DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LINGUISTICS, AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Updated November 9, 2023

Post-Tenure Review Criteria and Procedures

According to the Provost's Post-Tenure Review memorandum mandating a Post-Tenure Review (PTR), the basis of PTR evaluation is the faculty member's annual performance over a broad (5-year) period, with the faculty member's annual evaluations from this five-year period serving as a primary (but NOT SOLE) set of reference documents.

The Provost's memorandum 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."

The faculty member under review will provide the following items in their PTR portfolio:

• a current curriculum vitae that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service,

• copies of the last five annual assignments and annual evaluations including any attached written comments by the faculty member under review,

• a copy of the report of the previous SPE or PTR, if available,

• a copy of the LLCL PTR criteria,

• and a brief (2 page) narrative.

The PTR portfolio will be reviewed by the departmental personnel committee, which includes all tenured faculty members. In keeping with departmental personnel committee procedures, all members of the personnel committee (both Associate and Professors) will discuss and vote on the portfolios of Associate Professors, whereas only Professors will discuss and vote on the portfolios of Professors.

The results of each PTR review will be documented by the Chair of the department. Full records of this documentation, including portfolios, will be delivered to and stored in the DFSCAL Dean's Office. The department will also keep a copy of those documents.

Given 1) that the purpose of the PTR is to measure a faculty member's performance in a holistic sense over a period of five years, and 2) that the Provost's PTR guiding memorandum clarifies that "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 following point-value ranking system for each annual

evaluation category will be used to establish point-value thresholds for each of the four Provost-mandated PTR evaluation categories of 1) Exceeds expectations, 2) Meets expectations, 3) Fails to meet expectations, and 4) Unsatisfactory.

Because consistency between long-term and short-term evaluation is both desirable and necessary, there is a clear relation between annual evaluations (which weigh teaching, scholarship and service) and the four PTR rankings. However, PTR evaluation in LLCL will also be based on a holistic consideration of a faculty member's achievement over the five-year period, especially in cases where one or more annual evaluations deviate from the faculty member's overall achievements.

Primary Weighted Scale for PTR Evaluation

A formal point value will be assigned to each of the categories of teaching, research, and service based on the annual evaluations (see below). A score between 1 and 5 will be assigned for each category (research, teaching, service) of the annual evaluations in the five-year period under review. The point values that correspond to the 5 evaluation categories are listed below. Thus, an Exceptional in all three categories in any given year, corresponds to a score of 15 points for that year. An Unsatisfactory in all three categories, corresponds to 3 points. Over a five-year period, a maximum score would be 75 points, and a minimum 15 points. We propose the following point distribution for the Provost's mandated four-tier rating system based on annual evaluation scores:

 Annual evaluation categories and scores

Exceptional	5
Outstanding	4
Good	3
Needs Improvement	2
Unsatisfactory	1

 PTR Evaluative categories and point-range equivalence

Exceeds Expectations	73 to 75
Meets Expectations	45 to 72

Does not Meet Expectations	30 to 44
Unsatisfactory	0 to 29

Examples:

1.   Exceeds Expectations: A faculty member receives "Exceptional" in each category but one (teaching, research, or service) during the five-year period of PTR evaluation

2.   Meets Expectations: A faculty member receives a combination of "Good," "Outstanding," and "Exceptional" in the three categories during the five-year period of PTR evaluation

3.   Does not Meet Expectations: A faculty member receives a combination of "Needs improvement" and "Good" on all categories during the five-year evaluation period.

Whereas the quantitative measure of evaluation above is necessary, it might not always capture the full picture of a faculty member's productivity over a five-year period and may even contradict a faculty member's overall trajectory or performance. In such cases, the personnel committee will revise its assessment. Non-exhaustive examples of cases where such a revision would be necessary are below.

Examples:

1)   A faculty member receives, in their annual evaluations, a "good" (3 points) in Research for 2 or 3 years before publishing a ground-breaking book.
2)   A faculty member receives an overall score between 45 and 72 points for PTR (typically enough for "Meets Expectations"), but they have underperformed in at least 2 of the 5 years in one of the three categories receiving 1 or 2 points on that category in those years.

Non-Academic Criteria

If applicable, and according to the Provost's Memorandum, the PTR file should also include documentation from the review period regarding the faculty member's substantiated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governor's regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment; unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses; and substantiated student complaints. To preserve the confidentiality of the faculty member's personnel file, the Chair 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 Chair letter and ranking. In that letter, they may choose to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.

The faculty member may also respond to subsequent assessments if allowed by the process as dictated by the Provost's memorandum.