

Post Tenure Review Ad Hoc Committee

Arp, Carson, Johnson, Jovanovic, Nielsen

Preliminary recommendations

In the following points, we refer to “post tenure review” as a process involving a peer component.

1. Post tenure review (PTR) must be initiated following two “negative” Periodic Reviews of Faculty (PROF). A negative PROF must always be followed by either PTR in the same or following year or a PROF in the following year. A supervisor could initiate the PTR process at any time following a negative PROF. A faculty member could initiate the process at any time.

Rationale: The workload and reticence of faculty and unit heads to engage in the PTR has led to uneven implementation. Requiring the process only for situations where major improvements are needed would greatly reduce the workload. A consequence of this recommendation is that peer review would not be required in reaching the initial negative review, but would be required if the negatives identified in one year were not corrected at the next review. This consequence might be perceived as concentrating too much authority in the hands of unit leaders. However, unit leaders are already encouraged to engage other faculty in evaluations and this recommendation would not prohibit such engagement. A faculty member might choose to initiate PTR to obtain evaluation beyond that provided by the unit leader in order to obtain a more broadly representative opinion. This broadly representative opinion might be desirable following a negative PROF or to determine if progress towards promotion is adequate. A supervisor with concerns about a faculty member's performance might choose to initiate PTR prior to two negative reviews in order to get a broader, “peer” opinion of the faculty member's progress, and to get the faculty member on a (funded!) development plan sooner.

2. A “negative” PROF would identify inadequate progress or expectations not met in one or more areas in the job description (e.g., teaching, research, service, outreach).

Rationale: In the promotion process, falling short in a single area of the job description provides a basis to deny promotion. The post tenure process should follow a similar model.

3. The current overall outcome rating system (Exemplary or Extraordinary/Strong and Positive/Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory) would be abandoned.

Rationale: This removes a task (i.e. assigning a rating) that many professors have found difficult and which is not done evenly across campus. A consequence of this

recommendation is the loss of the cash award (\$3,000) to those faculty found “exemplary or extraordinary” in the current process.

4. PTR will include a component external to the unit. For example, a peer review team could include one member from outside the Department. As another example, recommendations of a PTR committee could be vetted through a college promotion and tenure committee.

Rationale: An outside member would perform a function much like a Graduate School Representative on a graduate committee. They would help to ensure the fairness and the integrity of the process. In developing a process for PTR aligned with these recommendations it would be important to clarify how the outside member would be selected and what authority they would have.

5. A PTR that finds unsatisfactory performance should result in a plan developed by the unit leader and the individual in consultation with the peer review committee that will lead to satisfactory performance in the deficient areas within a period of one to three years. The administration should make available a pool of funds to facilitate development plans.

Rationale: Current guidelines call for a three-year development plan. We felt more flexibility was called for. In some cases, inadequate performance in a single area could be turned around in a year. In other cases, the full three years might be needed. We also felt that some funds should be made available to assist in the development. We are proposing that unit leaders and the individual on a development plan be allowed to jointly request up to \$10,000/year. Requests for funds would clearly indicate how the funds would be used to facilitate the development plan. Guidelines for receiving, tracking, and reporting associated with these funds should be straightforward and not cumbersome.