

Arnold School of Public Health
POST-TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES
October 2010

Post-tenure review is a systematic process for the periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members with permanent tenure. The goals of the post-tenure review are (a) to promote and support faculty development and (b) to evaluate faculty productivity. The post-tenure review process respects the basic principles of academic freedom and does not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action described in the *USC Faculty Manual*.

The post-tenure review process is not a duplication of the tenure and promotion process. The outcome of the post-tenure review process is meant to encourage and promote continued growth and development of tenured faculty who demonstrate their capacity and willingness to perform at appropriate standards or to improve. For tenured faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory, and who fail to improve based on recommendations that are made following the post-tenure review, the result may be the initiation of the tenure termination process as described in the *USC Faculty Manual*.

The post-tenure review process must recognize that the nature and extent of responsibilities of tenured faculty change over time; this is particularly true for full professors. The post-tenure review process must, in turn, take into consideration the changing nature of the roles and responsibilities of tenured faculty during the period under review. In general, all tenured faculty are expected to be productive in scholarship, teaching, and service throughout their career at the University of South Carolina.

One of the goals of post-tenure review for tenured associate professors in the Arnold School of Public Health is to encourage continued growth toward promotion to the rank of full professor. However, it is possible to receive a 'satisfactory' post-tenure review at the associate professor level without making progress toward promotion. In all cases, the post-tenure review process is designed to encourage continued growth and development toward new and higher professional goals for all tenured faculty members.

I. General Procedures

The procedures described below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review as established in the *USC Faculty Manual*. In cases of potential conflict, regulations specified in the *USC Faculty Manual* take precedence.

II. Post-Tenure Review: Faculty Manual Regulations

A. Eligibility

1. Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in administrative positions other than dean, will be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six year period, the faculty member has been advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., dean, chaired professorship, promotion to full professor), in which case the post-tenure review cycle restarts.
2. Post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing of planned retirement within three years of the next scheduled review.
3. Tenured faculty members who hold joint appointments will undergo post-tenure review according to the criteria and by the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank of the primary unit but including consultation with dean, department chair and faculty members of the secondary unit.

B. Organization of the Post-Tenure Review File

1. The post-tenure review file must include a current curriculum vitae with any accompanying materials deemed appropriate by the candidate. Supporting documentation (e.g., copies of grants and manuscripts) is not required.
2. The post-tenure review file must include peer and student evaluations, research/scholarship activities, and service activities, as appropriate for the six years of review.
3. The post-tenure review file must incorporate annual performance reviews accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review. At minimum, annual performance reviews from the most recent six years are to be included.
4. The post-tenure review file may include a personal statement providing a thoughtful overview of faculty member's activities in the previous six years in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service and the faculty member's future goals as well as developmental needs.
5. The post-tenure review file must include detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year period prior to the review.

III. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

Ad hoc committees representing the Arnold School of Public Health Tenure & Promotion Committee (SPH TPC) are jointly appointed by the chair of the TPC and the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum and are responsible for carrying out the post-tenure review for individual faculty under review. Ad hoc committees consist of three members; at

least one member is from the department of the faculty member under review. The remaining members are normally from other departments within the SPH.

Chairs of the ad hoc committees for post-tenure review are selected jointly by the chair of the SPH TPC and the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum. The chair of the ad hoc committee must be a full professor. Ad hoc committees assigned to review full professors consist of full professors only; ad hoc committees reviewing associate professors must include at least one full professor.

IV. **Criteria for Evaluating Productivity**

Evidence for evaluating productivity is the same as that established for evaluation a candidate for tenure and promotion at the appropriate rank (full or associate professor). For each category, any applicable evidence should be presented, but most candidates will not have evidence of every activity listed. Evidence may be presented in the personal statement, the CV, or separate documentation; with the exception of teaching evaluations noted below, separate documentation is not required.

A. Teaching Productivity.

The following could be included in post-tenure review materials.

