

THE CITADEL
The Military College of South Carolina
171 Moultrie Street
Charleston, SC 29409

MEMORANDUM
NUMBER 3-602

9 DECEMBER 2022

POLICY ON POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Memorandum is to describe the following:

- A. The criteria and standards for evaluating the total performance of a faculty member over a number of years after being tenured at The Citadel.
- B. The timeline for conducting a review of a tenured faculty member.
- C. The process for conducting post-tenure review.

For a Table of Contents of this Memorandum, see [Annex B](#).

2. REFERENCE

S.C. Code Ann. 59-103-30 (Law Co-op, 1976)

S.C. Code Ann 8-17-370 (Law Co-op, 1987)

S.C. Regulations 19-715.01 (1987)

1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings,
<http://www.aaup.org/report/1958-statement-procedural-standards-faculty-dismissal-proceedings>

3. DEFINITIONS

- A. Appeal: Appeal is the petition to a higher tribunal following a negative decision for post-tenure review.
- B. Instructor: Instructor is a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member with a specified contractual period of employment.
- C. Assistant Professor: Assistant Professor is a faculty member at the college or university who ranks in between an instructor and an associate professor.
- D. Associate Professor: Associate Professor is a faculty member at the college or university who ranks in between an assistant professor and professor.

- E. The Departmental/School Post-Tenure Review Committee: The committee will be composed of tenured members of the department/school and an outside member. The Candidate will provide a list of possible outside members to the departmental/school committee. The committee will select the outside member, who will come from another department/school (excluding Deans and Department Heads). Faculty with whom the Candidate has a personal relationship (i.e., spouse, significant other, or family member) or faculty who are currently undergoing post-tenure review may not serve on the committee. The members of the department/school committee will elect a member to serve as the Chair. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs will resolve any issues in the selection of the outsidecommittee member. This committee must include a minimum of three faculty members. If a department cannot meet the minimum membership or membershipwith the appropriate seniority, then the Department Head will seek the appropriatenumber of additional faculty and/or faculty with the appropriate seniority from withinthe school or a related discipline, per the approval of the Provost. Whenever a school cannot form a committee which meets the aforementioned size and/or seniority requirements, the Dean must devise a plan that is agreeable to the Provost. All plans will be forwarded to the Provost.

All members of the committee, inclusive of the outside member, are full and equal participants in the evaluation process.

Each department/school will decide by majority vote whether to require, permit, or exclude participation in the post-tenure review by persons from outside The Citadel. If the school/department decides in favor of participation of an outside professional in the post-tenure review process, the school/department Post-Tenure Review Committee, with input from the faculty member under review, will arrange for this participation. This individual will not participate as a voting member of the committee, but will provide an independent evaluation of those portions of the faculty member's record that have been specified by a majority vote of the departmental faculty. This input will be reflected in the departmental/school documentation of the post-tenure review.

- F. Faculty Data Portfolio (FDP): Faculty Data Portfolio is a form used annually by the administration to evaluate tenure and tenure-track faculty at The Citadel. The form requires evidence for teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professionalactivity, and service.
- G. Peer-Reviewed Publication: Peer-reviewed publication is any book, book chapter, conference proceeding, or article that was reviewed by one or more experts in the field.
- H. Portfolio: Portfolio refers to the documentation that a faculty member provides when seeking tenure and/or promotion at The Citadel. These materials include the following items: the letter of appointment with any sensitive (e.g., personal or financial) information redacted, a narrative summary, a curriculum vitae, a summative PDS, student and peer evaluations, copies of publications, and supporting evidence. Explicit details are given in Annex A, Section A.

- I. Professor: Professor is a faculty member at the college or university with the highest academic rank.
- J. Second Review: A second review is an additional review of the submitted portfolio following a negative recommendation by a departmental/school committee or Department Head. The candidate must request in writing a second review within five business days of receiving the written recommendation. The second review must occur within ten business days of receipt of the written request.
- K. Tenure: Tenure is the permanent status that is awarded to a faculty member who meets the criteria established by *this policy* and the faculty member's departmental/school standards, following a probationary period. Academic tenure provides a faculty member freedom in teaching, scholarship, and service, as stated by the American Association of University Professors. (1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and 1970 Interpretive Comments).
- L. Terminal Appointment: A terminal appointment is the continuing employment of a faculty member for a specified period, which shall not exceed twelve months. Termination will occur at the end of this period.

4. POLICY

As mandated by South Carolina law, all state-assisted institutions of higher learning are required to institute a policy to evaluate all faculty members. This faculty evaluation policy governs four types of evaluation: 1) student evaluation for all courses; 2) an annual administrative evaluation to include assessment from the Dean/Department Head; 3) a peer review annually for untenured faculty members; and 4) a post-tenure review every six years.

The implementation of a post-tenure review process should not be viewed as simply a new consideration for tenure. The expectations for tenure at The Citadel change over time, and tenured professors should not be expected to qualify under the new standards. The current expectation of tenured professors is that they perform their duties conscientiously and with professional competence in the three areas of activities (teaching, scholarship, and service). The review must be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages in faculty careers.

In reviewing a faculty member's performance, the school/departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee will focus attention on the faculty member's areas of endeavor while recognizing diverse talents, activities, and accomplishments. A rating of satisfactory in the post-tenure review process should reflect an acceptable level of performance.

