

Department of Humanities & Cultural Studies Post-Tenure Review Procedure & Criteria

Submitted September 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: September 14, 2023

In accordance with BOG Regulation 10.003, tenured members of the Department of Humanities & Cultural Studies undergo Post-Tenure Review in the fifth year following their last promotion or last comprehensive review, whichever is later. For faculty hired with tenure, the hire date constitutes the date of last promotion.

Faculty under Post-Tenure Review complete a dossier composed of the following:

- the faculty member's five most recent annual performance reviews;
- a narrative, written by the faculty member, describing their record of accomplishments during the previous five years (not to exceed 12,000 characters);
- the faculty member's CV;
- the faculty member's disciplinary record for the previous five years, if any exists.

Criteria for Post Tenure Review in Humanities & Cultural Studies are based on the university-approved guidelines for "Annual Evaluations of Faculty" described in the department's By-Laws. They are adjusted to account for five years of review and weighted according to a faculty member's annual assignments for the period under review. The criteria should not yield results that depart significantly from the mean of the faculty member's five most recent annual evaluations, renormalized to the scale outlined in BOG Regulation 10.003:

1. Exceeds Expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performance of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit;
2. Meets Expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit;
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: performance falls below the normal range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement;
4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

Having reviewed a faculty member's dossier, the chair of HCS assesses their performance in a narrative (not to exceed 12,000 characters). They also assign the faculty member a holistic rating consistent with the foregoing categories and based on the following criteria for teaching, research, and service, as weighted by annual assignments.

TEACHING

The criteria for Post-Tenure Review assume an annual 55 percent teaching assignment average, which is typical for a tenured HCS faculty member. Adjustments are made for assignment variation. The following items are considered in the department's annual review of teaching performance:

- Course Materials: the design of syllabi and assignments as well as course websites and other materials provided to students, as applicable;

- Student Evaluations: written student comments and quantitative averages on required end-of-semester student evaluations; the latter are assessed as raw scores and in relation to evaluation completion rates, modes of delivery, course grade distributions, and departmental and college means for similar sizes and types of courses;
- Additional Materials: discussions of teaching in the faculty member's Post-Tenure Review narrative carry weight as evidence of reflective teaching practices and supply a means for contextualizing teaching within the faculty member's overall effort within and contribution to the curriculum; materials documenting duties beyond regular classes (e.g., directed readings and independent studies, graduate student and thesis advising, development of materials for future and / or online courses, supervising TAs, and other relevant work with students), and peer evaluations based on class visitations are also considered.

Specific criteria for Post-Tenure Review assessments of teaching are as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: assigned to faculty members who achieve high levels of accomplishment in teaching as demonstrated by annual reviews for the previous 5 years and evidence in the foregoing categories; additional consideration is granted teaching awards; the development of new courses or major revisions to existing ones; innovative pedagogy; online course development; and supervision of or contributions to graduate theses and dissertations, as applicable;
2. Meets Expectations: assigned to faculty members with at least adequate levels of accomplishment in teaching as demonstrated by the annual reviews for the previous 5 years and evidence in the foregoing categories; additional consideration is granted nominations for teaching awards, revisions to courses and assignments; online course innovations; and contributions to graduate theses and dissertations, as applicable; acknowledged lapses in teaching performance are permissible;
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: assigned to faculty members whose teaching efforts indicate the need for significant improvement as demonstrated by annual reviews for the previous 5 years and evidence in the foregoing categories;
4. Unsatisfactory: assigned to faculty members whose teaching efforts have failed to meet departmental needs and standards as demonstrated by annual reviews for the previous 5 years and evidence in the foregoing categories.

RESEARCH

The criteria for Post-Tenure Review assume a 35 percent research assignment, which is typical for a tenured HCS faculty member. Adjustments are made for assignment variation. Assessment of research is qualitative as much as quantitative, taking short-term productivity as well as a long-term research projects into account. Quantitative measures, such as acceptance ratios and citation counts, are imperfect in the humanities. Evidence of achievement in research may refer to any of the following categories:

- single-authored articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals;
- single-authored book chapters in anthologies published by disciplinarily reputable presses;
- demonstrated progress toward the publication of multiyear, single-authored book projects;
- edited anthologies of scholarly work published by disciplinarily reputable presses;
- new editions or translations of scholarly works;
- collaborative work in the form of co-authored manuscripts, articles, or book chapters;

- creative work published or exhibited through disciplinarily recognized presses and institutions;
- presentations of scholarly work at regional, national, or international conferences;
- organization of scholarly panels, seminars, or conferences;
- invited talks at regional, national, or international colleges, universities, or other relevant cultural institutions;
- digital publications in the form of websites, blogs, video essays, podcasts, etc.
- reception of published work as evidenced by reviews, awards, speaking invitations, etc.;
- additional publications and other public scholarship, including book reviews and book essays, encyclopedia articles, conference proceedings, and publications not subject to peer review.

