

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES****I. General procedure:**

The procedures discussed below comply with the Faculty Manual with respect to the objectives of post-tenure review. Should disputes arise about this document and the provisions set forth in the Faculty Manual, the post-tenure review committee will seek information from the Dean's Office and attempt to resolve any discrepancies. The ultimate arbitrator will be the Faculty Manual.

II. Faculty to be included in the Post-Tenure Review:

All faculty members will be reviewed every six years after being tenured. The timing of evaluation will vary. If an individual has been tenured or promoted to full or associate professor within the preceding five years, they will not need to be evaluated until six years has elapsed since their last review. Waivers are permitted for any faculty who has executed a retirement agreement within three years of the next scheduled review.

III. The Post-Tenure Committee:

The Committee will include all tenured full professors of the department's tenure and promotion committee (who themselves are not under review), who will evaluate all cases, and all tenured associate professors (who themselves are not under review), who will evaluate the cases of associate professor reviewees. Such individuals, however, will remain seated on the decision-making board of the regular tenure and promotion committee. The Chair of this committee will be selected by the full tenure and promotion committee and must be a full professor. The Chair of the department and any individual under review is ineligible for this position. Any individual with a conflict of interest such as a spousal/partner relationship with the person under review must recuse him/herself from the committee. Individuals on sabbatical are eligible.

IV. The File for Post-Tenure Review:**A. Teaching:**

1. A list of all courses taught since either the last post-tenure review or evaluation by the tenure and promotion committee.
2. Results of student evaluations starting at Fall 1998, with data analyzed by the Department of Sociology.
3. Evidence of teaching quality from other sources such as graduate students and colleagues.
4. Any other evidence the reviewed wishes to include; such as course syllabi or the development of new courses.

5. Evaluations by the peer faculty teaching committee.

B. Scholarship:

1. A current curriculum vitae.
2. A one-page summary of proposed and current research and scholarship.
3. A summary of all scholarly activities conducted since either the last post-tenure review or evaluation by the tenure and promotion committee for either tenure or promotion as defined by the Department of Sociology's definition of scholarship. (See the Sociology Department's tenure and promotion criteria.) These include peer-reviewed publications, books and monographs, extramural funding, scholarly presentations, awards, and book reviews.

C. Service:

A summary of all departmental, college, university, professional and community service activities. These include holding offices, serving on and directing theses and dissertations, serving on departmental and university-wide committees, reviewing for journals, holding positions in professional organizations, serving on editorial boards of journals, panel members of granting agencies, community appointments, and community services such as speaking engagements and advising reporters for newspapers. Advisement of students is also required to satisfactorily meet professional service.

D. Annual Evaluations:

Annual faculty evaluations since the last post-tenure review or evaluation for promotion will be provided by either the Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Chair of the Department depending upon which unit conducts the evaluation for the post-tenure review file.

E. Sabbatical Reports:

Copies of sabbatical reports, if they were taken, will be included in the file.

V. Committee Procedures:

The post-tenure review committee (as specified in III, above), will evaluate the faculty members. The post-tenure review committee will evaluate three areas: scholarship, teaching and service. There are three possible ratings: superior, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory that can be applied to each of these categories.

For each area of review (scholarship, teaching, service), the committee's report will rate the reviewee as satisfactory when either a majority of the participating committee members give an evaluation of satisfactory or when no level of evaluation (superior, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) obtains majority (viz., 51%) support from the participating committee members.

For each area of review, the committee's report will rate the reviewee as superior when a majority of the participating committee members give an evaluation of superior.

For each area of review, the committee's report will rate the reviewee as unsatisfactory when a majority of the participating committee members give an evaluation of unsatisfactory.

Each member of the post-tenure review committee must provide written justification for their voting in all three areas. The Chair of the post-tenure committee will collect and tabulate the ratings. Results of the tabulations, but not the numerical vote count, will be given to the faculty member under review.

Prima facie evidence of satisfactory performance in scholarship may be met by having peer-reviewed publications accepted or appearing in peer-reviewed journals (usually not book reviews or letters to the editor), refereed academic books or monographs, or by garnering extramural funding in the three years prior to review. *Prima facie* evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching may be met by having met the standards set forth by the tenure and promotion criteria of the department and/or by attaining satisfactory ratings (i.e., a majority [51%] of responses are "agree" or better) on mandated student evaluations of teaching.

With respect to service, faculty members must present evidence that they effectively serve the profession and the department in some capacity.

Should a post-tenure reviewee receive an unsatisfactory rating in teaching, scholarship, or service; they will be put on rehabilitative status for not less than one, nor more than three years. Faculty members placed on rehabilitative status will develop a plan, in consultation and in conjunction with the committee, on how to upgrade their status in areas where it is considered necessary to do so. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, development plans and copies of the committee report will be sent to the Dean of our College and the Provost. All materials will be housed in each faculty member's permanent file. If the review is satisfactory, that information will be forwarded to the Dean.

VI. Unsatisfactory Performance:

In the event that a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory review the following steps must be taken.

- A. The Chair of the post-tenure review committee must report to the faculty member in writing of an unsatisfactory evaluation. In their report the committee members should include remarks about how they believe that the faculty member could restore his/her performance evaluation. The committee will also serve as a faculty member's Development Committee. As such, they will monitor the progress of any member judged to exhibit unsatisfactory performance.
- B. The Committee and the Chair of the Sociology Department, in conjunction with the faculty member, will produce a development plan for the faculty member. Included in this plan will be specific objectives and a specific timetable laid out to set deadlines for meeting objectives. The timetable should commence immediately, and extend in duration for no more than three years. If a faculty member has received an unsatisfactory rating for scholarship, they can be restored immediately to

a rating of satisfactory upon acceptance of peer-reviewed publications (usually not book review or letters to the editor) or prestigious extramural funding. If a faculty member has received an unsatisfactory rating for teaching, they can be restored immediately to a rating of satisfactory upon receiving a subsequent teaching evaluation of satisfactory from the committee or by attaining satisfactory ratings on mandated student evaluations of teaching. Any effective service can restore an unsatisfactory rating for service. Committee members apply the standards set forth by the tenure and promotion criteria of the department in making such evaluations. A copy of the development plan will be sent to the Dean and the Provost.

- C. Each year the Committee will check to see if significant progress (as specified in the development plan) toward getting back on track is being made. The Chair of the Sociology department in conjunction with the post-tenure review committee will file periodic progress reports with the Dean.
- D. Final determination of whether the faculty member is meeting the objectives will be made by the post-tenure review committee in consultation with the department Chair.
- E. Failure to make significant headway toward rectifying an unsatisfactory evaluation exposes a faculty member to termination.

VII. Appeal Procedures:

Faculty members who disagree with an unsatisfactory evaluation or with any aspects of the recommendations may appeal the decision in general or in any particular to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The findings of the tenure and promotion committee, together with its recommendations for action, and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean for final determination.

VIII. Justification of the Plan:

Several ideas were behind the logic of this document. We used the Faculty Manual and recommendations from the Provost's Office to make sure our procedures were consistent with the guidelines on post-tenure review. Most of the proposal emanated directly from the Faculty Manual. Faculty eligibility for review was taken from the Faculty Manual.