion process, as this constitutes a peer review. The ISEN faculty reviews are staggered such that 1/6th of the tenured professors are evaluated annually.

Each faculty member under the six-year post tenure review is required to submit a current CV, with a supplement that includes a summary of teaching performance or a summary College of Engineering Faculty Progress Report. The documentation should summarize the activities and performance over the last six years. If requested by the PTPRC, annual review data will be provided. If a faculty member requests an external PTPRC external support letters will be requested following tenure and promotion procedures for external letters, the letters will be solicited equally from a list provided by the faculty member and a separate list generated by the PTPRC. If a faculty member does not choose this option, then the PTPRC will not solicit letters.

Each faculty member receives annual notification of his or her upcoming review date. The PTPRC will be formed following the departmental guidelines described in this document. The chair of the PTPRC manages the Post Tenure Peer Review process and submits a report to the department head. The department head then makes post-tenure review recommendations to the dean.

ARTICLE X. PROCEDURE CHANGES

Any changes to the processes established in this document will require approval by the Industrial and Systems Engineering Faculty via a faculty vote.