**Post-Tenure Review Criteria: English Department**

In accordance with the BOG Regulation 10.003 for a Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process by which “Each tenured faculty member shall have a comprehensive post-tenure review of five years of performance in the fifth year following the last promotion or the last comprehensive review, whichever is later,” the department of English establishes the following standards and procedures, as supplemental to those specified in the Provost’s PTR policy of September, 2023. The Provost’s PTR policy specifies that “Each academic unit that does annual evaluations shall clearly define criteria for PTR among its tenured faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These written criteria shall reflect the customs and practices of the academic unit, the professional discipline(s) of its faculty, and its overall mission as part of the University.”

As stated in the Provost’s PTR policy, the faculty member under review will provide the following items in his/her PTR portfolio:

* a current *curriculum vita* that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service,
* copies of the faculty member’s last five annual assignments and annual evaluations including any attached written rebuttals by a faculty member under review,
* a copy of the report of the previous SPE or PTR, if available,
* a copy of the published PTR criteria from the faculty member’s academic unit
* a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member, and
* other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate.

If applicable, the PTR File reviewed by the Chair should also include documentation regarding the faculty member’s substantiated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment; unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses; and substantiated student complaints. The faculty member in the 2-page narrative may also provide explanations in relation to substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.

**Chair**: The Chair will convene a PTR Advisory Committee consisting of a minimum of three professors in the Eligible Faculty Member’s Unit. For the review of associate professors, the Committee shall consist of professors of at least associate rank in the Eligible Faculty Member’s Unit. For the review of full professors, the committee shall consist of all full professors in the unit. Should there be less than an adequate number of professors in the unit at the required rank, the Unit Head and the Unit full professors will select professors within the college at the appropriate rank so that there are three professors at the appropriate rank or above serving on the committee.

The **PTR Advisory Committee** will review each PTR file and prepare a report for each Eligible Faculty Member based on the Criteria and Report Requirements of the five-year Review Period defined above. The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall include a recommended Performance Rating. The PTR Advisory Committee will affix its reports to the PTR files and return them to the Unit Head. The PTR Advisory Committee’s report shall not be binding upon the Unit Head, the Dean, or the Provost.

* Portfolios will be reviewed by the English department’s PTR Advisory committee, which will include tenured faculty members. The entire committee will discuss and vote on the cases of associate professors. Only full professors will discuss and vote on the cases of full professors. If a faculty member disagrees with the decision of the departmental PTR committee, the result will be reviewed by the College PTR Committee of the College of Arts and Letters. The Advisory Committee will produce a report that must include an assessment of the Eligible Faculty Member’s performance and conduct for the five-year Review Period based on the aforementioned Criteria.
* The report must state whether the faculty member’s performance and conduct Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Fails to Meet Expectations, or is Unsatisfactory and provide specific reasons to support the determination.
* In reaching a Criteria based Performance Rating, the responsible party must consider the written criteria of the University and Eligible Faculty Member’s unit.
* The Advisory Committee report must also consider the following:
  + that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments,
  + that faculty can make essential contributions to the University’s mission in various ways,
  + that the nature of an individual’s contributions may vary over time,
  + that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes not result in a grant, journal article, or other scholarly product,
  + that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not sufficient cause for a negative evaluation, and
  + the five-year Review Period.

The results of PTR Advisory Committee reviews will be duly recorded by the chair of the department. Full records of PTR proceedings, including portfolios, will be delivered to and stored by the dean of the College of Arts and Letters; copies will also be kept by the department.

**Eligible Faculty Member**’**s Chair** shall:

* Review the following for each Eligible Faculty Member:
  + PTR file, including the Department’s PTR Advisory Committee report and Performance Rating.
  + personnel file, records of accomplishments and awards, annual evaluations, and faculty responses as applicable during the entire five-year Review Period.
  + any findings of a completed and substantiated inquiry or investigation of non- compliance with active (at the time of the PTR Review) and applicable laws, BOG and University regulations, and University policies within the scope of their University employment during the entire five-year Review Period.
  + any records of substantiated unapproved absences during the five-year Review Period, and
  + any disciplinary action issued by the University during the entire five-year Review Period.
* The Chair’s report must certify that any substantiated reports regarding documented professional conduct, academic responsibilities or performance for the Review Period have been included in the report.

The Provost’s guidelines expressly require inclusion of annual evaluations in PTR portfolios. Because consistency between long-term and short-term evaluation criteria is both desirable and necessary, the English department establishes the following relation between annual evaluations (which weigh teaching, scholarship, and service equally) and the four available PTR rankings:

**Exceeds Expectations**: **In at least 4 out of the 5 years under review, the faculty member will have received annual evaluations with an overall score in the top two categories (Exceptional, Outstanding)**

In addition to the above, to achieve “Exceeds Expectations” overall, the faculty member must achieve “Exceeds Expectations” in **two of the three** areas of evaluation: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, Service. The following criteria will be used to determine “Exceeds Expectations” in each of these three areas:

**Teaching:**

Evidence of at least 3 of the following during the years under review. (Remarkable productivity or qualitative achievement in one category may be counted more than once at the discretion of the committee):

* received a 2.00 or better on question #6 of the majority of university evaluation forms or SPOT evaluations during the years under review (note that 1 is the best score)
* thesis, dissertation, and/or comprehensive exam supervision; an average of one per year for the years under review
* internal and/or external grant on pedagogical development during the years under review
* teaching a WAC course 4 out of the 5 years under review
* documented commitment to curriculum development -- new course development during the years under review
* documented commitment to curriculum development -- substantive revision of existing courses during the years under review
* Directed Independent Studies course during the period under review
* promotion and supervision of graduate research
* supervising GTAs; served as an IOR
* documented commitment to mentoring students (advising, taking students to conferences and readings, participating in students’ events, writing recommendation letters, etc.) during each year under review
* teaching research intensive (RI) undergraduate courses, courses supported by the OURI curriculum grants program, or otherwise offering supervised research experiences
* community engagement through experiential-learning courses such as academic service learning, field experience, co-ops, internships, co-curricula, and independent study
* substantial documented contributions to the field of instruction not listed here

**Research/Creative Activity:**Demonstrated record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly excellence, as evidenced by at least 1 of the following during the period of review.

