

# **Professional Development Policy for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

**Finance Department  
Moore School of Business  
University of South Carolina**

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

This document is intended as a comprehensive formal policy statement outlining procedures for (1) Annual Professional Reviews, (2) Third-Year Reviews, (3) Promotions to Associate and Full Professor, (4) Tenure, and (5) Post-Tenure Reviews. All of these important milestones are related to the faculty member's performance in three areas: Research and Scholarship, Teaching and Student Development, and Professional Service and Administration. The areas of performance are specified in Section II. Throughout all of the actions a common set of ratings is used: Superior, Average and Unsatisfactory. The standards that merit each of these ratings in each of the three areas also are described in Section II.

Most of the actions described herein require participation of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. This Committee's composition and procedures are described in Section III. University policy regarding confidentiality of tenure and promotion files is described in Section IV. Procedures for Annual Reviews are explained in Section V, and Third-Year Reviews are described in Section VI. In Section VII procedures for promotion to Associate Professor are outlined, including specific standards required in each of the three areas of performance. A similar description of procedures for promotion to Professor is in Section VIII. Procedures for the Tenure process are outlined in Section IX, and the Post-Tenure Review process is described in Section X. Procedures for initiating changes in this document pertaining to areas of performance, standards and procedures described herein, are outlined in Section XI.

This document is to be provided to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members as well as those newly appointed. Changes made following appointment of new faculty will be conveyed to them in writing prior to the effective date of employment.

## **II. Areas OF PERFORMANCE**

### **A. Definitions of the Three Areas of Performance**

The areas of performance to be evaluated in all of the actions enumerated in Section I are (1) Research and Scholarship, (2) Teaching and Student Development, and (3) Professional Service and Administration. Detailed descriptions of each area are given below.

### **(1) Research and Scholarship**

Scholarly research in banking, finance, insurance, and real estate assumes a variety of forms and represents contributions in the theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and empirical domains. Research contributions include: generating theories or developing methods; reporting substantive empirical findings; validating theories or testing methods; and analyzing and synthesizing existing knowledge.

Quality is defined in terms of (1) importance of results and discoveries for the respective field; (2) sophistication and depth of analysis; (3) methodological rigor; and (4) prominence of the journal or publisher. Original breakthroughs in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods are more heavily weighted than works exhibiting minor variations of prior work, or those repeating familiar themes in the literature.

Evidence of a faculty member's contribution to Research and Scholarship includes, for example, the following: (1) publication of scholarly articles in refereed journals; (2) publication of scholarly books; (3) publication of scholarly book chapters or monographs; (4) acquisition of peer-reviewed research grants/contracts from outside the University; (5) publication of refereed proceedings; (6) presentation of research papers at meetings of academic societies or associations; (7) publication of articles in professional, policy and non-refereed journals; (8) chairing research sessions and discussing research papers at conferences and other universities and colleges; and (9) editorship and reviewing for scholarly journals.

### **(2) Teaching and Student Development**

This area of performance consists of classroom teaching, work with students and student organizations outside of class, advising, developing courses, planning curricula and developing teaching materials.

Evidence of a candidate's contribution in this area includes, but is not limited to the following: (1) formal course evaluations by students; (2) evaluations of teaching methods and materials by peers; (3) honors and awards for teaching excellence; (4) development of instructional material including textbooks, workbooks, cases, computer software and media in support of the teaching mission; (5) participation in Ph.D. dissertation committees, and undergraduate and masters thesis committees; (6) involvement with students pursuing non-dissertation and non-thesis research; (7) supervision of student consulting projects, internships and field studies; (8) publications and presentations that describe pedagogical developments and curricula design; and (9) student counseling and advisement.

### **(3) Professional Service and Administration**

Professional Service and Administration may take many forms. Evidence of a faculty member's contribution to service, for example, includes but is not limited to the following:

*For the University of South Carolina and the broader community:* (1) performance on committees at the University, School and Department levels; (2) undertaking administrative responsibilities and functions; (3) performing special projects for the University and agencies of South Carolina government; (4) providing testimony before governmental bodies; (5) making presentations to business and professional groups; (6) conducting interviews with news media; and (7) advising student groups and clubs.

