

**POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
AND
STATEMENT OF FACULTY OBLIGATIONS AND STANDARDS**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES
Effective October 2002**

1. Post-Tenure Review Policies and Procedures

1.1. General

University Policies and Procedures relating to Unsatisfactory Performance and Post-Tenure Review are contained in Section 2.9 of the Faculty Handbook. Nothing in this document supersedes or abrogates any policies or procedures contained in the Faculty Handbook.

During the annual evaluation of faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with the departmental Personnel Committee, may choose to assign to a faculty member a rating of “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Unsatisfactory” is the lowest rating that can be assigned to a faculty member and is defined to mean failure to meet the minimal expectations of the Communication Studies Department, as set forth in this document. In particular, an Unsatisfactory rating is not intended to be automatically assigned when a faculty member’s performance is deemed to be deficient and in need of improvement in one or more areas, or when the faculty member’s annual evaluation is among the lowest in the department. In the assigning of an Unsatisfactory rating, the burden rests upon the Department Head to make the case that the faculty member’s performance is so seriously deficient that it fails to meet the department’s minimal expectations.

As stipulated in Section 2.9.2 of the Faculty Handbook, a faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory rating shall be given written notification of that rating and the considerations upon which it is based. The faculty member will then be provided a reasonable opportunity to respond to the stated reasons for the Unsatisfactory rating. This response may include a written statement to be included in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file. In addition, the faculty member shall be notified in writing of specific actions that may be taken to avoid a further Unsatisfactory rating. Indeed, in all cases where a faculty member’s performance is considered deficient to the point that an Unsatisfactory rating is viewed as a realistic possibility, whether that rating is assigned or not, the faculty member shall be notified in writing of the perceived deficiencies and their seriousness, and of remedial actions which, if implemented, will correct them.

When a faculty member is given a rating of Unsatisfactory and the departmental Personnel Committee fails to concur with the Department Head in the assignment of that rating, a dissenting letter from the Personnel Committee will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file and the faculty member’s departmental personnel

file and the faculty member and the Dean of the College of Human Sciences and Education.

Faculty members have a right to review their departmental personnel file at any time, including letters or documentation of complaints contained therein which may be or have been used in the evaluation process. If student complaints or other sensitive material are to become part of the personnel file, they should be handled in a timely manner, but one that is respectful of the rights of those involved. (Confidential letters of reference which may be contained in the file will not be released.) Faculty members have a right to respond to negative material and to have their responses included in their personnel file.

1.2. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

Whenever a faculty member with tenure or continued appointment receives two consecutive annual evaluations of Unsatisfactory performance, a post-tenure review is mandatory. The review shall be conducted by a Post-Tenure Review Committee selected as follows:

- 1.2.1. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall consist of three members selected from the tenured faculty of the Department of Communication Studies.
- 1.2.2. The Department Head, in consultation with the departmental Personnel Committee, and the faculty member undergoing the review shall initially attempt to identify a panel that is mutually acceptable. If such a panel can be identified and is willing to serve, it shall constitute the Post-Tenure Review Committee. In this event the faculty member undergoing review must waive (in writing) the right to an elected committee. Such a procedure has the advantage of preserving a measure of privacy and confidentiality. If, however, in the judgment of either the Department Head or the faculty member under review, this procedure cannot be successfully implemented, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be elected by the department as described in 1.2.3 below.
- 1.2.3. The tenured faculty of the Department of Communication Studies will vote (by ballot) to select candidates for the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A list of the five members of the department who receive the most votes will be presented to the faculty member under review. In the event of a tie vote for the fifth candidate, a larger list will be presented. From the list, the faculty member under review will select three individuals who will constitute the Post-Tenure Review Committee.
- 1.2.4. In the event that a vacancy occurs on an existing Post-Tenure Review Committee, the Department Head, in consultation with the departmental Personnel Committee, and the faculty member undergoing the review shall initially attempt to identify a mutually acceptable replacement for each vacancy. If, in the judgment of either the Department Head or the faculty

member under review, this procedure cannot be successfully implemented, the tenured faculty of the Department of Communication Studies will vote (by ballot) to select candidates to fill the existing vacancies. The number of candidates elected will be the number of vacancies plus one and the elected candidates will be those who receive the most votes. In the event that a tie vote prevents election of the exact number of candidates, a larger list of candidates will be presented to the faculty member under review. From the list, the faculty member will select one individual for each vacancy.

