

# Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science

## Post-tenure Review Policy

Approved by the EECS Faculty

**General Principles:** In accordance with Board of Regents requirements, Article 7, section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, the University Policy on Post-tenure Review, and the School of Engineering Post-tenure Review Criteria and Policy, the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) has adopted these procedures for conducting post-tenure review. Post-tenure review is a process for periodic peer evaluation of faculty performance that provides an opportunity for a long-term assessment of a faculty member's accomplishments and future directions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Post-tenure review must be conducted in a manner that respects the rights of faculty members involved, including academic freedom, tenure, and due process. In addition, *all those involved in the evaluation process must recognize that it is a confidential personnel matter and take appropriate steps to protect confidentiality.*

**Period for Review:** Post-tenure review is conducted on a seven-year cycle and covers the seven-year period leading up to the review. The cycle is restarted if a faculty member is evaluated for promotion or is awarded a distinguished professorship. In the first seven years of implementation of the post-tenure review policy, the department chair, with approval of the dean, will determine the year for a faculty member to be reviewed if it has been more than seven years since last promotion or review. Some years may be excluded from the period in accordance with the University policy and the review may be postponed if the faculty member is on leave during the year of review. The Dean of the SoE will notify faculty members scheduled for post-tenure review no later than March 15 in the spring semester preceding the academic year of review.

**Expectations:** All tenured faculty members must meet academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Unless otherwise specified by the job description or differential allocation of effort assigned by the department chair, the ordinary allocation of effort is 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service.

The EECS Department's standards and expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as its annual evaluation procedures are described in the EECS Faculty Evaluation Policy. This Policy is updated annually and submitted to the School of Engineering and Provost for approval. The expectations for post-tenure review are consistent with these standards, with overall productivity commensurate to the seven-year period under review.

**Review Committee:** Post-tenure review is conducted by the EECS Post-tenure Review Committee. Members of this committee are appointed by the Chair and approved by the faculty at the beginning of the academic year and serve until the end of the academic year. Because of the sensitive nature of this process, involving personnel files and requiring confidentiality, the size of the EECS Post-tenure Review Committee should consist of no more than three representatives of the tenured faculty. Members of this committee may be reappointed for succeeding terms as needed.

No person may serve on the committee if his or her spouse or partner is scheduled for review. A committee member who believes that there may be a conflict of interest should

withdraw from the committee. If a faculty member who is undergoing review believes that there is a conflict of interest, he or she may object to the inclusion of a member. If the member declines to withdraw, the remaining committee members shall consider the basis for the alleged conflict and decide the matter. If a committee member withdraws or is removed based on a conflict of interest, the department chair will name a replacement, with the concurrence of the remaining committee members.

**Preparation of the File:** The Post Tenure Review will be conducted on the basis of a summary of a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service which consists of the following:

- A current curriculum vitae and (optionally) a list of additional activities not covered on the curriculum vitae.
- Copies of the faculty member's annual evaluation letters for the years during the review period. The department will provide these evaluation letters.
- A brief narrative statement by the faculty member, of his or her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period as they relate to his or her long-term career path and goals. See Attachment 1 for a suggest template.

Note that copies of publications and student evaluations are not to be included. Also, outside reviews of scholarship should not be submitted.

**Evaluation and Report:** The committee will review the file and evaluate the faculty member's overall performance and his or her contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Applying the expectations defined above, the committee will determine whether the faculty member's performance in each area, as well as his or her overall performance, meets or exceeds expectations, or fails to meet expectations. In making its evaluations, the committee must bear in mind that (1) faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of contributions to the mission of the Department, School, and the University; (2) a faculty member's activities vary over time according to his or her strengths, interests, and career path; and (3) innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail.

The committee will prepare a written report summarizing its evaluation using the template in Attachment 2. The report provides a brief summary of the faculty member's activities, an explanation of the committee's ratings, and recommendations or suggestions for acknowledgement of contributions (if appropriate) and future development of the faculty member. The committee will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the faculty member's Chair.

