

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE
POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY
Approved by Faculty Senate 4/8/13

I. Purpose

College of Science post-tenure review will follow the guidelines as specified in WSU PPM 8-11, Section II (Evaluation of Faculty Members, Post-Tenure Review) and Regents Policy R481 (Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-Tenure Review). The post-tenure review process uses criteria that are separate from those used for the award of tenure and recognizes the academic independence earned by tenured faculty.

II. Procedures

II. A. Review Procedure

Post-tenure review shall be based on the College of Science Annual Reviews (Attachment A). These reviews are comprehensive and detailed, and the information in these reviews is well suited for use in post-tenure evaluation of faculty. The initial post-tenure review will occur five years after the faculty member was tenured, and every five-year period thereafter while the faculty member was employed at W.S.U. For the review, the faculty member will (1) assemble the Annual Reviews from the preceding five years; (2) append a cover sheet; and (3) include a single-page summary (see attached pages). The summary should address teaching, scholarship and service achievements following the criteria specified in PPM 8-11, section IV, part I. For purposes of post-tenure review, the faculty member must satisfy the requirements for a Satisfactory rating in all three categories. For subsequent reviews, the summary should address the criteria specified in PPM 8-11, section IV, part I, for the five-year period since the previous post-tenure review.

All faculty members subject to post-tenure review shall be notified by the Dean by Jan. 15 of the calendar year of the scheduled review. In the Fall semester that follows the five-year anniversary of the original award of tenure, and every five years thereafter, the faculty member will submit the above documentation to their reviewing entity and schedule a formal review. Tenured faculty will fall into one of three categories:

1. Tenured but not fully promoted. The faculty member will meet with the Chair for the formal review. In lieu of a review by the Chair, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the Department Ranking and Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once completed, the department or committee Chair will forward the results to the Dean for oversight of the review process. A faculty member who is undergoing review for promotion to full professor during the fifth academic year of his or her post-tenure review cycle is exempt from post-tenure review for that cycle. As a summary of the faculty member's activities since tenure, the ratings for the promotion review can substitute for the compilation of five annual reviews. Even if a faculty member does not meet a channel for promotion, the ratings could still indicate a positive post-tenure review, using the criteria described above.

2. Tenured and fully promoted. The faculty member will meet with the Chair for the formal review. In lieu of a review by the Chair, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be reviewed by the Department Ranking and Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once completed, the department or committee Chair will forward the results to the Dean for oversight of the review process.

3. Department Chairs. The department Chair will meet with the Dean for the formal review. In lieu of a review by the Dean, the faculty member may choose, at his or her discretion, to be

reviewed by the Department Ranking and Tenure Evaluation Committee. Once completed, the Dean or committee Chair will forward the results to the non-reviewing entity for oversight of the review process.

II. B. Remedial Actions

If the faculty member does not meet the standards of the post-tenure review, he or she is responsible for remediating the deficiencies. The faculty member will work with the department Chair to establish a plan that addresses the deficiencies specified in the unfavorable review. This plan may include consulting with a peer-review committee, mutually agreeable to the faculty and Chair, as described in PPM 8-11, IV.E.3. To the extent possible, the plan should specify the evidence needed to address the deficiencies to the satisfaction of the Chair and faculty member. The Dean must approve the remediation plan and is expected to provide reasonable support if requested by the faculty member. The faculty member under review shall have two years to provide evidence of progress towards meeting the post-tenure standards. This will be monitored each year in the Annual Reviews. After the two years, there will be another review (during the Fall semester), as described in II. A. above. If that review determines that progress is not being made (an unfavorable review), the faculty member will be reviewed by the College Ranking and Tenure Evaluation Committee during the Spring semester. The committee will forward its decision to the Dean, who will make the final recommendation. A favorable review at this point will satisfy the post-tenure review until the next scheduled review, in three years (maintaining the overall five-year rotation). An unfavorable review at this point by the Dean will be forwarded to the Provost, for a final review. Any faculty member receiving an unfavorable review from the Provost will have access to due process as described in PPM 9-9 through 9-17.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE POST-TENURE REVIEW

Name: _____ **Department:** _____

Date of tenure decision: _____

Post-tenure interview date: _____

_____ Based on evidence detailed in the Annual Reviews, the faculty member has satisfied the requirements for post-tenure review, as specified in University Policy PPM 8-11 and Regents Policy R481.