*For the profession:* (1) undertaking leadership roles in the administration of professional organizations; (2) serving on government committees or task forces; (3) serving as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure decisions at other colleges and universities; and (4) publishing book reviews.

## **B. Performance Standards**

As described in detail in sections VII through IX, promotion and tenure require a candidate's Research and Scholarship be judged "superior," teaching and student development be judged "average," and professional service and administration be judged "average." In this section, levels of performance required for Average and Superior ratings in each of the three areas are specified. It is understood that performance below that level described as Average is deemed Unsatisfactory. Emphasis is on Research and Scholarship, and Teaching and Student Development, for each of the actions enumerated in Section I.

### **(1) Research and Scholarship**

*Superior.* To be considered Superior, a candidate's record of Research and Scholarship as demonstrated by the quality and quantity of publications must be comparable to that of scholars who (1) have recently received the rank sought by the candidate in the fields of banking, finance, insurance and real estate at peer or aspirant research universities and colleges, and (2) are respected for their high quality research, publications in top-tier journals, and other scholarly contributions.

Top-tier journals are defined as the highest quality academic journals in finance, banking, insurance, real estate, and economics. These journals are characterized by a blind review process. Second-tier journals are those academic and professional journals recognized by the pertinent academic communities to be of high quality, also characterized by blind review, but of a quality immediately below that of the top-tier journals. Other research and publication activities of the types listed above in Section II.A.(1) contribute to the determination of Superior performance in this area, but by themselves are insufficient to represent Superior performance.

*Average.* To be considered Average, a candidate's record of published research must be at least equivalent in quality and quantity to that of scholars of the same academic rank as the candidate in the respective fields of banking, finance, insurance, and real estate at peer or aspirant research universities and colleges, and who have published regularly in second- and top-tier journals, but who do not meet the superior definition. Other research and publication activities of the types listed above in Section

II.A.(1) contribute to the determination of Average performance in this area for promotion, but by themselves are insufficient to represent Average performance.

## **(2) Teaching and Student Development**

*Superior.* To be considered Superior, (i) a candidate's course evaluations by students must be rated in the upper quartile among faculty members in the Moore School of Business, and (ii) peer evaluations of teaching methods and materials must rank the candidate in the upper quartile among faculty members in the Finance Department, and (iii) a candidate's achievements in at least two of items (4) – (9) listed in section II.A.(2) are in the upper quartile of members of the Finance Department.

*Average.* To be considered Average, a candidate must satisfy one of the following: (i) the candidate's course evaluations by students must be rated in the middle two quartiles among faculty members of the same rank teaching similar courses in the Moore School of Business, or (ii) the candidate's peer evaluations of teaching methods and materials rank the candidate in the upper half of the Finance Department and the candidate's contributions to Ph.D. student research achievements [items (5) and (6) listed in section II.A.(2)] are in the upper half of members of the Finance Department.

## **(3) Professional Service and Administration**

*Superior.* To be considered Superior, a candidate's service contributions must rank in the upper quartile among faculty members in the Moore School. Superior performance requires significant and extensive contributions to the activities as defined in Section II.A.(3).

*Average.* To be judged Average, a candidate's contributions must rank in the middle two quartiles among faculty members at the candidate's present rank in the Moore School.

## **III. DEPARTMENT TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE**

The Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of all tenured faculty members of the Department, excluding the department chair. The Chairperson is elected by that Committee annually no later than April 15, and the name of the Chairperson is reported to the offices of the Provost and the Faculty Senate. This Committee, or a subset thereof as described below, is responsible for third-year reviews, tenure recommendations, promotion recommendations and post-tenure reviews. The Committee serves in an appellate capacity in the annual review process.

