

**Criteria and Procedures for  
Post Tenure Review**

**March 18, 1999**

**Management Science Area  
The Darla Moore School of Business  
University of South Carolina**

Post tenure review in the Management Science Area will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Manual and the criteria and procedures defined in this document. In the event of a conflict, the Faculty Manual will govern. The post tenure review will be based on a tenured faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research and service. The specific criteria in the areas of teaching, research and service are specified in greater detail in the remainder of this document along with defining terms.

## CRITERIA

For the purposes of post tenure review, performance will be rated by the Post Tenure Review Committee or its designated Subcommittee as either superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the performance categories of teaching, research and service.

In addition, the Post Tenure Review Committee/Subcommittee will provide an overall performance rating of superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A faculty member will be rated superior overall if he/she is rated superior in teaching and research and at least satisfactory in service. A faculty member will be rated satisfactory overall if he/she is rated satisfactory in teaching and at least satisfactory in either research or service. In order for performance to be rated unsatisfactory overall, a faculty member must either be rated unsatisfactory in teaching or if satisfactory or better in teaching, unsatisfactory in both research and service. Lastly, for a finding of unsatisfactory overall to be made, it is necessary that the Committee/Subcommittee determine that taking into consideration all relevant factors, including the degree to which performance is superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in the three categories of performance, such a conclusion is warranted.

In judging performance on each performance category, the Post Tenure Review Committee/Subcommittee will utilize the following definition of terms, which are based on those contained in the faculty manual.

- Superior on a performance category – performance at the very highest level with respect to area standards.
- Satisfactory on a performance category – performance that meets the standards of the area.
- Unsatisfactory on a performance category – performance that does not meet the standards of the area.

In applying these criteria, candidates will be compared to faculty of their present rank. In other words, associate professors will be compared to other associate professors and professors will be compared to other professors as detailed on pages 3-5 of this document.

## Teaching Definitions and Specifications

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that is composed of classroom teaching, working with students outside the formal classroom setting, advising students, and developing courses, curricula, and teaching materials.

Evidence of a candidate's contribution to teaching includes the following:

- (1) Teaching honors and awards;
- (2) Evaluations of a candidate's teaching performance by area chair, faculty peers, and students;
- (3) Amount of teaching as reflected by course load (number of courses taught per year), course level (undergraduate, masters, or doctoral), number of students (class size), and number of different courses taught;
- (4) Development of new courses and curricula;
- (5) Development of instructional material and methods including, but not limited to, textbooks, work books, cases and exercises, visual media, and computer software that are directly related to the candidate's teaching;
- (6) Chairing of and service on dissertation and thesis committees;
- (7) Supervision of student projects, internships, and field studies;
- (8) Student counseling, advisement, and participation in student organizations;
- (9) Publications, presentations, and reviews that deal with pedagogy, curricula, or other educational issues.

<i><b>Superior</b></i>	Candidate's achievement <b>far exceeds</b> what one would expect of a faculty member at the candidate's present rank.
<i><b>Satisfactory</b></i>	Candidate's achievement is <b>consistent with</b> what one would expect of a faculty member at the candidate's present rank.
<i><b>Unsatisfactory</b></i>	Candidate's achievement is <b>far below</b> what one would expect of a faculty member at the candidate's present rank.

## Research Definitions and Specifications

Research in the Management Science Area assumes a variety of forms and can represent contributions in the theoretical/conceptual, methodological, and/or substantive domains. Management Science research contributions include generating theories, methods, and reporting substantive findings; validating theories or testing methods; and analyzing and synthesizing existing knowledge.

Both quality and quantity of a candidate's research are important. Quality is defined in terms of (1) importance of the information revealed; (2) conceptual/theoretical sophistication; and (3) methodological rigor. Original breakthroughs in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods are considered of higher quality than works exhibiting minor variations or those repeating familiar themes in the literature.

The most direct evidence of a candidate's contribution to research is the  
publication of articles in high quality refereed journals.

Other evidence includes the following:

- (1) Receipt of honors or awards for the candidate's research activities;
- (2) Publication or editing of scholarly books, chapters or monographs;
- (3) Acquisition of research grants or contracts;
- (4) Publication of non-refereed journal articles;
- (5) Publication of proceedings papers; and
- (6) Presentation of papers at professional meetings;

***Superior*** Candidate's record of research **far exceeds** that of most colleagues at the candidate's present rank in similar areas at like colleges of business.

***Satisfactory*** Candidate's record of research **is comparable to** that of most colleagues at the candidate's present rank in similar areas at like colleges of business.

***Unsatisfactory*** Candidate's record of research is **far below** that of most colleagues at the candidate's present rank in similar areas at like colleges of business.

## Service Definitions and Specifications

There are many forms of service. Evidence of a candidate's contribution to service includes the following:

*For the University of South Carolina and the State:*

- (1) Committee service at the University, School, and Area level;
- (2) Administrative responsibilities and functions;
- (3) Special projects; and
- (4) Continuing education programs;

*For the Profession:*

- (1) Leadership roles in the administration or activities of professional organizations;
- (2) Editorial and review work for publications and organizations;
- (3) Chairing sessions and discussing papers at conferences.

*For Business and Not-for-Profit Organizations:*

- (1) Pro bono consulting;
- (2) Presentations and other service to business, civic, and professional groups; and
- (3) Service on government committees or task forces.

***Superior*** Candidate's achievement **far exceeds** what one would expect of a faculty member at the candidate's present rank.

***Satisfactory*** Candidate's achievement is **consistent with** what one would expect of a faculty member at the candidate's present rank.