1.3. Conducting the Post-Tenure Review

The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall conduct its review in accordance with the procedures specified in Section 2.9.4 of the Faculty Handbook. A majority vote of the committee is sufficient to find either (a) that the faculty member's competence and/or professional contributions do not meet the department's minimal expectations.

University policy stipulates that, following a period of remediation, the Post-Tenure Review Committee either certifies satisfactory performance, recommends dismissal for cause, or recommends that a sanction be imposed. A further period of remediation is not an option. A majority vote of the committee is sufficient to carry its recommendation.

If a faculty member is either under review by a Post-Tenure Review Committee or in a period of remediation specified by the committee, the departmental Personnel Committee may continue to evaluate the individual for purposes of salary increases, but further ratings of Unsatisfactory may not be assigned to that individual until the Post-Tenure Review Committee submits its final recommendation.

2. Statement of Faculty Obligations and Standards

2.1 Introduction

Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this document outline the "normal" standards and obligations of the tenured faculty of the Department of Communication Studies in the areas of Instructional Activities, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Service and Outreach. The "normal" standards included in this document, the standards of conduct and ethical behavior as stated in the Faculty Handbook and/or promulgated through other channels, the statement in Section 2.2 on failure to meet minimal expectations, and the statement in Section 2.3 regarding an Unsatisfactory rating shall provide a basis for the Department Head, in consultant with the departmental Personnel Committee, to assign an annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" to a faculty member.

These standards are not intended and shall not be used to violate the principles of academic freedom nor to discourage the expression of minority opinions, dissent from professional orthodoxies, and honest and civil disagreement.

An integral part of the department's annual evaluation of a faculty member is a consideration of the duties assigned to that faculty member. Depending on available resources, departmental needs, changing interests, and the performance of duties, the annual evaluation may result in a reassignment of duties. A reassignment of duties does not typically imply a failure to meet minimal expectations; it typically represents a workload adjustment to better utilize existing skills. It must be emphasized that an evaluation of Unsatisfactory is to be based on the performance of those duties and responsibilities that have been explicitly assigned to the faculty member.

Throughout this document the word deficiency is interpreted to mean a failure to meet normal standards and obligations.

2.2 Failure to Meet Minimal Expectations

2.2.1 A faculty member fails to meet the minimal expectations of the Department of Communication Studies in one of the areas of Instructional Activity, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Service and Outreach provided the faculty member has assigned responsibilities in that area and EITHER (a) demonstrates a consistent, serious, and willful disregard of the standards for that area, OR (b) fails, over the course of a reasonable, pre-assigned period of time, to remedy identified, serious, and chronic deficiencies in that area.

2.2.2. Further, a faculty member fails to meet minimal expectations in the area of Instructional Activity provided that faculty member's demeanor, policies, presentation of material, or other behavior when teaching, so negatively impacts the learning environment that students' performance in the faculty member's classes chronically, consistently, and demonstrably fall substantially below the department's expectations for students in that course.

2.3. Unsatisfactory Rating

Before the beginning of each academic semester, it is expected that the department, through the action of the Head, will inform each faculty member of the percentage of total workload to be allocated to each of the three areas of Instructional Activity, Research and Scholarship, and Service and Outreach. An overall rating of Unsatisfactory is appropriate when (a) a faculty member fails to meet minimal expectations in one or more of these three areas, AND (b) those areas in which the faculty member's performance fails to meet minimal expectations comprise the majority of the individual's assigned workload, AND (c) when a previous reassignment of duties has not yielded sufficient improvement, or a reassignment of duties would fail to meet the department's

needs or be contrary to departmental policy or offer little expectation of remediating the identified, serious deficiencies.

2.4. Faculty Standards in Instructional Activities

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the department, through the action of the Head, will define the responsibilities of each faculty member in the area of Instructional Activities. As part of this process, the faculty member's expected course load and the percentage of the faculty member's total workload devoted to Instructional Activities will be established. In making instructional-related assignments, a conscientious effort to balance the abilities and interests of the faculty member against the needs of the department, college, and university is presupposed.