For all tenure and promotion decisions the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will assess each file by secret ballot. Faculty will vote YES, NO, or ABSTAIN on all personnel decisions. Votes to ABSTAIN are not counted in the total tally for determining the majority vote; e.g., if the votes are 7 YES, 2 NO and 1 ABSTAIN, the tally will be recorded as 7 of 9 in favor and 2 of 9 against. If the majority vote of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee is YES, the file will be forwarded to the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson will then add an assessment of performance and a YES or NO recommendation, then forward the file to the Dean. If the majority vote

of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee is NO or a TIE, the file will not be sent forward. In such a case, the candidate may appeal as described in the *Faculty Manual*.

For untenured Assistant Professors, annual and third-year reviews, as well as tenure and promotion decisions, will be the responsibility of the full Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. For annual reviews and promotion decisions involving tenured Associate Professors, the appropriate group consists of Committee members with the rank of Professor. For annual and third-year reviews involving untenured Associate Professors the appropriate group will be the full Committee consisting of all tenured faculty in the Department. For tenure decisions involving untenured Associate Professors, the appropriate group consists of Committee members with the rank of Professor.

For promotion and tenure decisions involving Assistant and Associate Professors, the appropriate group must consist of at least five members. In the event there is an insufficient number of available tenured faculty in the Department with the appropriate rank, additional faculty must be added from outside the Department. The full Committee shall nominate outside members of the appropriate rank to be appointed by the Dean as needed. For Post-Tenure Review the composition of the Committee is specified in Section X.C.

#### **IV. CONFIDENTIALITY**

Access to tenure and promotion files is governed by University Policy ACAF 1.30 (February 1995). The University allows individual faculty members fullest possible access to their files consistent with maintaining the confidentiality of materials included. Evaluative statements, recommendations and vote justifications from colleagues, administrators or outside references are considered confidential.

Votes of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will not be revealed to individuals under consideration. However, as part of the formal grievance procedures, they may request through the Dean's office the voting results of the UCTP.

The Dean has access to the complete tenure and promotion files of the faculty in the Moore School, including comments from the Provost and the record of vote and vote justifications of the UCTP. The Dean is authorized as part of the formal grievance procedures to give individuals summaries of their files, provided the summaries are approved first by the Office of the Provost. The University Faculty Grievance Committee in its official capacity has full access to individual files.

#### **V. ANNUAL REVIEWS**

Annual written performance reviews of all tenure track faculty and all tenured faculty are required. The Dean will inform each faculty member of the necessary documentation required for the annual review. The Department Chairperson will conduct reviews of all faculty members, and the Department Chairperson will in turn be reviewed by the Dean of the Moore School. Written copies of annual reviews will be given to those reviewed and will be permanently retained by the Department

Chairperson and the Dean. Reviews will include specific assessments of the three performance areas in Section II. The assessment of Teaching and Student Development must incorporate formal course evaluations, and peer evaluations will be included for untenured faculty.

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will conduct independent annual reviews of all untenured faculty on tenure-track, and all tenured faculty below the rank of Professor. These reviews will include specific assessments of the performance areas in Section II.

Based on ratings for each of the three performance areas, an overall rating of Superior, Average or Unsatisfactory will be determined separately and independently by the Department Chairperson and the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee will then convey its assessments along with a detailed report to the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson will then synthesize the assessments and render a final determination which will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file along with the report of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee. An Unsatisfactory overall rating will be forwarded to the Dean together with recommendations for restoring performance to a Satisfactory level. A faculty member who receives an overall Unsatisfactory review or an Unsatisfactory rating for any of the performance areas, and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations for restoring performance, may appeal to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The findings of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, together with recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean for final determination of the evaluation.

## **VI. THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS**

A written review is required for all untenured faculty, regardless of rank, at the end of the third year since appointment at the University of South Carolina. The review for Assistant Professors is to be conducted by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, whereas reviews for Associate Professors or Professors will be conducted by members of that Committee having at least equal rank to the member under review. The Chairperson of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will inform each faculty member to be reviewed of the documentation to be submitted for review.

