

Submitted: September 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 09/06/2023

Department of Physics Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulations, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of Physics are subjected to post-tenure review every five years. The post tenure review (PTR) is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment.

The PTR assessment will be based on a "review packet" composed of the following materials:

- The faculty member's narrative record of accomplishments for the past five years in a university-designated template. This narrative will have a maximum limit of 12,000 characters.
- The last five years of annual performance reviews by the Chair/Director,
- The faculty member's curriculum vitae (not to exceed 5 pages single-spaced), and
- The faculty member's disciplinary record (if any exists) in their personnel file covering the past five years to ensure compliance with state laws, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies. Only substantiated disciplinary matters will be considered for the purposes of a post-tenure review.

Department of Physics guidelines for post-tenure review ensure that the faculty member will be reviewed in relation to nationally recognized standards consistent with the discipline as it exists at research universities. These guidelines are based on quantifiable department criteria for annual evaluation. Post-tenure review will be based on the annual assignments of the faculty member across the five-year period under review.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:

1. Exceeds expectations: A clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at top-tier research institutions. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
2. Meets expectations: Expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a top-tier research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct

and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.

3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous five years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectation that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation two or more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.

The following criteria for post-tenure review in the Department of Physics are drawn from university approved criteria for annual evaluations:

Teaching

Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of teaching evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

In addition to student evaluations, the effectiveness of teaching will be judged by the following 4 elements in the faculty members evaluation report.

- Course Development
- Curricular Rigor
- Curricular Innovation
- Effective research mentorship and advising for post-docs, graduate students, and undergraduate students.

The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Evidence of outstandingly effective teaching indicated by high numerical student ratings in all courses, absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary, and efforts to facilitate student learning by engaging in at least 2 of the 4 elements.

2. Meets expectations: Evidence of demonstrably high quality of teaching indicated by numerical student ratings at or above average for the level of courses, and efforts to facilitate student learning by engaging in at least 1 of the 4 elements.
3. Does not meet expectations: Poor quality of teaching indicated by numerical student ratings that are below average for the level of courses and shows evidence of *minor* effort (or improvement) and impact in any one of the above 4 elements.
4. Unsatisfactory: Poor quality of teaching indicated by numerical student ratings that are below average for the level of courses, patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary, and shows *no* evidence of effort (or improvement) and impact in any of the above 4 elements.

Research

Post-tenure review of research will be based on the previous five years of research evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period.

The faculty member's contributions to the department's research mission for the previous 5 years will be evaluated based on quality, significance, and impact. The discovery of new knowledge in the form of creative activity as acknowledged by others in the field that may be used for further inquiries into the discipline is important. Ideally research is transformational either at the academic or society level. Evidence to support impactful research may include grant activity, published books, journal papers, conference papers, research presentations, seminars, technology transfer, patents, citations. Chair will establish benchmarks for the 5 years under review based on FAC evaluations, department averages, and data published by Academic Analytics in the following categories:

- (i) Publications/faculty,
- (ii) External funding/faculty,
- (iii) Number of proposals submitted/faculty,
- (iv) Citations/faculty.
- (v) Impact factor of the publications,

The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: high-quality research that meet or exceed at least 3 of the 5 benchmarks.
2. Meets Expectations: good quality research output that meets or exceed 2 of the 5 benchmarks.
3. Does not meet expectations: research output needs improvement, meets only 1 of the 5 benchmarks.
4. Unsatisfactory: Does not show effort in meeting any benchmarks.

Service

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of service evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The faculty member should be a role model that students and community members would look to for counsel and support.

Service in the following 3 elements will be evaluated:

- Service to the university (department, school, college, or university)
- Service to the profession, including high-level leadership activities in international professional organizations, serving as reviewer for proposals and journals, and other similar activities.
- Service to communities in which we live and work.

The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Engaged in multiple service roles representing all 3 categories.
2. Meets expectations: Engaged in multiple service roles representing at least 2 categories.
3. Does not meet expectations: Limited engagement in only 1 category.
4. Unsatisfactory: No engagement in any service category.

The post-tenure review requires one, holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average according to annual assignments based on the scores for teaching, research, and service.