**Consideration by the Chair:** The committee's report (along with any faculty response) will be provided to the chair. If the chair agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the file. If the chair disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee; and the faculty member may submit a written response for inclusion in the file. The chair may ask the committee to provide additional information or reconsider the review. The chair will forward the file to the Engineering Dean, who will consider the report and express his or her agreement or disagreement in the same manner as the chair. The Dean will explain the reasons for any

disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee, and the faculty member may submit a written response for inclusion in the file.

**Relation to Annual Evaluations:** The committee report will be considered as part of the annual evaluation process and the chair will discuss the review with the faculty member in conjunction with that process. This discussion should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member with an aim toward enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance, including adoption of a performance improvement plan, if necessary. Any action on the review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken under that policy. Accordingly, unless the review indicates the failure to satisfy a performance improvement plan that was previously in place and performance that constitutes sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, a recommendation for dismissal cannot follow from post-tenure review.

**Appeals:** If a disagreement between the committee and the chair or dean cannot be resolved or if the faculty member wishes to appeal an evaluation of “fails to meet or below expectations,” the matter will be handled as an appeal under the Department Faculty Evaluation Policy.

**Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science**  
**POST-TENURE REVIEW REPORT –** *(Year of Review)*  
*(Name of Individual)*

**1. Summary of Teaching and Future Direction**

Provide a brief summary of teaching activities over the past seven years. Your approach should be general in nature rather than listing courses taught. Include a perspective on the nature of the classes you have taught and how your teaching program has benefitted you as a professor.

How do you see yourself growing or evolving as a teacher over the next seven years? What changes would you like to make? What kind of growth do you want to achieve?

**2. Summary of Research and Future Direction**

Provide a brief summary of scholarship activities over the past seven years. Indicate major accomplishments in research in terms of publications, funding and students graduated. Do not provide listings of grants or publications or any information that may already be included in your CV.

Where do you see your research program in seven years? What are your ambitions? Do you have plans on changing directions? Do you have plans for new collaborations sought or perhaps searching for new opportunities?

**3. Summary of Service Activities and Future Direction**

Provide a brief summary of service activities over the past seven years. Do not provide listings of service activities. Rather, provide a general overview of the kinds of service activities to which you have chosen to contribute your time. Highlight the most important experiences and explain how they have benefitted your professional development.

How would you like to see your service activities evolve over the next seven years? Do you see your service activities changing, growing or shrinking? Any specific accomplishments that you would like to achieve?

**4. General Comments**

Include any comments that you feel would be important in helping the committee and the chair understand your strategic plan going forward.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science

## POST-TENURE REVIEW EVALUATION – (Year of Review)

(Name of Individual)

**1. Summary of Sustained Performance in Teaching, Research & Service.**

This section should include a factual summary of the significant information contained in the required and optional documents provided by the department and the individual faculty member for this evaluation. Specifically mention accomplishments in teaching, research and service in the context of the differential workload allocation assigned to the faculty member. Do not make qualitative comments in this section.

**2. Performance Assessment.**

This paragraph should include a brief qualitative evaluation of the faculty member’s long-term performance over the past six years, highlighting notable contributions during the evaluation period. Existing deficiencies should be noted if they are of sufficient seriousness to warrant an overall assessment of *Below Expectations*. Enter the overall assessment in the box below, as indicated.

	Fails to Meet or Below Expectations	Meets or Exceeds Expectations
Teaching		XXX
Research		XXX
Service		XXX
<b>Overall</b>		XXX

**3. Recommended Long Term Goals or Objectives.**

Provide any recommended long term goals or objectives that would help an individual faculty member improve overall performance or achieve specific goals. Most notably, this is the opportunity to help long-term associate professors that are interested in achieving promotion to professor. Also, this is the opportunity to make general or specific recommendations to help faculty who are achieving below expectations.

Note that it may not be appropriate to recommend long-term goals or objectives for faculty members who have demonstrated a productive contribution to the mission of the Department, School and University.

**4. Faculty member comments.**

This paragraph should include this comment: *Faculty members who have comments they wish to add to this review should submit those to the committee either a separate document – email is sufficient. The reply will be attached to this document and forwarded to the chair.*

Evaluation by:

Acknowledged:

\_\_\_\_\_  
PTR Committee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
EECS Chair Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date