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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, peer, and administrative evaluation;
2. the quality of scholarly and creative performance, professional activity and/or research productivity, and
3. service to the profession, school, and community.

Teaching performance should be a priority item for discussion. To provide a focus for discussion and better inform the chair, faculty members shall submit a summary of their most recent activities in teaching, in scholarship/creative/professional activity, and in service (vita update since the last review) to the chair at least one week prior to the scheduled interview. The College of Art and Humanities Annual Faculty Reports may be used in lieu of an updated vita. If a faculty member has additional artifacts, they too should be submitted to the chair at least one week prior to the scheduled interview.

The chair shall send a written summary report of the interview to the dean for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. That report shall include a listing of the major items of accomplishment of each faculty member and identify deficiencies, if any. A copy of the report shall be sent to the faculty member, who may make a response 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 office of the chair.

**PEER EVALUATIONS**

Peer review involves seeking feedback from an informed colleague for the purposes of improving her/his practice (formative assessment) and/or evaluating it (summative assessment). There are many possible components to peer review, 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.

Peer reviewers will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. Faculty under review are encouraged to submit teaching materials to the review team. The peer 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 seen by the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries will be kept on file in the office of the chair.

**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 following channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is found to not 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. 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 9-17.