Faculty with teaching-related duties are expected to exhibit the competence and to maintain the skills necessary to carry out those duties normally assigned. They are further expected to perform those duties in a responsible and professional manner while adhering to departmental and university policies and procedures. Specifically, faculty are expected to:

- 2.4.1. Accept assigned duties. This is not intended to prevent faculty from questioning the appropriateness of an assignment. However, once an assignment is determined by the Department Head in a consultation with the faculty member in question, or, if necessary to resolve persistent disagreement, the Personnel Committee, to be reasonable and to have been made following proper procedures, the faculty member does not then have the prerogative to refuse the assignment.
- 2.4.2 Provide students in each course with a course syllabus substantially as described in paragraph 4.6.1 of the Faculty Handbook. In particular, students are to be informed of the expected performance for which grades will be assigned, the instructor's attendance policy (if any), how the Honor System is to be applied, and the prerequisites for the course. The syllabus should also include information about the instructor's office hours and how he or she can be reached. In those courses where a departmental syllabus is provided, the instructor is expected to cover the essential elements of that syllabus.
- 2.4.3 Meet all scheduled classes except for university-wide cancellations, absences sanctioned by the department and/or university, or absences related to illness or emergencies. When faculty cannot meet a class, it is their responsibility to follow departmental procedures so that appropriate measures can be taken to deal with the situation.
- 2.4.4 Deliver lectures or present material in a well-prepared, professional, and competent manner.

- 2.4.5. Provide regularly scheduled office hours each week and be available during those times for consultation with students. With reasonable effort a student should be able to confer with the teacher in a timely manner, either at scheduled office hours or by other arrangement. In applying this standard it must be recognized that other professional duties, emergencies, travel, etc. will sometimes conflict with scheduled office hours. In such events, alternate arrangements should be made.
- 2.4.6. Adhere to principles of appropriateness, fairness, and clear communication in the assignment of grades.
- 2.4.7. Maintain a good learning environment in the classroom, and environment that is inclusive and accepting of students without regard to race, color, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, veteran status national origin, religion, or political affiliation and an environment that promotes mutual respect, honesty, and integrity.

2.5. Faculty Standards in Research and Scholarly Activity.

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the department, through the action of the Head, will define the responsibilities of each faculty member in the area of Research and Scholarly Activity. Typically this will entail specifying the percentage of the total workload assigned to Research and Scholarly Activity. The individual faculty member is expected:

- 2.5.1. Pursue scholarly activity in a competent and intellectually honest manner, including appropriate citation of existing, closely related work known to the researcher, and acknowledging substantial contributions from colleagues and/or students (cf. the Statement of Professional Ethics and Responsibilities in Section 2.7 of the Faculty Handbook.)
- 2.5.2. Be visible and active professionally, disseminating the results of research and scholarly activity in an appropriate manner (e.g. journal articles, books, presentations, etc.)
- 2.5.3. Make a conscious effort to remain vital and grow intellectually in the chosen area of scholarship.
- 2.5.4. Participate, to an appropriate degree and as opportunities arise, in the scholarly training of typically qualified undergraduate and graduate students, assisting them in the pursuit of their professional and degree objectives, and in no way inappropriately taking personal or professional advantage of their efforts. This shall not be construed as discouraging joint publication of completed research, but is intended rather to emphasize that premature or

inappropriate publication, presentation, or commercial use of such work by the supervising faculty member is not acceptable.

2.6 Faculty Standards in Service and Outreach

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the department, through the action of the Head, will define the responsibilities of each faculty member in the area of Service and Outreach. As part of this process, the percentage of the faculty member's total workload devoted to Service and Outreach will be established. In making assignments in the area of Service and Outreach, a conscientious effort to balance the abilities and interests of the faculty member against the needs of the department, college, and university is presupposed. It is assumed, moreover, that the department, college, or university has committed itself to providing the faculty member with the information and resources required to effectively discharge the assigned duties.

It is clear that new tasks, involving service/outreach and requiring additional, prompt faculty involvement, will typically arise during the course of an academic year. Similarly, service assignments may prove to be more burdensome than initially anticipated. It is expected that both the department administration and individual faculty will exercise reasonableness and flexibility in making the necessary adjustments to address these matters.

The individual faculty member is expected to:

- 2.6.1 Obtain a clear understanding of the expectations and responsibilities inherent in each assigned duty.
- 2.6.2. Acquire the information and resources needed to perform these duties.
- 2.6.3. Perform the assigned duties in a timely, effective, and collegial manner. Serious difficulties and/or impediments that arise in the performance of these duties must be reported to the Head or other relevant agency so that the problems can be addressed in a timely manner.
- 2.6.4. Provide in a timely and accurate manner any required documentation or report.

In addition to assigned duties, faculty members are encouraged to pursue activities which provide service to the profession and professional service to the community and state. Such activities will be considered when evaluating the faculty member's service/outreach.