_____ Based on information summarized in the Annual Reviews, the faculty member has not satisfied the requirements for post-tenure review, as specified in University Policy PPM 8-11 and Regents Policy R481. A specific plan to address deficiencies is attached.

Dean: _____

Dept. Chair / _____
R&T Comm. Chair

Faculty: _____
Signature

Summary

Please provide a one-page summary of post-tenure accomplishments for the five-year period covered by this review. The summary should address teaching, scholarship and service activities, as described in PPM 8-11, section IV, part I (attached).

Unsatisfactory

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they are consistently rated by students and peers as inadequate relative to other faculty members and/or make no effort to develop new materials, new methods or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they have no publications and/or have made no visible effort to write for publication. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. No record of completing a formal education program or a work experience which would help the candidate keep current in the discipline would also be viewed negatively, as would no evidence of presenting papers, making speeches, developing courses and/or programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in service if they unreasonably decline to participate on departmental, college, or University committees, task forces, or advisory groups when asked. Refusal to serve in any capacity in their professions and/or being passive in interest and action in any of the above shall also be viewed negatively.

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in administration if they fail to perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated by their immediate superiors and subordinates as unsatisfactory.

Satisfactory

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory if they are consistently rated by students and peers as satisfactory relative to other faculty members and provide evidence of having occasionally developed new materials, new methods or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates may be rated satisfactory when they provide evidence of writing and/or publication. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. Evidence of candidates' completing some formal education and/or work experience which would support their keeping current in the discipline should be viewed as positive. Evidence of having presented papers, delivered speeches, written grant proposals, etc., shall be viewed positively. A positive rating in all of the indicated activities should not be necessary to receive a satisfactory rating in this area.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in service if they accept and perform in an acceptable manner those duties constituting an average share of the work load in the department, college, University or academic community.

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in administration if they perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated satisfactory by their immediate superiors and subordinates.

Good

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated good if they are consistently rated by students and peers as good relative to other faculty members and provide evidence of having often developed new materials, new methods or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates may be rated good if they provide evidence of a regional and/or national refereed publication since the date of their last promotion and evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity.

A college may elect to substitute an equivalent activity in lieu of a regional or national refereed publication. However, in the cases of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate, department and college to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to a regional or national refereed publication.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated good in service if their leadership within the department, college, University or academic community is recognized as stronger than average or if their influence in the development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs, improved operations or organizational changes is recognized as considerably above average.

Candidates shall be rated good in administration if they set ambitious goals and achieve many of them. Candidates should also be consistently rated as good by their immediate superiors and subordinates in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a positive intellectual climate and procuring and allocating resources competently.

Excellent

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated excellent if they are consistently rated as excellent by students and peers relative to other faculty members and provide evidence that they are continually developing new methods, new materials or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates may be rated excellent if they provide evidence of more than one refereed publication at the regional and/or national levels since the date of their last promotion and evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. However, in the case of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate, department and college to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to regional or national refereed publications.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated excellent in service if they provide leadership within the department, college, University or academic community, on a major project, committee or activity in which their work significantly influenced development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs improved operations or organizational changes. The candidate's being recognized locally, regionally and /or nationally for work in extra University activities usually serving in a working position of leadership in appropriate associations and organizations is evidence of significant service work in the academic community.

Candidates may be rated excellent in administration if they set ambitious goals and achieve most of them. Candidates should also consistently be rated excellent by their immediate superiors and subordinates in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a positive intellectual climate, procuring and allocating resources competently and facilitating the operation of the organization in setting up and achieving objectives.