**EITHER**

1. One of the following (either in press or published) during the period of review:

* a refereed book from a university press or from a trade press; for Creative Writing candidates, a refereed book published by a university press, trade press, or literary small press.
* a refereed book published electronically by a recognized academic e-publisher
* a textbook or pedagogically oriented study that has received external reviews
* a scholarly edition that has received external reviews
* an edited collection that has received external reports, whether scholarly, pedagogical, or creative in focus
* an invited book in the faculty member’s field

**OR**

1. Three of the following (either in press or published) during the period under review

* a scholarly article or chapter in a book that has received external reports
* a work of short fiction, a poem, a work of nonfiction, or a translation of any of these genres.
* refereed scholarship of shorter length that advances pedagogical theories and practices. Among these might be included a refereed article, website, video, or database.
* an invited chapter in a book
* an entry for an encyclopedia, handbook, or reference work
* an editor-reviewed textbook
* a reprint of work previously published. Such re-publication attests to the continuing importance of the work.

This list is not exhaustive; other significant contributions to scholarship and creative activity will be accepted as evidence of excellence in this area.

**Service:**

Demonstrated consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence, as indicated by three (3) of the following during the years under review. (Remarkable productivity or qualitative achievement in one category may be counted more than once at the discretion of the committee):

**University Service**:

* chairing a committee or taskforce (University, College, or Department)
* serving on a committee or taskforce (University, College, or Department)
* serving as an officer in College FA or UFF
* mentoring a junior colleague
* advising student bodies, such as EGSS, *Coastlines*, Sigma Tau Delta, and directing the English Internship Program, etc.
* mentoring undergraduate students in research and inquiry through the department or a grants program; serving as judge or reviewer for undergraduate research journals, grant programs, symposia, etc.
* other services to the Department, College, and University not included on this list

**Professional service**:

* organizing or chairing panels for professional conferences
* judging professional competitions
* serving as an officer in state, regional, and professional organizations
* serving on the editorial board of or as a referee for scholarly journals and presses
* writing external reviews of P&T cases
* community-engaged service that applies professional expertise in collaboration with the community in order to address a community-identified need and support the goals and mission of the university
* other professional services not included on this list

**Meets Expectations**: **In at least 4 out of the 5 years under review, the faculty member will have received annual evaluations with an overall score in the top three categories (Exceptional, Outstanding, Good) but will not have met the above criteria for "Exceeds Expectations."** If the faculty member has received a Performance Improvement Plan connected to any of the annual evaluations, it is expected that he or she will have fulfilled the plan, or be in the process of doing so (in accordance with the timeline specified in the plan).

**Does Not Meet Expectations**: The faculty member has not met the criteria for either Exceeds Expectations or Meets Expectations.

Any faculty member whose PTR results in a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations shall work with the Chair to draft a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) setting specific milestones that the faculty member will be responsible to meet over a period of no more than 12 months to achieve documented requirements of the PIP. The Dean, in consultation with the Unit Head, must review and approve the PIP and forward a copy to the Provost.

**Unsatisfactory**: performance fails to meet the unit’s written criteria which reflects disregard or failure to follow previously documented and/or otherwise given advice or other efforts to provide correction; or documented incompetence or misconduct, as defined in applicable University regulations and policies, or applicable CBA provisions.

The Provost’s policy also states that “PTR is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that PTR will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of five years. Most importantly, the PTR process has been designed to uphold the University’s fundamental principles of tenure, academic freedom, due process, and confidentiality in personnel matters.”

That is, evaluation over a protracted period will capture long-term patterns in a faculty member’s professional progress that may not be apparent from the annual reviews regarded separately. To take one example, long-term work on a major scholarly or creative project will not necessarily result in a regular series of annual publications, and, in any case, qualitative judgments must prevail over quantitative measures in evaluations of intellectual achievement. Likewise, on-going activities that fall under the headings Community Engagement and Undergraduate Research, categories that have recently been added to the English department’s annual evaluation criteria, may not be fairly and fully represented in the annual evaluations alone. The PTR Advisory committee will of course consider such activities whether or not they were part of the annual evaluation criteria in the years under review. If the PTR candidate has relevant accomplishments during the review period that are not captured by annual evaluations, the candidate should highlight those accomplishments both in the curriculum vitae and in the 2-page narrative to be submitted in the portfolio. In addition, the candidate should discuss in the narrative any extraordinary circumstances that have a clear bearing on the period under review. Taking all such factors into account, the department’s PTR Advisory committee may consider the adjustment of a candidate’s PTR evaluation as defined above.

In accordance with the above, the PTR committee will look not only at Annual Evaluation scores but will, if necessary, count and average quantifiable accomplishments over the 5-year period under review in order to be able to evaluate longer-term developments in teaching, research and service not captured in the Annual Evaluation. The faculty member under review should use the brief narrative to trace such developments.

**NON- ACADEMIC CRITERIA**

If applicable, the PTR File reviewed by the Chair should also include documentation regarding the faculty member’s substantiated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment; unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses; and substantiated student complaints. If needed, the unit head shall be responsible for adding these documents to the PTR File and assessing the impact of these documents on their recommended PTR ranking.

The faculty member may include a response to the unit head’s letter and ranking. In that letter, they may choose to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.