1. Student evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance in all classes taught during the period under review (*required*).
2. Peer evaluations of a candidate's classroom teaching performance (*required*).
3. Direction and completion of dissertations and theses.
4. Direction of students in practica/projects and independent studies.
5. Service on dissertation and thesis committees and service on examination committees.
6. Development and/or revision of new courses, curriculum, and instructional material and methods.
7. Demonstration of activities to improve teaching effectiveness.
8. Student advisement activities.
9. Any other documentation to support teaching effectiveness.
10. Nomination for and receipt of teaching awards.
11. A track record of accomplishments by former graduates, especially doctoral students.

B. Scholarship/Research Productivity

The following evidence of scholarship/research productivity could be included in post-tenure review materials. Lists are sufficient; copies are not required.

1. Publication of original, data-based and/or methodological research in peer-reviewed research journals as lead author or senior author with student lead author.
2. Solicitation and receipt of competitive research grants or contracts as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or significant participant (with indication of contribution and time commitment).
3. Publication of data-based and/or methodological research in peer reviewed research journals as support author (with an indication of contribution).
4. Citation of candidate's work by other scholars.
5. Publication of specialized reference books or publication of chapters in these books, or publication of textbooks that have passed editorial boards.
6. Publication of review articles in peer-reviewed journals.
7. Publication of monographs.
8. Publication of papers in proceedings, or Invited Commentaries.
9. Publication of articles in non-refereed professional journals.
10. Publication of abstracts of scholarly presentation.
11. Presentation of research at professional meetings.
12. Participation in specialized workshops, lectures, or colloquia, especially at other institutions.
13. Editing of books.
14. Book reviews.
15. Receipt of non-competitive research grants and contracts.
16. Receipt of honors and/or awards that recognize the quality of research.
17. Patents, patent disclosures, software or other intellectual property activities based on original research.

C. Service Productivity

The following evidence of service productivity could be included in post-tenure review materials:

Service to the Profession

1. Roles and active participation in professional organizations.
2. Submission and receipt of or participation in training grants/contracts (with an indication of contribution and time commitment).
3. Editorial and review work for academic publications and research funding agencies.
4. Assisting students in job placement.
5. Service as session chair or discussant at professional meetings.
6. Consultation (e.g. panels with NIH, NSF, member of executive council, National Board Science Advisor)

Service to the Academic Community

7. Service on committees at the University, School and/or department level with an indication of leadership contributions on those committees.

8. Administrative responsibility and function which includes key University, School and/or department administrative positions.
9. Special projects for the University, School and/or the department.
10. Initiating efforts to improve academic or other programs at the University, School and/or department, level.
11. Continuing education programs.

Service to the Local/State Community

12. Service on government committees or task forces.
13. Consulting that is related to the candidate's professional activity.
14. Service to state or local agencies.
15. Leadership role in not-for-profit organizations.
16. Presentations to community groups.
17. Serving on advisory boards, societies or councils,

V. Standards for Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory Reviews

Within each area of teaching, research/scholarship, and service and overall, the candidate's performance will be evaluated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. While there is not a numerical rating involved, the expected distribution of effort includes a majority of time on instructional and research activities with less time dedicated to service activities, including academic administration. However, any faculty member can present and justify an alternative distribution of effort that will guide the overall evaluation.

A. Satisfactory Performance

Satisfactory performance is performance that meets or exceeds the expectations of the Arnold School of Public Health for the current rank of the individual under review.

B. Unsatisfactory Performance

Unsatisfactory performance is performance, taken as a whole, that fails to meet accepted standards of the Arnold School of Public Health for the current rank of the individual under review.

VI. PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING THE POST-TENURE REVIEW

- A. The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review established in the University *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the regulations in the *Faculty Manual*, the *Faculty Manual* will take precedence. The Arnold School post-tenure review calendar will follow the calendar established for this purpose by the Office of the Provost.

- B. Faculty are notified by the Office of the Dean at least six months in advance that the post-tenure review file is due to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Curriculum on a specified date.
- C. Ad hoc committees for each faculty under review are jointly appointed by the chair of the SPH TPC and the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum. Ad hoc committees are responsible for carrying out the post-tenure review. Ad hoc committees consist of three members; at least one member is from the department of the candidate being reviewed. The remaining members are normally from other departments within the SPH.

