

Section III. Faculty Performance, Development and Evaluation

This section of the Handbook covers professional expectations of COS faculty. Because different faculty positions have different expectations; not all sections below apply to all faculty. Faculty and administrators should use this section as a guide to faculty performance, development, and evaluation.

An outline of this section is:

- III.1, Performance Criteria: Lists general college-level guidelines used for evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service.
- III.2. Promotion (all faculty) and Tenure Timeline
- III.3, Promotion and Tenure (P&T) for Tenured and Tenure-Track (T/TT) Faculty: Includes important definitions, specific college-level expectations for promotions to Associate and full Professor, and the college P&T process. Departments have more detailed expectations; see Appendix XXX for these.
- III.4, Promotion for Fixed-Term Faculty: Lists college-level expectations and process for promotion of Professional, Research, and Clinical faculty. Departments may develop more detailed explanations.
- III.5, Faculty Annual Evaluation: Describes the college annual evaluation process, as well as minimal college-level criteria for annual evaluation. Again, departments may have more specific criteria.
- III.6, Pre-Tenure (Midterm) Review: Describes the process for the midterm review of tenure-track faculty.
- **III.7, Post-Tenure Review:** Describes the process and criteria for post-tenure review.

III.7 Faculty Post-Tenure Review Process

Post-Tenure review is governed by university procedure [12.06.99.C0.01](#), Post-Tenure Review. The following guidelines are to be used for post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty in the College of Science.

For faculty holding administrative appointments, reviews shall focus on individual performance within the context of a tenured faculty member, including scholarship, teaching, and service. The reviews must align with the workload assignments. The post-tenure review will not evaluate an individual's administrative responsibilities.

Individuals returning to tenured faculty roles from a fully administrative position will undergo post-tenure review **no sooner than three (3) years** and no later than **five (5) years** after entering the new role, as determined by the faculty member in consultation with the dean/director.

These guidelines do not infringe on the tenure system, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights. These guidelines do not establish new term-tenure systems or require faculty to reestablish their tenure credentials.

The purpose of a comprehensive review is to:

1. Ensure continued faculty development and productivity.
2. Recognize and reward meritorious performance.
3. Identify and support faculty in need of development.
4. Ensure accountability consistent with the mission of the College of Science and the University.

Responsibility and Scope

The review shall be conducted by a peer committee of tenured faculty at the college level. The committee consists of five tenured full professors. Each department, by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, elects one tenured full professor to the committee annually; the peer-review committee members are selected by the Dean.

Department chairs and associate deans shall not serve on the committee.

Terms of service for elected members are for one year; Dean's appointees, two years.

If there is a conflict of interest at the committee level, the Dean will suggest replacements for those members.

Every tenured member of the faculty will undergo a comprehensive review every six (6) years or following the second **Unsatisfactory** comprehensive annual evaluation in any 6-year review cycle. The six-year period begins with the first whole academic-year appointment to a tenured position. The period restarts at the time of promotion to full professor.

Except for approved deferrals, leaves still count toward the six-year requirement. Deferrals may not exceed one year per request and must be submitted to the provost through the department chair and dean.

A faculty member who has submitted a letter of resignation will not be reviewed.

Basis of Review

The review is based on **teaching, scholarship, and service records**.

The following materials are to be assessed for the six years under review:

- Current curriculum vitae (faculty)
- Annual performance evaluations for the five (5) calendar years preceding notice of review (provided by the Dean's office)
- Annual faculty activity reports, as required by the college (faculty)

Faculty members will receive an evaluation for each category/ responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service) and com responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service) and a performance relative to assigned duties and contributions

Review Categories

- *Satisfactory* – meets or exceeds expectations for assigned responsibilities and provides contributions that always meet or exceed those expected of a tenured faculty member of

comparable rank and workload.

