

School of Education, University of Kansas

Post-tenure Review Criteria and Procedures

Approved by School of Education Faculty Assembly 04/25/2014

General Principles: In accordance with Board of Regents requirements, Article 7, section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, and the University Policy on Post-tenure Review, the School of Education, hereafter referred to as the School, has adopted these expectations and procedures for conducting post-tenure review. Post-tenure review is a process for periodic peer evaluation of faculty performance that provides an opportunity for a long-term assessment of a faculty member's accomplishments and future directions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Post-tenure review must be conducted in a manner that respects the rights of faculty members involved, including academic freedom, tenure, and due process. In addition, all those involved in the evaluation process must recognize that it is a confidential personnel matter and take appropriate steps to protect confidentiality.

Period for Review: Post-tenure review is conducted on a seven-year cycle and covers the period since the last comprehensive review, which may be consideration for promotion and/or tenure, the award of a distinguished professorship, or a previous post-tenure review. Some years may be excluded from the period in accordance with the University policy and the review may be postponed if the faculty member is on leave during the year of review. The time period when a faculty member is on medical or familial leave or that would otherwise be excluded when computing time in rank does not count toward this period. In addition, time serving as department chair, program director, dean or associate dean, or other administrative position subject to administrative review is excluded. Faculty members on phased retirement or whose retirement date has been approved by the university will be exempt from review under this policy. The dean of the School of Education will notify faculty members scheduled for post-tenure review no later than March 15 in the spring semester preceding the academic year of review.

Expectations: All tenured faculty members must meet academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Unless otherwise specified by the job description or differential allocation, the ordinary allocation of effort is 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service.

Each of the five Departments has defined its standards and expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service in their individual annual faculty evaluation procedures. The expectations for post-tenure review are consistent with these standards, with overall productivity commensurate to the seven-year period under review. Therefore, individual faculty are to refer directly to the specific criteria for their department for purposes of the post-tenure review.

Review Committee: Post-tenure review is conducted within individual departments by the members of their respective the Post-tenure Review Committees. (Rather than appointing a new committee, departments may use their standing Personnel Committee as their post-tenure review committee, so long as the group conducting the post-tenure reviews is consistent with the following committee characteristics.) Each committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members at or above the academic rank of the individual being reviewed and are to be

appointed by the Department Chair. If the Department does not have three tenured faculty members at or above the academic rank of the individual being reviewed, the Department Chair may request and appoint faculty members from one of the other Departments in the School to serve on the three member committee.

No person may serve on the committee if his or her spouse or partner is scheduled for review. A committee member who believes that there may be a conflict of interest should withdraw from the committee. If a faculty member who is undergoing review believes that there is a conflict of interest, he or she may object to the inclusion of a member. If the member declines to withdraw, the remaining committee members shall consider the basis for the alleged conflict and decide the matter; and if there is tie decision among the members on the matter of the alleged conflict, the Department Chair will make the determination. If a committee member withdraws or is removed based on a conflict of interest, the Department Chair will name a replacement.

Preparation of the File: Review will be conducted on the basis of a file that documents a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service. In contrast to evaluation for promotion and tenure, outside reviews of scholarship, copies of publications, and copies of original student evaluations are not required.

The faculty member under review should provide a brief (not more than 2 pages) narrative statement of his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period as they relate to his or her long-term career path and goals. In addition, the faculty member should submit a current curriculum vitae. The Department Chair will furnish copies of the faculty member's annual evaluations for the years during the review period, including the six prior annual evaluation letters (the summary letters provided by the chair to each faculty member).

Evaluation and Report: The committee will review the file and evaluate the faculty member's overall performance and his or her contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Applying the expectations defined in the Department's annual evaluation plan, the committee will determine whether the faculty member's performance in each area, as well as his or her overall performance, meet expectations, exceed expectations, or fail to meet expectations. In making its evaluations, the committee must bear in mind that (1) faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of contributions to the mission of the Department, School, and the University; (2) a faculty member's activities vary over time according to his or her strengths, interests, and career path; and (3) innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail.

The committee will prepare a written report summarizing its evaluation. The report should provide a narrative description of the faculty member's activities, an explanation of the committee's ratings, and recommendations or suggestions for acknowledgement of contributions and future development of the faculty member. The committee will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the Department Chair.

Consideration by the Department Chair: The committee's report (along with any faculty response) will be provided to the Department Chair. If the Department Chair agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the file. If the Department Chair disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee. The Department Chair may ask the committee to provide additional information or

reconsider the review. The Department Chair will forward the file to the Dean, who will consider the report and express his or her agreement or disagreement in the same manner as the Department Chair. If the Dean disagrees with a positive evaluation by the committee, the faculty member may submit a written response.

The Dean will forward a summary of post-tenure review outcomes and copies of the files to the Provost.

Relation to Annual Evaluations: The committee report will be considered as part of the annual evaluation process and the Department Chair will discuss the review with the faculty member in conjunction with that process. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member with an aim toward enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance, including adoption of a performance improvement plan, if necessary. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken under that policy.

Appeals: If a disagreement between the committee and the Department Chair or Dean cannot be resolved or if the faculty member wishes to appeal an evaluation of “fails to meet expectations,” the matter will be handled as an appeal under the Department’s and School’s Faculty Evaluation Policy.

The School of Education’s Faculty approved the Post-Tenure Review Criteria and Procedures: 04/25/14.