

POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES  
DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

I. General

These post-tenure review guidelines are adopted by the Department of Government and International Studies to fit its particular needs within the framework established by the regulations on post tenure review established in the University Faculty Manual. If any question should arise between the procedures in this document and the regulations in the University Faculty Manual, those in the University Faculty Manual will take precedence.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review.

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions (other than the department chair), will be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six year period, the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., a chaired professorship). Members of the department faculty whose principal appointment is in another unit will not be subject to post-tenure review by the department. However, the department's post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the department chair in writing that he or she has a contractual agreement to retire within three years of the next scheduled review. Post tenure review will also be waived for anyone who has been promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor or who has been granted tenure within the previous six years.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

For the review of faculty below the rank of full professor, the membership of the department Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full and associate professors in the department who have not received an unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluation within the past six years. For the review of faculty at the rank of full professor, the membership of the Committee will consist of all tenured full professors in the department who have not received an unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluation within the past six years. Faculty who are having post-tenure review conducted in a given year will be excluded from participation on the Committee during the year of their review. The chair of the department is eligible neither to vote nor serve on the Committee. The Chair of the Committee will be appointed by the department chair.

Each year, the chair of the department will appoint a subcommittee (hereafter referred to as the Subcommittee) of at least three members from among the members of the Committee eligible to participate in Committee deliberations for the year. The Subcommittee will be charged with conducting an examination of the record of achievement of each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review for the year and preparing a report on the candidates' qualifications to the full Committee.

In any year in which the department does not have five tenured full professors and yet must constitute a post tenure review committee for a full professor, the unit will follow the general guidelines for tenure and promotion.

#### IV. File Documentation.

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Subcommittee. After the Subcommittee evaluation is completed, the file will be available for inspection by all members of the Committee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member must include at least the following material in the file:<sup>1</sup>

##### A. Teaching

1. A list of all courses taught in the previous six years, with enrollments for each course.
2. A numerical summary of student evaluations for all courses taught in the past six years for which department policy required student evaluation.
3. A copy of the peer teaching review conducted by the Subcommittee.

##### B. Scholarship

1. A listing of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous six years, giving complete bibliographic information. The listing should indicate whether each entry was peer reviewed by external reviewers.
2. One copy of each peer reviewed publication published in the past six years.
3. Two letters from external reviewers that evaluate the candidate's research over the past six years (only required of candidates not including peer reviewed articles or books in their file).
4. Details about any sabbatical leave awarded during the period under review.

##### C. Service

1. A listing of major service activities performed over the past 6 years.

##### D. Annual Evaluations

1. The annual report forms from the past six years.
2. A current vita.
3. A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the chair for the past six years.

#### V. Procedures

- A. The chair of the Subcommittee will insure that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Materials specified below as required that are contained in the annual evaluation files do not need to be provided in any separate format.

Subcommittee conducts a peer review of the candidate's teaching in a timely manner.

B. The Chair of the Subcommittee will secure two external evaluations of the candidate's research for the previous six years for all candidates whose files do not include any peer reviewed research articles or books.

C. The Subcommittee will meet and discuss the performance of each candidate after each member of the Subcommittee has carefully reviewed the files of all candidates. At the conclusion of this discussion, the Subcommittee will prepare a written report explaining its evaluations. This report shall be available only to members of the Committee and other members of the university community participating in the post-tenure review of the candidates. The contents of the report and of the Subcommittee's deliberations shall not be revealed to any persons not authorized to participate in the post-tenure review of the candidate.

D. After review of the Subcommittee's report and after review of each candidate's file by each member of the Committee, the Committee will meet to discuss the performance of the candidates. All discussion in this meeting will be kept confidential by all members.

E. After the meeting of the Committee, each member of the Committee will have 48 hours to complete a ballot in which to evaluate each candidate. Each candidate will be evaluated in writing in three areas: teaching, research scholarship, and service. Each member of the Committee will rate each candidate in each of three areas, rating performance in each area as either: "superior," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory." The evaluation of research scholarship will be the most important component of the evaluation. A rating of "unsatisfactory" in any area must be explained in writing. Each member of the Committee will also provide an overall evaluation of the candidate. A majority vote by those voting will be necessary to establish a recommendation by the committee that the candidate's record is satisfactory.

F. For purposes of post-tenure review, the performance rating terms will be defined as follows:

1. "Superior" performance means performance at the highest level. Those rated "superior" overall must have an excellent record in teaching and have a research record that advances the understanding of politics and enhances the national prestige of the department.

2. "Satisfactory" performance means performance that meets the expectations of the department. There will be a presumption, rebuttable only by clear and convincing evidence, that a candidate must have received an evaluation of "satisfactory" or better in the

annual performance evaluations of the department for at least five of the preceding six years in order to achieve a "satisfactory" rating in a given category.<sup>2</sup> Conversely, there will be a strong presumption that any candidate who has received an evaluation of "satisfactory" or better in the annual performance evaluations of the department for at least five of the preceding six years will receive no lower than a "satisfactory" rating in a given category.

3. "Unsatisfactory" performance means performance, taken as a whole for the preceding six years, that does not meet the standards described above for a rating of "satisfactory."

G. The Chair of the department will tabulate the votes for each candidate in each of the three categories and the overall evaluations and prepare a report of the post tenure review of each candidate. The report will record the vote of the Committee in each of the three categories and the overall evaluations, and will summarize the evaluations of the Committee in each category and the reasons or justification provided by members of the Committee. In addition, the report will provide the department chair's overall evaluation of the candidate, the reasons for his or her evaluation of the candidate. The report will also contain a summary of the votes and explanations provided by members of the Committee. The report should contain sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development.

H. The chair of the department will forward a copy of the report to the faculty member who was reviewed. A copy of the report will be retained in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, a copy of the report and the department chair's comments will be forwarded to the dean of the college. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost.

#### J. An Unsatisfactory Review

1. If the department chair's report indicates that the overall performance of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory", the report will include recommendations to assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The chair of the department, after consultation with members of the Subcommittee, will appoint a development committee to produce a plan that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.

2. The department chair, in consultation with the faculty

---

<sup>2</sup> For annual evaluation prior to 1996, evaluations of "average" or better are considered to be satisfactory.

member and his/her development committee, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member to bring his/her overall performance up to a satisfactory level. The timetable is at the discretion of the department chair, but in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year nor more than three years in duration.

3. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the development committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the department chair. The chair of the department will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the development plan, and whether or not future measures may be necessary. The department chair will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports with the dean of the college and the Provost.

4. Failure to meet the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings leading to termination.

## VI. Appeal Procedures

A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the dean of the college. Alternatively, a faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation of any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the Committee, in general or in any particular. The findings of the Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the dean for final determination of the evaluation.

B. If a faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the department chair, he/she may appeal any specific aspects of the development plan or its timetable to the dean of the college. The dean of the college will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.