

Report
Post Tenure Review Committee
April 5, 2016

Committee Members: Marilyn Button, Neal Carlson, Carol-Ann George, Robert Millette, Linda Stine, David Royer

The Post Tenure Review Process was carried out for the first time during the 2014-15 academic year. The process was established with the ratification of the 2012-16 Collective Bargaining Agreement between Lincoln University and the Lincoln University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (the CBA sections that address post-tenure review are in Appendix I). The CBA established September 1, 2014 as the start date for the process.

2014-15. The first group of faculty members chosen for the Post Tenure Review Process included 11 tenured professors, three from the College of Science and Technology, three from the College of Professional, Graduate and Extended Studies, and five from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. The faculty were chosen by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the deans. Dr. Wilbur shared with the Committee that she made choices based on the length of time since the last review. In addition, the number chosen from each college was approximately proportionate to the number of faculty in each college. Each faculty member was notified by the September 15 deadline, and to the best of the Committee's knowledge, each of these faculty members submitted a portfolio to their respective dean containing the materials specified in the CBA. These materials are:

1. A curriculum vitae
2. A statement outlining his/her performance in the areas of teaching and service since the last review.
3. A copy of the most recent sabbatical report if such exists.
4. Department chair's and dean's evaluations of the faculty for the last five years.
5. Student course evaluations over the preceding five years.

The deans reviewed the portfolios submitted by faculty members in their College; the result was that four faculty members successfully completed the Post Tenure review process at the dean's level because there were no concerns about teaching and scholarship or service; the portfolios of the remaining seven faculty members were referred to the Post Tenure Review Committee for additional review. The Committee met weekly for most of the 2015 spring semester to review each of the seven portfolios and complete its recommendations by the April 15 deadline.

Results of the 2014-2015 Committee Reviews

Met or exceeded expectations thereby successfully completing post tenure review with no further action necessary and no recommendations from the Committee	Two faculty members
Met or exceeded expectations thereby successfully completing post tenure review	Four faculty members

with no further action necessary, but with recommendations from the Committee	
Met or exceeded expectations in the areas of service and scholarship but additional development in teaching was deemed necessary	One faculty member

As prescribed by the CBA, the review results were sent to the respective deans and copied to the faculty member under review and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Results of the 2015-2016 Review

In December, 2015, the Committee received a list of 13 faculty that were chosen for post-tenure review for the 2015-16 academic year. Of the 13, five were from the College of Science and Technology, five were from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, and three were from the College of Professional, Graduate and Extended Studies.

None of the 13 selected faculty was referred to the PTR Committee for further review.

Reviewed Faculty Feedback

The Committee reached out to the faculty who were referred to the Committee for further review in the spring of 2015 for feedback on how the process might be changed. The responses included:

1. The selection process for choosing faculty for post-tenure review should be more transparent.
2. Faculty should be allowed to submit materials beyond those required by the CBA. (The Committee recommends against this suggestion. If the Committee feels that additional materials are needed, the Committee can request them from the faculty member.)
3. The Office of Institutional Research should provide the teaching evaluations for the faculty who are chosen for post-tenure review.
4. Deans cannot require materials or activities that are not included in the process as defined by the CBA.
5. The Deans should complete a simple check-off form using “exceeds expectations”, “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations” for the three areas under review.
6. Review materials should be sent directly to the Committee.

Committee Recommendations

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the deans, should select faculty for post-tenure review based on selection guidelines in the CBA.
2. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs should notify the faculty chosen for post-tenure review and copy the notification to the deans, chairs and the chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee.
3. Faculty should be encouraged to submit only the materials required by the CBA. If the Committee needs additional materials, a request will be sent to the faculty member requesting those materials.