- *Unsatisfactory* – does not meet minimum expectations for assigned responsibilities and contributions that are not consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member of comparable rank and workload. Evaluations may reflect disregard of previous advice or development efforts and/or professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence.

Review Process

October 15th: The tenured faculty member is notified that he or she will undergo a comprehensive periodic review during the following spring semester. The college committee will also be notified. All faculty in the sixth full year of service since their last evaluation or promotion must be notified unless a deferral has been requested and approved by the Office of the Provost.

January 20th: The faculty member submits a current curriculum vitae and faculty activity reports to the Dean or the Dean's designee in the electronic faculty review system. Department chairs submit copies of the faculty member's annual evaluations for the past five (5) calendar years or since the last review, along with an evaluation summary not to exceed one page, to the Dean or Dean's designee. The Dean or designee uploads copies of the completed annual reviews for the previous five (5) calendar years to the faculty member's case. If a faculty member has written a response to any annual evaluation during the review period, the response letter(s) will be included.

February 1st: The Dean or Dean's designee meets with the peer-review committee to provide instructions for conducting the review and provides the committee with a copy of the submitted documents.

March 1st: The peer-review committee will submit a report for each faculty member undergoing a post-tenure review to the dean's office. The report shall state the rating for each category of responsibility, the comprehensive review rating, and the basis for that determination.

If the peer-review evaluation is *Unsatisfactory* in any category, the peer-review committee report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) of the unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee's decision.

After reviewing the peer-review committee evaluation report, the Dean shall prepare an individual evaluation for each faculty member under review.

- The Dean will meet with the faculty members to inform them of the Dean's and peer-review committee's recommendations. The faculty member will be provided with copies of both written evaluations.
- Upon request, the Dean shall inform the faculty member of the numerical results of the peer-review committee's vote.

The faculty member may submit a written response to the peer-review committee's and the Dean's recommendations. Responses must be submitted to the Dean within five business days of the meeting and will be included in the reports and recommendations forwarded to the provost.

April 1st: The dean's and peer-review committee's reports and recommendations, and faculty response, if applicable, will be submitted along with a copy of the college post-tenure review process to the Office of the Provost.

April 15: The provost will review the documentation provided and prepare a final decision.

April 30: The provost will notify in writing the faculty member, Dean, department chair, and the peer-review committee of the final post-tenure review rating for each faculty member undergoing review via the electronic faculty review system.

Professional Development Plan

For all faculty ultimately receiving an **Unsatisfactory** rating in any category or an overall rating of **Unsatisfactory** from the Provost, the faculty member, in collaboration with the peer-review committee and department chair or Dean (if the faculty member has administrative assignments of 50% or greater), shall establish a **Professional Development Plan** addressing any unsatisfactory area (individual category or overall rating) within 30 days of receiving the final decision. This plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Dean.

If the 30-day period ends after the spring semester, the deadline will be extended to **September 15**.

The plan will:

- Indicate the University resources available to provide appropriate support for the faculty member in achieving the goals of the plan.
- Indicate who will monitor the implementation of the plan and support the faculty member through the process (for example, a faculty mentor, department chair).
- Include a follow-up schedule (with specific dates), benchmarks, and tangible goals for evaluating improved performance.

The original written review and professional development plan shall be submitted to the provost's office with one copy each for the faculty member, the department chair, and the college dean. Typically, the development plan period is 2 years.

The department chair/dean, with input from the current peer-review committee, will assess evidence of improvement after one year. A one-year status report and a final report will be submitted to the dean and the Office of the Provost by May 15th of the ensuing year. The successful completion of the professional development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. However, suppose the faculty member is deemed to have made insufficient progress by the end of the plan period. In that case, the department chair, in conjunction with the dean, will take appropriate administrative action, up to and including a recommendation for dismissal.

Disciplinary Action

If incompetence, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined, appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including review for termination, may be initiated in accordance with due process described in university procedure [12.01.99.C0.05](#) (Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments), and system policy 12.01 (Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure)