

**Process for Post-Tenure Reviews**  
**Division of Humanities**  
**Adopted by Humanities Council, December 1, 2020**

As stipulated by the *Faculty Handbook*, Humanities faculty who have received tenure will be reviewed every fourth year for two cycles or until being promoted to Full Professor, and subsequently will be reviewed every fifth year. This policy, outlining the Division's procedure and guidelines, is meant to supplement but not contradict any guidance from the *Handbook* ([Section IV.2](#)) and the Rank & Tenure Committee.

*Process in Outline:*

- The process begins when the chair provides a schedule to the faculty member being reviewed.
- The faculty member being reviewed prepares materials for review by their department and any other colleague(s) they would like to include in the process.
- Colleagues offer an evaluation of the faculty member being reviewed based on materials and their knowledge of that person's work.
- The chair writes a draft of the review that synthesizes these evaluations and includes feedback on strengths and areas for improvement.
- The dean reviews all evaluations and the chair's draft to verify that the evaluations are accurately reflected, requesting revisions if necessary.
- The chair shares the final draft with the candidate, who has the right to author a formal reply, which will be kept with the review in all records.
- The final review is submitted to the Provost and to the Dean to be retained as part of the faculty file maintained by the department. Copies will also be retained in the Provost's and Dean's offices.
- The evaluations from colleagues are destroyed six months after the review is submitted.

*Materials Assembled by Faculty Member Being Reviewed*

Faculty should provide the following materials to their chair and colleagues:

- An up-to-date CV
- All official teaching feedback since the last review
- All eFARS and annual self assessments since the last review
- Up to 1 document providing evidence of excellence in each of the areas discussed in the handbook
  - Teaching: A syllabus, assignment, class activity, or similar that demonstrates one or more of the characteristics of an excellent teacher named in the handbook (challenges students intellectually, communicates effectively, shows commitment to learning, remains current in their disciplines, demonstrates personal and professional integrity).
  - Scholarship: A piece of published, presented, or in-progress work that demonstrates scholarly competence, continued growth in professional activity, and/or accomplishment involving interaction with peers.
  - Service: Any evidence that demonstrates distinct academic influence or leadership in the university, profession, or community.

- A self-assessment of up to 10 single-spaced pages (for 4th-year reviews) or 2 single-spaced pages (for 5th-year reviews). The self-assessment should include an account and self-assessment of the faculty member's work according to the *Handbook's* criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. If applicable, the faculty member can also comment on progress toward promotion and/or future sabbatical plans.

### *Reviews by Colleagues*

All members of a faculty person's department are entitled and expected to review materials and submit an evaluation.

Colleagues should review materials and then submit their evaluation using [this form](#). Multiple choice questions are entirely optional.

The chair is responsible for maintaining records of all evaluations submitted by colleagues for six months, and then for destroying those records.

### *Roles of the Chair and Dean*

The chair is responsible for drafting a review that synthesizes key themes from evaluations.

These reviews should be constructive and honest, offering both appreciation for strengths and commentary on areas for growth.

The chair is also responsible for maintaining records that verify that the candidate received the review, had the right to reply, and that a final review was submitted to the Provost and Dean's offices.

The dean is responsible for reading the draft review and verifying that it accurately reflects themes from the evaluations. If it does not, the dean can request revisions. If the chair refuses to revise, the dean can add a reply to the review, which becomes part of the formal record.

In the event that the faculty member being reviewed is chair of their department, the dean takes on the chair's responsibilities and recruits a dean from another school or division to take on the role of dean.

### *Timeline*

Reviews are due to the Provost's Office by April 30, and the faculty member being reviewed has a right to see the letter by April 21. All other deadlines will be determined by the chair. A possible schedule would be:

- March 1: Materials assembled and shared with colleagues.
- March 30: Colleagues submit evaluations to the chair.
- April 15: Chair submits letter in draft form to the dean.
- April 21: Chair shares final draft with candidate, who can request changes and/or write a supplement.
- April 30: Final evaluation turned in to Provost's Office.

### *Other Processes*

- Neither the *Handbook* nor the Division require any formal meeting of departments concerning post-tenure reviews. Such meetings can be scheduled and planned by the chair, at the chair's discretion.
- Should the faculty member being reviewed want colleagues from outside their department to offer evaluations, they should inform their chair at the beginning of the process.