

The Citadel
The Military College of South Carolina
171 Moultrie Street
Charleston, S.C. 29409

GENERAL ORDER
NO. 3

25 March 2004

POLICY ON POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION:

The Legislature of the State of South Carolina has mandated that all state assisted institutions of higher learning will institute a policy of evaluations for all faculty. There are four types of evaluation which are required: (a) student evaluations for all courses, (b) an annual administrative evaluation to include assessments from the dean/department head, (c) a peer review annually for untenured faculty, and (d) a peer review every six years for tenured faculty (see *Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty* and *Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review* as presented in Performance Indicators 2B and 2C, respectively).

This mandate is a reflection of the larger concerns by society regarding proper use of resources and the efficient teaching and learning process conducted by the public universities and colleges of this state. Budgetary problems and the need to have age neutral assessment policies for older faculty members beyond the former retirement age are also concerns which must be addressed.

2. STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY:

At every stage of a faculty member's career, efforts must be made to identify strengths and weaknesses in performance, and through appropriate advice and action, provide opportunities for faculty to realize their complete professional development consistent with the academic needs and goals of The Citadel. The requirement for post-tenure review constitutes one aspect of a series of evaluations which occur in a normal career. Not only do professors receive evaluations through the types which are mandated by the state, but they also are subjected to evaluations in the hiring process, during the probationary period leading to tenure, in the tenure decision itself, in evaluations leading to academic promotions, in peer-reviewed research proposals, in peer-reviewed research products, in scholarly conference presentations, and in other opportunities. Through the annual probationary review process, the tenured members of a school/department inform untenured faculty members of their progress toward tenure. In this process, specific areas of concern should be clearly identified. The responsibility of informing tenured members of the faculty of their progress toward a successful post-tenure review is assumed by the dean/department head through the annual evaluation process. Constructive or developmental assistance should be provided at other times if requested by the faculty member. These processes result in the establishment and refinement of the school/departmental culture relative to expectations for tenure and post-tenure review.

The implementation of a post-tenure review process should not be viewed as simply a new

consideration for tenure. The expectations for tenure at The Citadel change over time, and tenured professors should not be expected to requalify under the new standards. The current expectation of tenured professors is that they perform their duties conscientiously and with professional competence in the three expected areas of activities. The review must also be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. In reviewing a faculty member's performance, the school/departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee will not only recognize the diverse talents, activities, and accomplishments of faculty members, but also will focus attention on the faculty member's specified areas of endeavor. A rating of satisfactory in the post-tenure review process should reflect an acceptable level of performance.

A post-tenure review policy should serve the main purpose of faculty improvement. There is no one model for a faculty career since the mix among teaching, scholarly activity, and service will differ from one faculty member to another. Nevertheless, there are certain common expectations which faculty members understand as part of their profession. Commitment to teaching, service to the institution, and scholarly activity are expected of all faculty. The degree of scholarly engagement will vary from member to member, but all faculty are expected to remain current in their field through some form of scholarly activity. Post-tenure review, therefore, should be used as a means to evaluate the total performance of the faculty member over a number of years, and it should be used as the basis for facilitating improvement where appropriate.

3. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES:

A. The various schools/departments at The Citadel will retain their primary responsibility for faculty evaluations. The dean's/department head's annual evaluation based on the faculty member's *Personal Data Sheet* (a form for annual evaluations requesting evidence in support of professional contributions in the three areas of responsibility: Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly and Professional Activity, and Service) will continue to be the primary means of evaluation for all faculty members. Each school/department will decide by majority vote whether to require, to permit, or to exclude participation in the post-tenure review by persons from outside The Citadel. If the school/department decides in favor of participation by an outside professional, the school/department Post-Tenure Review Committee, with input from the faculty member under review, will arrange for the participation in the review process by a professional outside The Citadel. This individual will not participate as a voting member of the committee, but will provide an independent evaluation of those portions of the faculty member's record that have been specified by a majority vote of the faculty. This decision will be reflected in the school/departmental procedures document.

B. Post-tenure review of the tenured faculty (in teaching positions) will take place every six years. Reviews will be conducted on a six-year schedule unless interrupted by a promotion, a written declaration to retire within two years of the next scheduled post-tenure review, or any form of leave of absence (including sabbaticals). If a tenured faculty member is promoted, the promotion action fulfills the post-tenure review requirement, and the six-year, post-tenure review cycle is

modified to begin with the effective date of the promotion. In the case of any form of leave of absence for a semester or longer, the period of the leave of absence does not count as a part of the six-year period between reviews.

C. Annually (during Fall semester), as needed, the tenured faculty members of each school/department will elect a three person committee of tenured faculty members, excluding the Dean/Department Head. The school/department members of the committee will arrange, with input from the faculty member under review, for a senior Citadel faculty member from another school/department to serve as a voting participant in the school's/department's post-tenure review process. The committee cannot include individuals currently undergoing post-tenure review. Any issues regarding committee membership will be resolved through the Dean and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the school/department.