Chairs of the ad hoc committees for post-tenure review panels are selected jointly by the chair of the SPH TPC and the associate dean for academic affairs. The ad hoc committee chair must be a full professor.

Ad hoc committees assigned to review full professors consists of full professors only; ad hoc committees reviewing associate professors must include at least one full professor. *Note, in the case of a full professor under review with no full professor from the home department available to serve on the ad hoc committee, a tenured associate professor from the department of the individual under review shall be appointed to serve on the committee.*

The ad hoc committees have a minimum of two weeks to review assigned files; it is the responsibility of the ad hoc committee to report the outcomes of their reviews to the SPH TPC.

- D. The ad hoc committee reviews the file of assigned faculty and by a two-thirds vote recommends an evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory for each of the areas of research, teaching and service and for overall performance based on the documented distribution of effort. The ad hoc committee formulates a draft document (prepared in writing by the ad hoc committee chair) which describes the performance of the faculty member in each area under review. For any area rated unsatisfactory, the committee must include sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development.

Regardless of distribution of effort, if two or more of the three areas under review are unsatisfactory, the overall review is considered unsatisfactory. If one area with substantial level of effort is viewed as unsatisfactory and the other areas are satisfactory, the overall review may be deemed unsatisfactory.

For all other scenarios the overall rating should be satisfactory.

- E. A post-tenure review meeting for the SPH TPC is set by the chair of the TPC and the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum. The chair of the ad hoc committee presents the

draft summary letter to the appropriate membership of the SPH TPC in the form of a detailed summary. After review and commentary by members of the SPH TPC, the summary letter may be revised; revisions are carried out by the ad hoc committee chair. After the summary letter is approved by the SPH TPC, a copy of the letter and post-tenure review file is forwarded by the chair of the SPH TPC to the department chair and to the dean.

- F. The chair, independent of the dean, reviews the summary letter and the post-tenure review file and indicates in writing concurrence or disagreement. The dean reviews the summary letter and the post-tenure review file and indicates in writing concurrence or disagreement. In the case of disagreement, the dean, department chair, ad hoc committee chair, and chair of the SPH TPC shall discuss areas of disagreement and resolve differences. The dean makes the final decision as to the content of the summary letter.
- G. If the outcome of the post-tenure review is satisfactory, a copy of the document is forwarded to the faculty member and a copy is placed in the faculty's academic personnel file in the office of faculty affairs and curriculum. The process is then complete.
- H. If the outcome of the post-tenure is unsatisfactory, faculty member must follow procedures for completion of a development plan.
 - 1. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations, he/she may appeal to the local SPH TPC in general or in any particular.
 - 2. The department chair, in consultation with the faculty member, reviews and discusses a development plan for the faculty member. The development plan process requires designation of a unit development committee with at least three faculty members of equal or higher rank. The development plan must (1) specify the steps to be taken to move to a satisfactory review; (2) provide information about how support will be provided for taking those steps; and (3) indicate the time line (generally 1 to 2 years and in no case to exceed 3 years) for meeting the recommended steps in the plan.
 - 3. A copy of the unsatisfactory review and the associated developmental plan are forwarded to the Office of the Provost.
 - 4. At the time of subsequent annual reviews, a follow-up review which involves an assessment of the progress of the faculty member in meeting the developmental plan is completed by the SPH TPC; the outcome of this review is forwarded to faculty member, to the department chair and to the dean. The dean makes the final determination on progress or lack thereof and whether or not further measures may be necessary. If the plan has been fully completed, the

performance of the faculty member is deemed satisfactory, and a letter from the dean to this effect is forwarded to the faculty member and a copy is placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

5. If the faculty member does not agree with the follow-up review, he/she may request a consultation with the dean.
6. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination of tenure. If proceedings for termination of tenure are recommended, standards and procedures for termination of tenured faculty, as described in the *USC Faculty Manual*, will be followed.