The third-year review is to be comprehensive of the three-year period, but will not be limited to that period in the event the faculty member has a record of performance in the three areas that was initiated prior to appointment at the University of South Carolina. The review will be based on the areas of performance described in Section II. Copies of the review will be given to the faculty member and retained by the Department Chairperson and the Dean. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee or an appropriate subgroup will recommend in writing to the Department Chairperson whether or not the faculty member should be retained. This recommendation will be based on overall performance according to the three performance areas in Section II. In the event of an overall rating of Unsatisfactory, the Committee will assess the likelihood that satisfactory performance can be achieved by the time of the mandatory tenure decision. In such a case, if the Committee agrees that satisfactory performance can be achieved by the time of the mandatory tenure decision, the Committee

may recommend retention. Thus, an Unsatisfactory overall rating does not necessarily dictate a recommendation against retention.

The Department Chairperson will review the candidate's file and the Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation, then recommend to the Dean whether the candidate should be retained. The recommendation of the Department Chairperson and the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean then makes a determination, and if that decision is the same as that made by the tenured faculty, then the faculty member will be retained or not, accordingly. If there is disagreement between the Dean and the tenured faculty, the case is then forwarded to the Provost for resolution. Grounds and procedures for grievances in connection with non-reappointment are described in Section I of Academic Grievance Procedures in *The Faculty Manual*.

The following procedures and timetable adapt University policy (ACAF 1.05, March 1998) as it pertains uniquely to third-year reviews.

- (1) No later than the first semester of the faculty member's third academic year at the University, the Dean will inform the faculty member that in the following year the candidate must submit a tenure progress file to the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee. The faculty member will also be explicitly informed that the review process does not positively or negatively affect the institution's ultimate decision in connection with the faculty member's future application for tenure.
- (2) The faculty member must follow the usual tenure and promotion file format, process, and calendar for submission of the tenure progress file as prescribed by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The primary exceptions to this process are that:
  - (a) Neither the Department nor the faculty member should solicit outside reviewers' statements or letters of support;
  - (b) No individual ballots are collected during the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee's deliberations;
  - (c) The file and supporting materials are not forwarded past the Dean unless there is disagreement between the Dean and tenured faculty. In such case the file and supporting materials are forwarded to the Provost for a determination.
- (3) The Chairperson of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will draft an evaluation letter of the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure. The letter will specifically address the candidate's progress in each of the performance areas described in Section II. In addition, the Committee may also choose to include written evaluations from individual committee members. The letter(s) should be addressed to the next level of file review (i.e., Department Chair or Dean) and copies should be placed in the file and sent to the faculty member.

- (4) The Dean must then review the faculty member's tenure progress file and write a detailed evaluation of the faculty member's progress in terms of the unit criteria for tenure. The written evaluation must be sent to the faculty member, and a copy placed in the file.
- (5) When the Dean has completed the review of the faculty member, the Dean will have a conference with the faculty member to discuss the results of the evaluation. The faculty member must receive a copy of the Dean's written evaluation prior to the meeting. The tenure progress file must be returned to the faculty member after the conference with the Dean, but a copy of all evaluation letters must be retained in the faculty member's personnel file in the Dean's office.

## VII. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Decisions regarding promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure are generally made simultaneously for faculty hired as Assistant Professors. In some cases, faculty may be hired at ranks above Assistant Professor, without tenure.

The *Faculty Manual* states:

Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995, shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their hiring. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting unit criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion.

Final authority for recommending promotion to the University Board of Trustees resides with the President, and final authority for approval rests with the Board of Trustees. Promotion to Associate Professor requires a record of accomplishment that indicates continuing progress toward development of national and/or international stature in the respective field. To be awarded the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a record of Research and Scholarship activities judged to be Superior, Teaching and Student Development activities that are at least Average, and evidence of Professional Service and Administration activities that are at least Average. These criteria are described in detail in Section II, and the standards are consistent with the *Faculty Manual*, 2000, p. 16.