4. When the Post-Tenure Review Committee makes recommendations for further development for a faculty member under review, the faculty member should prepare a letter no later than one year following the receipt of Committee recommendations describing the actions taken in response to the recommendations. This letter should be submitted to the faculty member's chairperson along with the original recommendations and a sign-off sheet that must be signed by the faculty member's chairperson and dean indicating agreement that the faculty member has successfully addressed the recommendations. The materials should then be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs where the documents are reviewed and stored.
5. Rubrics should be developed to be used by the deans and the Committee for their reviews to promote uniformity in the post-tenure review process. Ideally, there should be a single rubric for all the colleges with an alternative rubric for library faculty.
6. The deadline for the referrals to the Committee should be changed to January 15th from the current January 2nd deadline.
7. There should be a uniform process and schedule for notifying the faculty of the deans' decisions, whether they are accepting the portfolio as is or sending it on to the Committee for further review. In addition, the Committee should be notified by the deans when a faculty member has successfully completed post-tenure review at the dean review level.
8. The Post-Tenure Review Committee should report each April to the faculty on that year's activities and decisions.
9. The materials to be submitted by faculty members under review include "Department chair's and dean's evaluations of the faculty for the last five years." This implies that chairs and deans prepare annual evaluations of faculty which is not common practice. The Committee recommends that the wording should be changed to "Department Chair's letter that evaluates a faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly work and service over the previous five years."

Appendix I. Section 10.4 and Article XI (Sections 11.1-11.5) from the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Section 10.4. Post-Tenure Review

After a faculty member has achieved tenure, the faculty member will be reviewed every fifth year following the last submission of their materials to the Promotion, Tenure and Severance Committee or any other committee established to evaluate faculty performance periodically. The purpose of these reviews is to examine, recognize, develop and enhance the performance of tenured faculty through an advisory peer review process.

ARTICLE XI – POST TENURE REVIEW

Section 11.1. Purpose

The purpose of post-tenure review is to assist faculty in maintaining teaching effectiveness and service or scholarship to the university. Effective September 1, 2014 the following procedure will be in place.

Section 11.2. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee Membership

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee Membership: This committee will be a new faculty standing committee and will be constituted in accordance with existing Faculty By-Law procedures. All members of this committee must be tenured faculty and they cannot serve in a year in which they are being evaluated. The committee members will serve three (3) year staggered terms. The membership of this committee is one tenured faculty member from each of the three Schools/Colleges, one tenured faculty from the library, one tenured faculty from the graduate school, and one tenured faculty member appointed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Section 11.3. Scheduling Procedure

Tenured faculty to be reviewed will be scheduled based on length of time since last review (promotion, sabbatical, or previous PTR), but no more than one-fifth of the tenured faculty will be scheduled in any given year.

Section 11.4. Post-Tenure Review Process

The PTR process will be conducted in two (2) steps.

- a. Faculty will be notified by the Dean by September 15 that they have been scheduled for review. The materials described below* will be submitted to the Dean by November 7. If the Dean decides, following review of the submitted material, with a preponderance of the evidence that further review is needed, the previously submitted materials accompanied by the Dean's assessment, will be referred to the PTR Committee no later than January 2. The affected faculty member will receive a copy of the Dean's assessment at the same time.
- b. The PTR Committee will review the submitted materials and may request additional documentation including a response by the faculty member to the Dean's assessment. The Faculty Member will always be afforded an opportunity to respond to the Dean's assessment. The PTR Committee will issue a recommendation to the Dean with a copy to the faculty member by April 15.

Section 11.5. Post-Tenure Review Committee Report

The PTR Committee report will include the following:

- a. A conclusion that the faculty member's teaching and service or scholarship are satisfactory, or
- b. A finding that improvements are needed and will identify specific areas where those improvements are needed, and will recommend a proposed course of action to bring about those improvements.

*The materials to be submitted are:

- a. A curriculum vita
- b. A statement outlining his/her performance in the areas of teaching and service since the last review.
- c. A copy of the most recent sabbatical report if such exists.
- d. Department chair's and dean's evaluations of the faculty for the last five years.
- e. Student course evaluations over the preceding five years.