

POST-TENURE REVIEW (Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 8-11)

PURPOSE

The post-tenure review shall be based on criteria separately defined from the award of tenure with the following intent:

1. Demonstrating the tenured faculty member's growth and development in the discipline;
2. Communicating to the faculty member specific areas in need of improvement related to performance in scholarship, teaching, and service, and
3. Enhancing each individual's future productivity.

PROCEDURES

After tenure is granted, faculty will be evaluated every five years or more often at the discretion of the department chair or dean or at the request of the faculty member. The post-tenure review is for the most recent five years, or the time period since the last formal review. Within the College of Arts and Humanities post-tenure review will evaluate the following professional activities:

1. Teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative evaluation;
2. The quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity, and
3. Service to the profession, school, and community.

Dated Guidelines and Process for Faculty Members Undergoing Post-Tenure Review

To occur by:	(Please note: dates will be adjusted yearly for weekends and holidays.)
Oct 15	The department chair or dean will notify the faculty member of the upcoming post-tenure review.
Oct 15	Deadline for a faculty member to initiate a request for a Post-Tenure Review.
Dec 1	Deadline for the department chair and faculty member to jointly select a three-member team for peer evaluations.
Feb—Tuesday following Presidents' Day Holiday	The faculty member under review submits an updated vitae (or the College of Arts & Humanities Annual Faculty Reports) and any other pertinent artifacts to their department chair.
Mar 2	The faculty member under review and the department chair receives the findings (in writing) of the team for peer evaluations.
Mar 16	The faculty member under review may submit a written response concerning the findings of the team for peer evaluations to their department chair.
Mar 16	The faculty member under review may request, in writing, an optional interview with the department chair to discuss the faculty member's teaching, scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity, and service.
Mar 31	Deadline for the department chair to interview the faculty member under review if the interview was requested by Mar 16th.
Apr 10	Deadline for the department chair to submit the post-tenure review report to the faculty member under review.
Apr 17	Deadline for the faculty member under review to request, in writing, an optional meeting with the department chair to discuss the report.
Apr 30	Deadline for the department chair to submit the post-tenure review report to the dean for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file.

May 15	Deadline for the faculty member under review to submit a written response concerning the post-tenure review report to the dean.
--------	---

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, student evaluations shall be administered and compiled by an impartial third party. Each tenured faculty member shall have student evaluations administered in at least two courses each year. The two courses to be evaluated will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. If the faculty member and the chair cannot come to agreement on which two courses should be evaluated by the students, the choice of courses to be evaluated will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean after consultation with the faculty member and the chair. The results of those evaluations shall be seen by the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries of these evaluations will be kept on file in the offices of the chair and the dean.

PEER EVALUATIONS

Peer evaluation involves seeking feedback from informed colleagues for the purposes of improving the faculty member’s teaching practice (formative assessment) and/or evaluating it (summative assessment). There are many possible components to peer evaluations, such as observing classroom teaching, evaluating and giving feedback on course design and assessment practices, and reviewing examples of student products. Formative evaluations, if done well, can help improve teaching and inform summative decisions.

The team for peer evaluations will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. Faculty members under review are encouraged to submit teaching materials to the review team. The peer evaluation review for the College of Arts and Humanities will be limited to three pages of comments and observations. The results of those evaluations shall be provided to the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries of these evaluations will be kept on file in the offices of the chair and the dean.

REMEDIAL ACTIONS BASED ON POST-TENURE REVIEW

Tenured faculty members are expected to maintain the requirements they fulfilled to earn tenure. as noted by the channels in the chart below. Failure to maintain the requirements will result in a rating of “inadequate” in teaching, in scholarly/creative/professional activity and/or in service.

Channel	Teaching	Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity	Service
I	Excellent	Good	Adequate
II	Good	Good	Good
III	Excellent	Adequate	Good
IV	Good	Excellent	Adequate

If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is not found to be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of his or her discipline, he or she is responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and both the University and College are expected to assist through developmental opportunities. The faculty member, the department chair, and the College dean must mutually decide upon a timeline for remediation. A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action governed by due process pursuant to the standards described in the Policy and Procedures Manual, Sections 9-9 through 9-16.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING POST-TENURE REVIEW

In 2014-15, WSU created a program called the Performance Compensation Plan (PCP). This plan allows faculty who have held the rank of full professor for at least a specified threshold of years to apply for a permanent raise.

The application process requires that faculty provide a detailed report of their teaching, scholarship and service over the most recent five years. In order for the faculty member to be eligible for the raise, the faculty member's record must be sufficient so that the faculty member would again earn promotion to full professor. The department chair, dean, and provost evaluate that record and write letters indicating whether it would qualify the faculty member for promotion to professor. The provost makes the final decision on which university faculty are awarded raises.

Faculty who apply for the PCP shall be considered to have passed their five-year post tenure review if they receive peer evaluation (see Peer Evaluations outlined above) **and** the chair and the dean both state in their letters that the faculty member has met the standard for the raise.

Faculty who apply for PCP but do not receive positive reviews from the chair, dean, and/or provost will not be deemed to have undergone a post-tenure review. Those faculty will undergo reviews at their designated times according to the other sections of this post-tenure review document.