Faculty who are to be considered for promotion will be notified by May 1. They will prepare documentation files in accordance with instructions provided by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (UCTP). This file will be supplemented by formal assessments of the Research and Scholarship performance areas by five outside reviewers, at least three of whom will be selected by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and no more than two of whom will be selected by the Chair of that Committee in consultation with the candidate. Outside evaluators will be drawn from leading scholars with national or international stature in the respective fields from research universities and colleges.

Ratings of Superior, Average and Unsatisfactory are determined as outlined in Section II.B of this document. With respect to the Professional Service and Administration criterion, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires a record of average service contributions of the types listed in Section II. The primary responsibilities of a faculty member prior to promotion to Associate Professor should be directed toward excelling in Research and Scholarship, and in Teaching and Student Development. Grounds and procedures for grievances in connection with denial of promotion are described in Section II of Academic Grievance Procedures in *The Faculty Manual*.

## **VIII. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

The *Faculty Manual* states:

Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995, shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their hiring. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting unit criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion.

Final authority for recommending promotion to the University Board of Trustees resides with the President, and final authority for approval rests with the Board of Trustees. Promotion to Professor or initial appointment as Professor requires evidence of achievement of national or international stature in the respective field. To be awarded the rank of Professor, a faculty member must have a Superior record of Research and Scholarship, at least Average Teaching and Student Development, and Average Professional Service and Administration. Ratings of Superior, Average and Unsatisfactory are determined as outlined in Section II.B of this document. These standards are consistent with the *Faculty Manual*, 2000, p. 16.

Faculty who are to be considered for promotion will be notified by May 1. They will prepare documentation files in accordance with instructions provided by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (UCTP). This file will be supplemented by formal assessments of the Research and Scholarship performance areas by five outside evaluators, three of whom will be selected by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and two of whom will be identified by the Department Chair in consultation with the candidate. Outside evaluators will be drawn from leading scholars with national or international stature in the respective fields from research-oriented universities and colleges.

These criteria are judged primarily on accomplishments subsequent to the more recent of either promotion to Associate Professor or the date of employment at the University of South Carolina. With respect to the Professional Service and Administration area of performance, promotion to the rank of Professor or initial appointment as Professor requires a record of material service contributions since promotion to Associate Professor. Grounds and procedures for grievances in connection with denial of promotion are described in Section II of Academic Grievance Procedures in *The Faculty Manual*.

## **IX. TENURE**

### **A. Performance Standards**

Regardless of rank, the tenure process is governed generally by Departmental and University policies and procedures in force at the time of hire.

The *Faculty Manual* states:

Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995, shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their hiring. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting unit criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion.

Final authority for recommending tenure to the University Board of Trustees resides with the President, and final authority for approval rests with the Board of Trustees. Grounds and procedures for grievances in connection with denial of tenure are described in Section II of Academic Grievance Procedures in *The Faculty Manual*.

#### **(1) Professor**

To be eligible for Tenure, a candidate's record must be consistent with the standards for promotion to Professor as described in Sections II and VIII. When evaluating a candidate's record, greater weight is placed on the candidate's recent performance. To be eligible for initial appointment as Professor with Tenure, the candidate's overall record must be consistent with the standards for promotion to Professor described in Sections II and VII. A negative tenure decision prior to the final decision year is not prejudicial to the candidate's application for tenure in a subsequent year.

#### **(2) Associate Professor**

To be eligible for Tenure, a candidate's record must be consistent with the standards for promotion to Associate Professor as described in Sections II and VII. When evaluating a candidate's record, greater weight is placed on the candidate's recent performance. To be eligible for initial appointment as Associate Professor with Tenure, the candidate's overall record must be consistent with the standards for promotion to Associate Professor described in Sections II and VII. A negative tenure decision prior to the final decision year is not prejudicial to the candidate's application for tenure in a subsequent year.