Additional consideration is granted the scope, significance, and originality of publications and their contributions to relevant fields; the quality of publication venues as determined by disciplinary norms; the development of new lines of research or research that requires unusual effort, expenditures of time, or technical skills; and application to or receipt of internal and external prizes, fellowships, grants, and awards.

Specific criteria for Post-Tenure Review assessments of research are as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: assigned to faculty members who achieve high levels of accomplishment in research as demonstrated by annual reviews for the previous 5 years and evidence in the foregoing categories; such achievement includes either 1) four or more single- or co-authored articles, book chapters, or substantial works of creative or other, public scholarship submitted, under review, or published during the five years under review; 2) benchmarks toward the publication of a single- or co-authored book, anthology, new edition, or translation, including circulation or presentation of completed chapters; submission of a manuscript for review or with recommended revisions; acceptance of a manuscript for publication; publication of a manuscript and / or subsequent evidence of a manuscript's significance; or 3) a variable combination of items from #1, #2, and / or presentations of scholarly work, invited talks, documented funding proposals, or scholarly panel, seminar, or conference organization; receipt of a major prize, fellowship, grant, or award also warrants this rating;
2. Meets Expectations: assigned to faculty members with at least adequate levels of accomplishment in research as demonstrated by annual reviews for the previous 5 years and evidence in the foregoing categories; such achievement includes either 1) two or three single- or co-authored articles, book chapters, or substantial works of creative or other, public scholarship submitted, under review, or published during the five years under review; 2) demonstrated progress toward the publication of a single- or co-authored book, anthology, new edition, or translation, including presentations of chapters in various stages of active development; or 3) a variable combination of items from #1, #2, and / or presentations of scholarly work, invited talks, documented funding proposals, or scholarly panel, seminar, or conference organization;
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: assigned to faculty members who exhibit minimal evidence of ongoing research activity in the foregoing categories;
4. Unsatisfactory: assigned to faculty members who demonstrate no evidence of research activity in the foregoing categories.

SERVICE

The criteria for Post-Tenure Review assume a 10 percent service assignment, which is typical for a tenured HCS faculty member. Adjustments are made for assignment variation. Evidence of achievement may refer to any of the following categories: 1) university service to the department, college, and / or institution at large; 2) professional service; and 3) community service.

Specific criteria for Post-Tenure Review assessments of service are as follows:

1. Exceeds Expectations: assigned to faculty members who maintain a record of departmental, college, or university service in excess of the standard assignment; hold positions in regional, national, or international professional organizations; and / or regularly review, edit, or co-edit material for disciplinarily reputable academic presses or journals. Leadership in community service activities, including service to public schools and community colleges; arts councils; public lecture series and panel discussions; print, radio, TV, and other media outlets; etc. also warrant this rating, especially when combined with a consistent record of departmental service;
2. Meets Expectations: assigned to faculty members who at least adequately perform the standard assignment for departmental service and / or minor professional and / or community service;
3. Does Not Meet Expectations: assigned to faculty members whose service is limited to departmental responsibilities routinely expected of all members;
4. Unsatisfactory: assigned to faculty members assigned to faculty members who are negligent in their performance of basic departmental responsibilities.

APPEALS

A faculty member may appeal their Post-Tenure Review at the departmental level without prejudice. All appeals begin with a written request within one week of the review's release for a meeting with the chair of HCS . Faculty members may present material to justify a change in rating at this meeting. If the faculty member desires further review, then they must within one week of the previous meeting request in writing an additional meeting with the chair of HCS and the chair of the Executive Committee. The outcome of this second meeting determines the Post-Tenure Review rating reported by the department.

Approved by HCS faculty vote on September 13, 2023.

Approved by Provost's Office on September 14, 2023.