D. Evaluation criteria will include the following as applicable: instruction/teaching; advisement and mentoring of students; supervision of students (independent study, etc.); course/curriculum development; research/scholarly activities; publications; service to the school/department/College; discipline-oriented service to the community; participation in professional organizations; honors, awards, and recognitions; participation in faculty development activities/programs; and activities which support the economic development of the region or the state. Standards and procedures for post-tenure review should be readily available at all times to all faculty.

E. The specific types of activities in the list above will vary from discipline to discipline, but teaching effectiveness and service to the College and school/department will be similar for all. Faculty members are expected to take this opportunity to produce a self-evaluation report as part of this process. This is a common practice in post-tenure review at many institutions, and it serves as a means for each faculty member to reflect on his/her accomplishments and assess goals and results during the previous period. This reflection should enable a faculty member to determine his/her future goals and directions as teacher, scholar, and colleague (service).

F. Faculty members are expected to submit the following material for the post-tenure review process:

- 1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae;
- 2) copies of the annual performance evaluation at the school/departmental level for each of the years in the review period;
- 3) the faculty member's responses to any of these annual evaluations if they exist;
- 4) computer summaries of the Student Evaluation of Instruction data for

each course taught by the faculty member during this period of review;

5) a self evaluation;

6) other data required by the school/department (must be in writing in the professional standards document).

G. Post-tenure reviews will take place according to the following schedule:

1) Faculty members scheduled for post-tenure review should submit their materials to the associate dean/department head by mid-January of the academic year in which the review will take place.

2) The associate dean/department head will review the materials for completeness with the faculty member and the materials will be available for review by the school/departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee and the associate dean/department head during February and March.

3) The committee report will be given to the faculty member and the associate dean/department head by the first working day in April.

4) By April 10, the associate dean/department head will submit his/her written recommendation to the faculty member.

5) The faculty member may choose to write a response to either the committee report or to the associate dean's/department head's recommendation or to both. All responses are due on the last working day of April.

6) The associate dean/department head and faculty member jointly ensure that the completed package of materials is submitted to the dean by the first working day in May.

7) The dean will inform the faculty member of his/her decision in writing prior to commencement. The decision will be one of the following:

a) Satisfactory,

b) Unsatisfactory.

8) The faculty member may appeal the decision of the dean to the Provost/Dean of the College. The appeal must be received by the Provost/Dean of the College by the first working day in June. It must be in writing and must state the grounds for the appeal which are the same as those contained in General Order 14.

9) The Provost/Dean of the College makes the final decision for the

institution. Appeals will be resolved by August 1.

H. The following actions will be taken for each of the post-tenure ratings:

a) Satisfactory -- This rating indicates that the faculty member's performance is in keeping with institutional expectations. A satisfactory rating means satisfactory in teaching and one or both of the other two performance areas (scholarly activities and service).

b) Unsatisfactory -- This rating indicates that the faculty member's performance does not meet institutional expectations. An unsatisfactory rating means unsatisfactory in teaching or both of the other two performance areas (scholarly activity and service). The faculty member will be required to present for approval by the department head and/or dean a faculty development proposal addressing the areas of concern presented by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Additional resources may be allocated by the institution to assist the professor in the faculty development plan. This faculty member will again undergo post-tenure review in the third year following the review that resulted in an unsatisfactory rating. The concurrence by the Provost/Dean of the College in a second rating of Unsatisfactory will serve as the initial steps called for in section 4.D.1) of the "Procedures For Dismissal 'For Cause'" in the section on "Termination of Tenured Faculty" in General Order 14, approved 7 June 2000. The Provost/Dean of the College will then inform the faculty member in writing the intent to terminate his/her employment at the College.

I. Initial implementation of post-tenure review will be accomplished as follows:

1) An initial year of review (YOR) will be established for each faculty member who has been tenured for six or more years and who was promoted prior to August 1994. Post-tenure reviews will be conducted during this year and then at six-year intervals thereafter.

2) The YOR for these faculty members (see a. above) is established as follows.

<u>YOR</u>	<u>Number to be Conducted</u>	<u>Academic Date of Rank (last digit of year)</u>
2000-01	16	0 & 1
2001-02	15	2 & 5
2002-03	17	3 & 4
2003-04	17	6 & 7
2004-05	14	8 & 9

J. For untenured faculty members, the initial YOR is the year they receive tenure plus six years, if applicable.

K. For faculty members who have been tenured for less than six years, their YOR is the year of tenure plus six years or the year of last promotion plus six years, whichever date is later.

L. For faculty members who have been tenured for more than six years but promoted in August 1994 or later, their YOR is their date of last promotion plus six years.

M. Annually, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will provide the dean an updated listing of scheduled post-tenure reviews for tenured members of the faculty in his/her school.

4. Rescission:

General Order 16, dated 19 July 2000, is rescinded.

FOR THE PRESIDENT:

OFFICIAL

CHARLES B. REGER
Colonel, USAF, Retired
Executive Assistant to the President