April 21, 2011

To:     Darryl Phillips, Speaker of the Faculty

From: 2011 Post-Tenure Review Committee (Julie Swanson – chair, Tom Baginski, Barbara Borg, Lou Burnett, Lee Lindner)


The committee met during January and February 2011 to review eleven candidates requesting a Superior review. Ten of the eleven cases were deemed to be Superior by the Committee. These recommendations were sent to the Provost in the form of letters on each of the candidates reviewed.

After the deliberations were completed, the committee compiled a memo to the Provost with issues and concerns identified on the Post-Tenure Review policy as found in the Faculty Administration Manual (FAM). We provided the following recommendations that should be helpful to faculty preparing packets for Post-Tenure Review and to future Post-Tenure Review Committees.

**Post-Tenure Review Policy.** We have identified inconsistencies in the Post-Tenure Review policy published in the *FAM* (pp. 132-139) as compared with the criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor (p. 101). The fundamental problem is that the criteria for promotion to Professor were revised in April 2009, but the corresponding standards for PTR were not revised at that time. The promotion policy and the PTR policy for candidates seeking a “superior” rating are at odds. The general principle behind the superior rating is that the candidate “continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the standards of the *Faculty Administration Manual*” (p. 136 – VI.H.6.a.(1)). Since the promotion standards and the PTR standards are tightly linked, the criteria for both should be consistent.

The specific wording of the **PTR policy** (*FAM*, VI.H.2.a.(6) on p. 133) states that “Candidates seeking a “superior” rating must also furnish clear evidence of **exemplary** teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship.” This section of the *FAM* goes on to discuss the nature of the evidence.

The revised **policy on promotion to Professor** (*FAM*, p. 101 – VI.A.4.c.) states that “Evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas is required.”

The PTR policy requires exemplary teaching effectiveness, while the promotion policy allows a candidate to be exemplary in any of the professional competency areas, or if not exemplary in one competency area, to have significant achievement in all three areas. We feel this is a
significant difference and the current PTR policy is more restrictive. Thus, we recommend that the wording of the PTR policy be changed to be consistent with the promotion policy. Our specific suggestions for change are shown below with additions in bold underline (FAM, p. 133).

VI.H.2.a.(6) Candidates seeking a "superior" rating must also furnish clear evidence of exemplary teaching effectiveness (exemplary professional competency in the case of librarians), leadership in service, and continuing quality scholarship. either

**exemplary performance in at least one of the specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas.** This evidence must include two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers, concerning aspects of the candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency). Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality; therefore, the evidence must also include at least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts). Candidates must provide evidence that the scholarly material submitted is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated. Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.

**Other recommendations.** Despite the fact that the requirements for Post-Tenure Review are clearly stated in the FAM, some issues could benefit from further clarification.

1. The period of evaluation needs to be more clearly identified by Academic Affairs. The wording in the FAM (p. 133 - VI.H.2.a.(6)) would appear to be clear enough, “Evidence is to be compiled for the intervening period between promotion evaluation and/or post-tenure reviews.” However, unless a year is specified, we believe confusion will result. This should be a part of the instructions given to faculty each fall when packets are put together. This year, for example, we judged that materials prior to 2005 would not be judged as a part of the evaluation period. Faculty members could benefit from this clarity and the clarification will help them streamline the materials they place in the packets.

2. Some packets were incomplete to varying degrees. The most frequent problem we had was in locating the letters of peer review of teaching. Another frequent problem was the lack of evidence for work being peer-reviewed. Even though this is a clear requirement, such evidence was often missing. There are six specific items the packets should contain (FAM, p. 133). We suggest the following specific arrangement of tabs in a packet as follows will greatly facilitate organization of the material by the candidate and review by the PTR committee.

Tab 1. A letter from the candidate indicating the rating for which he/she wishes to be considered.
Tab 2. Letter from Dean with recommendations.
Tab 3. Letter from Department Chair with recommendations.
Tab 4. Two letters from intra- and/or extra-departmental peers concerning aspects of the candidate’s teaching (or, for librarians, professional competency).
Tab 5. Curriculum vitae.
Tab 6. Statement from the candidate on teaching, research and service addressing accomplishments since the last review and future plans and goals. This should be one
narrative addressing the three competency areas. The narrative should be no more than 10 pages.

Tab 7. Annual performance evaluations by the department chair during the period under review. In the event that a department chair is being evaluated, the dean's annual evaluations of the chair will be included instead.

Tab 8. Computer-generated student teaching evaluations (summary pages with numbers) for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate during the period under review.

Tab 9. Other evidence of accomplishments in the competency areas.
   a. Sample of course syllabi (no more than three).
   b. At least two scholarly articles and/or books (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts).
      i. On co-authored articles, indicate candidate’s contribution.
      ii. Evidence that the scholarly material submitted for consideration is peer reviewed, juried or professionally evaluated.