#### **(3) Assistant Professor**

Tenure decisions for persons at the Assistant Professor rank normally will be made in the sixth year of service at the University of South Carolina. To be eligible for Tenure, a candidate's record must be consistent with the standards for promotion to Associate Professor as described in Sections II and VII. When evaluating a candidate's record, greater weight is placed on the candidate's recent performance.

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are normally linked. A negative Tenure decision prior to the final decision year is not prejudicial to the candidate's application for tenure in a subsequent year.

## **B. Procedures and Policies**

Faculty who are to be considered for tenure will be notified by May 1. They will prepare documentation files in accordance with instructions provided by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (UCTP). This file will be supplemented by formal assessments of the Research and Scholarship criterion by five outside evaluators, at least three of whom will be selected by the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the remainder of whom will be identified by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the candidate. Outside evaluators will be drawn from leading scholars with national or international stature in the respective fields from research universities and colleges.

The Provost will review the recommendation of the Dean and the accompanying materials and will attach his/her recommendation to the UCTP. The UCTP will review the recommendations and materials contained in the candidate's file and determine whether a positive recommendation to the President is justified. The President will notify the Dean and the Provost of the decision.

The University does not award tenure at the time of appointment, or appoint new faculty members at the rank of Professor, unless such an appointment can be demonstrated to be in the University's interest. Procedures for an exception are governed by University policy (ACAF 1.09, June 1998), and are outlined as follows. Permission to use award of tenure, and/or appointment at the rank of Professor in employment negotiations with potential faculty members must be secured in advance from the President's Office through appropriate channels. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will vote on the award of tenure and/or appointment at the rank of Professor by secret ballot. The Committee will use the criteria in Section II in determining their recommendation. The tally of votes and any written comments from Committee members, as well as the candidate's credentials, are forwarded through channels as part of the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.

## **C. Extending the Probationary Period**

For documented reasons of a serious health condition (of a faculty member and/or the faculty member's spouse, child, or parent), and for requirements of childbirth, adoption or placement of a foster child, faculty members holding a probationary term of appointment may request in writing that the maximum probationary period be extended, with no resulting change in employment obligations, in order to provide them additional time to demonstrate fully their professional qualifications for reappointment or tenure.

Procedures for extending the probationary period are outlined in University policy (ACAF 1.31, May 2001), and are summarized as follows. Requests from faculty members to extend their probationary period for tenure for reasons of a serious health condition, childbirth, adoption or placement of a foster child, must be initiated before the beginning of the decision year and require the approval of the Department Chairperson, the Dean, and the Provost. The request should normally be initiated simultaneously with a request for Family Medical Leave (see University policy HR 1.07). An extension

for reasons of childbirth, adoption, or placement of a foster child must be completed within twelve months of the birth or placement of the child.

In cases where faculty members have been in probationary status for more than seven years due to extension of the probationary period for reasons of a serious health condition, childbirth, adoption, or placement of a foster child, they will be evaluated as if they had been in probationary status for the normal probationary period, not longer. Faculty members within the probationary period who have not been reappointed for the following year are not eligible to extend the probationary period under this policy.

## **X. POST-TENURE REVIEW**

### **A. Faculty Members Subject to Review**

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions, will be reviewed every six years with the following exceptions: (1) faculty members who have been reviewed for promotion and/or tenure within the previous six years; (2) faculty members who hold Named or Distinguished Professorships; (3) Deans or Associate Deans; and (4) faculty members scheduled for review who notify the Dean 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.

### **B. Scheduling**

The process will be initiated by a notice from the Dean to the faculty member and the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee no later than September 1 of the academic year in which the review is to take place. Faculty members will be selected based on the length of time since being awarded tenure (beginning with those tenured for the longest time) or the time since the last post-tenure review, whichever is longer. If a faculty member is excepted based on Section X.A, this will not affect the review schedule of other faculty members.