***Unsatisfactory*** Candidate's achievement is **far below** what one would expect of a faculty member at the candidate's present rank.

# **PROCEDURES**

## **General Procedures and Calendar**

The procedures described in this document are intended to be in compliance with the regulations on post tenure review established in the Faculty Manual. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the regulations stated in the faculty manual, the Faculty Manual will govern. The Management Science Area post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the office of the provost.

## **Faculty Subject To Post Tenure Review**

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank will be reviewed every six years with the following exceptions:

- Faculty members who have been reviewed and promoted within the previous six years.
- Faculty members who hold Chaired Professorships.
- Faculty members who have concluded an administrative appointment at the Program Director level or higher within the previous three years.
- Faculty members scheduled for review who notify the Management Science Area Program Director in writing that they will retire within three years of their scheduled post tenure review. This three year period begins at the end of the fiscal year in which the post tenure review would have taken place.

The post tenure review process will be initiated annually by a notice from the Dean to the faculty members scheduled to be reviewed and to the Program Director. This notice will be given no later than September 1 of the fiscal year in which the reviews are to take place. If a faculty member normally scheduled for post tenure review is excluded from post tenure review due to being in one of the excluded categories listed above, this will not affect the review schedule of other faculty members.

## **The Post Tenure Review Committee/Subcommittee**

The Management Science Area Post Tenure Review Committee will consist of all tenured faculty in the Management Science Program Area, including those on leave. The Committee will be chaired by the Management Science Area Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair (referred to hereafter as the Committee Chair). Committee members will not participate in their own reviews. If the Committee Chair is to be reviewed, the Committee will elect a temporary chair for that review only.

A Subcommittee of three persons will be selected from the Post Tenure Review Committee to conduct an intensive review. The Subcommittee will consist of the Committee Chair, the Program Director, and a third person selected by the Program Director in consultation with the Committee Chair. The third person shall be the same rank as the person to be reviewed, if possible.

### **Evidence of Performance to Be Considered By the Post Tenure Review Subcommittee**

Evidence of performance in the various performance categories will be that which is appropriate for judging the categories for purposes of promotion and tenure under the Management Science Area's promotion and tenure criteria and procedures. In making these judgements as to associate professors, the Management Science Area Post Tenure Review Subcommittee will consider, in so far as they are available, all annual administrative reviews and peer reviews since tenure or the last post tenure review. In making these judgments as to full professors, the committee will consider, in so far as they are available, all annual administrative reviews since tenure or the last post tenure review.

Additionally, the faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post tenure review file to the Post Tenure Review Subcommittee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the file must include the following:

- A current vita.
- Teaching – A list of all classes taught and class sizes during the review period; all available peer and student evaluations of teaching.
- Research – A list of all research and scholarship activities during the review period indicating those activities evaluated by peers outside the unit.
- Service – A list of all service activities during the review period.
- Sabbatical leaves – A report of accomplishments during any sabbatical leave.

## **Evaluation Procedures**

The Post Tenure Review Subcommittee will review the faculty member's file (including annual peer and/or administrative reviews) and prepare a written evaluation. The evaluation will rate the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, service and overall as superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Evaluations of research by peers outside the unit, although not necessarily outside the University, are required; refereed publications or other reviewed research may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit. Each Subcommittee member will provide a written justification for his/her evaluation in each performance category and overall and sign his/her evaluation form. A determination by the Subcommittee that performance is superior or unsatisfactory whether on a particular performance category or overall, must be reached by an affirmative vote of a two-thirds majority of the Subcommittee. Failing a two-thirds majority vote for a finding of either superior or unsatisfactory, the finding will be that performance is satisfactory.

At the conclusion of its review, the Post Tenure Review Subcommittee will provide a written report to the faculty member giving specific evaluative information on the faculty member's performance in each of the categories of performance and overall. If the evaluation is either superior or satisfactory overall, this result will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file and reported to the Dean of The Darla Moore School of Business.

If the Post Tenure Review Subcommittee evaluation is unsatisfactory overall, it will be referred to the entire Committee for further review. The Committee will review the faculty member's file and prepare a written report in a manner similar to and replacing that of the Subcommittee. A complete copy of the candidate's file along with the Committee's evaluation report will be retained in the Management Science Program Area files.

An evaluation of unsatisfactory overall by the entire Committee will be forwarded to the Dean together with the Post Tenure Review Committee's report. The report will include recommendations for restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory overall evaluation may appeal it within 30 days to the Management Science Area Promotion and Tenure Committee. When a faculty member is finally determined to receive an unsatisfactory overall evaluation, a development plan will be put together by the Post Tenure Review Subcommittee in consultation with, and with the concurrence of, the faculty member. The time frame for the plan will normally be from one to three years. In the event that the faculty member and the Subcommittee are unable to agree on the content and time frame of the development plan, the Dean will make this determination. Where it is judged to be appropriate, the Subcommittee will appoint a Development Committee to assist the faculty member in improving his/her performance. The development plan will form the

basis for evaluation of the faculty member's performance until satisfactory performance is achieved in the judgment of the Subcommittee and the Dean. The Dean will forward unsatisfactory overall reviews and the associated development plans to the Provost.

At the next annual review following the year in which performance has been judged to be unsatisfactory overall, the Program Director and the Development Committee, if any, will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member and forward a report of this to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the assessment of the Program Director (and Development Committee, if there is one) and state in writing its concurrence or dissent. The Program Director's assessment and the response of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be sent to the Dean for final determination as to the faculty member's progress and whether further measures are necessary.