

Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development

Post-Tenure Review Guidelines

The EAHR Post-Tenure Review guidelines for tenured faculty are in accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01, *Post-Tenure Review* and the College of Education and Human Development's Post Tenure Review Guidelines. As noted by the CEHD guidelines, "Post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity."

The overall rating for performance in the core areas of teaching, research and service as provided in the A1 document is as follows: Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations (Satisfactory), Needs Improvement and Does not Meet Expectations (Not Satisfactory).

The University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 section 2.5 states that if a faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single category, he or she must work with his or her department head immediately to develop an improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take 1 year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. The rating of "Needs Improvement" can stay as "Needs Improvement" as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to "Unsatisfactory".

When any tenured faculty member is unsatisfactory or needs improvement on A1 (annual performance evaluation) in research or any other two areas, given the faculty work load distribution (percentages on teaching, research, and service), that faculty member will be provided with an opportunity to collaborate with the department head on a professional development plan at the department level.

Faculty distribution of work load percentages will affect decisions of whether a faculty is placed on a professional development plan. For instance, if a faculty member is listed as 40% on research, that faculty member will be expected to meet all departmental benchmarks in research. However, if a faculty has a 20% distribution of work load in research, that faculty will be expected to meet only part of the departmental benchmark in research as stated in the department's annual review (A1) document. Since there are so many combinations of work load distribution and so many different benchmarks, the determination of whether a faculty member meets the benchmarks in any one area, given that faculty's work load distribution, will be made by the Department Head.

After the peer review committee report and the department head's review of A1 report, the department head will determine if there are any faculty members who may require a professional development plan because of being Unsatisfactory in research or any other two areas. A faculty member with Needs Improvement rating in any two areas of research, teaching or service will be required to work with the department head to develop a professional development plan. The A1's of the faculty members so designated by the Head will be taken to the Executive Committee who will collaborate with the Head on the decision of whether a faculty member should have a professional development plan at the department level.

Faculty that the Head and Executive Committee agree require a professional development plan will be immediately notified of this decision, and a meeting will be immediately scheduled for the faculty member and the Department Head to collaborate on drawing up a professional development. This will occur prior to the faculty member's A2 meeting with the Head, and the resulting professional plan will be reflected on the A2. Both the A2 and the professional development plan will be submitted to the Dean.

If the faculty member does not agree with the designation of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement or if the faculty member and the Department Head cannot come to agreement on the professional development plan, the matter will be referred to the Executive Committee. The faculty member will be invited to a meeting of the Executive Committee to present her or his case. After hearing the faculty member present his or her case, the Executive Committee will, in collaboration with the Head, make the final decision on the issue at hand. The Head will communicate that decision to the faculty member.

The department will follow the CEHD Post-Tenure Review guidelines and University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 in implementing academic professional development for a faculty member who has fallen below the performance bench marks for the department.

Professional Development Review

The University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 section 4.1 states that a professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (section 2) or an "Unsatisfactory" Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7).

The rule states further that the department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.