### **C. The Post-Tenure Review Committee**

The Committee will be elected and will consist of three tenured Professors in the Department. All tenured faculty in the Department are eligible to vote and all tenured Professors are eligible for election except for the Department Chairperson. Faculty on leave (e.g., sabbatical, medical or other approved leave) may vote and serve provided they can be present for Committee meetings. The three faculty receiving the most votes will constitute the Committee. If there are fewer than three Professors in the Department, all tenured faculty in the Department will elect from Professors in other units of the Moore School a sufficient number to provide a Committee of three. The Committee will then elect a Chairperson. Voting will be conducted in the spring semester, concurrently with the election of the Chairperson of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Committee will serve beginning in the following fall semester for that academic year.

Members of the Committee who are themselves scheduled for post-tenure review during a given year will be replaced by a vote of all tenured faculty in the Department.

#### **D. Evaluation**

Post-Tenure Review is governed by the policies and procedures in force at the time the review process is begun.

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Post-Tenure Review Committee by the last day of classes in the fall semester. The file will document performance throughout the career, and will highlight accomplishments since the last Post-Tenure Review. The criteria are the same as those described in Section II. After the Committee has reviewed the file and met, each member will complete a signed written evaluation with justification of the assessments in each of the three performance s plus the overall assessment. An overall Average rating is merited if and only if ratings in each of the criteria are at least Average. A Superior rating overall is merited in the event that any two of three criteria are judged Superior. The Committee Chairperson will collect and tabulate the written ratings. A determination by the Committee that performance is Superior or Unsatisfactory, whether on individual performance areas or overall, must be reached by an affirmative vote of at least two members. Failing this, the rating will be recorded as Average.

The written appraisals will be retained temporarily by the Committee Chairperson to facilitate summarizing in the post-tenure review report. A complete copy of the post-tenure review file along with the evaluations and the post-tenure review report will be retained in the files of the Finance Department.

At the conclusion of its review, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will provide to the faculty member a written report giving specific evaluative information on the faculty member's performance in each of the categories of performance. If the overall evaluation is either Superior or Average overall, this result will be reported to the Chairperson of the Finance Department and noted in the faculty member's personnel file. The Department Chairperson will make his/her evaluation of the faculty member and forward this evaluation together with the evaluation of the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee to the Dean of the Moore School.

An evaluation of Unsatisfactory overall will be forwarded by the Department Chairperson to the Dean together with reports from the Department Chairperson and the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Post-Tenure Review Committee report will include recommendations for restoring performance to a satisfactory level. A faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory overall evaluation may, within 30 days after his/her receipt of such a report, appeal this evaluation to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, in general or in any particular.

When a faculty member is determined to receive an Unsatisfactory overall evaluation, a development plan will be constructed by the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee in consultation with, and with the concurrence of, the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member and the Committee are unable to agree on the content and time frame of the development plan, the Dean will make this

determination. Normally the time line will be not less than one year and not more than three years. Where it is judged to be appropriate, the Post-Tenure Review Committee 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 Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Dean. The Dean will forward Unsatisfactory reviews and the associated development plan to the Provost.

At the next Annual Review following the year in which performance has been judged to be Unsatisfactory overall, the Department Chairperson and the Development Committee, if any, will make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member and forward a report on this to the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee. (The members of this Committee, to the extent feasible, will be the same three faculty members who rendered the Unsatisfactory evaluation in the previous year.) The Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the assessment of the Department Chairperson (and Development Committee, if there is one) and the Chairperson of this Committee will state in writing the concurrence or dissent of the Committee. The Department Chairperson's assessment and the response of the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee will be sent to the Dean for final determination as to the faculty member's progress and whether further measures are necessary. The development plan must be completed in not more than three years.

## **XI. CHANGES TO THIS DOCUMENT**

Proposed changes to this document involving the standards, performance areas and procedures described herein, may be initiated by majority vote of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and unit chair. The proposed changes must then be submitted through the Dean of the Moore School of Business to the Provost, who in turn will forward the proposed changes to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (UCTP) for consideration. If the changes are deemed by the UCTP to be consistent with the provisions of *The Faculty Manual*, they will be approved and will take effect immediately unless otherwise specified.

March 2006