Implementation of this post-tenure review policy should serve the main purpose of faculty improvement. The mix among teaching, scholarship, and service activities will differ from one faculty member to another. Commitment to teaching, service to the institution and/or profession, and scholarly activity are expected of all faculty. The degree of scholarly engagement may vary from faculty member to faculty member,

but all faculty are expected to remain current in their field through some form of scholarly activity. Post-tenure review, therefore, should be used as a means to evaluate the total performance of the faculty member over a number of years, and should be used as the basis for facilitating improvement when and where appropriate.

The Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs maintains a timetable of when faculty members are due for post-tenure review. This office will contact Department Heads and Deans in the spring semester with a list of faculty members who will be reviewed for post-tenure the next academic year. Department Heads will subsequently inform the eligible faculty member the same semester so that the individual can develop the required portfolio over the summer and fall semester.

A. Standards for Post-Tenure Review

Faculty members are assessed for post-tenure based on both departmental/school standards and college-wide standards in the areas of teaching, scholarly and professional activities, and service.

1. Departmental/School Standards

A Candidate will be evaluated based on the standards developed by his or her department or school. The standards can be found on the FTPC web site at <http://www.citadel.edu/root/fcmte-tenurepromot-pps>. If the standards change during the six-year period for review, then the Candidate may choose which standards will apply: the original standards or the newly established one.

2. College-wide Standards

In addition to the departmental/school standards, the committee will use *this policy* to assess the Candidate's professional qualifications.

B. Timeline and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Candidates

A detailed timeline and procedure for the post-tenure review process are given in [Annex A](#). For "Instructions for Curriculum Vitae and Sample," see [Memorandum 3-601](#).

C. Actions

The following actions will result from the review:

1. Rating of satisfactory: This rating indicates that the faculty member has met institutional expectations in teaching and one or both of the other two performance areas, research and service.
2. Results of satisfactory (or higher such as departmental/school distinctions) rating: If given a rating of satisfactory or higher, the faculty member meets or exceeds the departmental/school and institutional expectations. Any departmental/school distinctions are described in the respective standards.

3. Rating of unsatisfactory: This rating indicates that the faculty member does not meet institutional expectations in either teaching or in both of the other two performance areas (research and service). A rating of unsatisfactory will be given to a faculty member who does not submit a portfolio in the sixth year, as described in the timeline in Annex A, or request an extension for extenuating circumstances (extended illness, family emergency, etc.) To receive an extension, a faculty member must submit a written request with sufficient detail in a letter to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.
4. Results of unsatisfactory rating: If given a rating of unsatisfactory, the faculty member must produce a professional development proposal designed to improve his or her performance in the performance area in which he or she was found to be unsatisfactory. This proposal must be submitted by September 10th in the academic year immediately following the unsatisfactory rating to the appropriate Department Head or Dean and approved by that person. The College may provide resources for the faculty member to fulfill this development plan.

In the third year after the review, the faculty member will undergo the post tenure review process again. If the faculty member is again given a rating of unsatisfactory, his or her portfolio will go to the Provost for his or her review. The Provost will review these materials starting on April 10th with the final decision due in writing to the faculty member by May 10th. If the Provost disagrees with the second unsatisfactory rating, the faculty member will continue to be employed at The Citadel in the same capacity. If the Provost agrees with the second unsatisfactory rating, then the Provost will initiate procedures for dismissal of the faculty member “for cause.” These procedures are described in Memorandum 3-601, the policy on Probationary Reappointment, Academic Tenure, Academic Promotion, and Termination of Tenured Faculty.

5. COMPLIANCE

In the event that a department/school does not follow the specified timeline and/or complete the post-tenure review process for a faculty member scheduled to undergo review, the Department Head/Dean will submit an explanation for noncompliance to the Dean (for departments) and Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (for departments and schools). Failure to comply with this policy may result in disciplinary action taken by the Provost against the Department Head/Dean.

6. NOTES

A. Dates of Official Enactment and Amendments:

General Order Number 3 approved by the Executive Assistant to the President on 25 March 2004

Revised Memorandum 3-602 approved by the Provost and Dean of The Citadel on 15 April 2014

B. Responsible Committee:

The Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee and The Faculty Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee

C. Responsible Official:

The Provost

D. Cross References:

[Faculty Manual](#)

[Memorandum 3-601](#)

7. RESCISSION

General Order number 3, dated 25 March 2004, is rescinded.

8. REVIEW

This document must be reviewed by the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee every two years or as needed.

FOR THE PRESIDENT:

OFFICIAL

SALLY SELDEN
Provost and Dean of The Citadel
Brigadier General, SCM

ANNEX A

Timeline and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Candidates

(*) Note: Departments/Schools or Deans must conduct the review early in the specified month so as to allow time for a second review. The faculty member receiving a negative recommendation must request a second review, if desired, within five business days. The reviewing body must conduct the second review within ten business days of written request.

Post-tenure review of tenured faculty (in teaching positions) will take place every six years. Reviews will be conducted according to a six-year schedule unless interrupted by promotion, written declaration to retire within two years of the next scheduled post-tenure review, or any form of leave of absence (including sabbaticals). If a tenured faculty member is promoted, the promotion action fulfills the post-tenure review requirement, and the six-year post-tenure review cycle is modified to begin with the effective date of promotion. In the case of a leave of absence lasting for a semester or longer, the period of the leave of absence does not count as part of the six-year period between reviews.

Spring Semester

- The Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs will notify Deans and Department Heads of the names of faculty who should be reviewed for post-tenure the next academic year.
- Department Heads notify the faculty members in the department who will be reviewed for post-tenure the next academic year.

Summer-Fall Semester

- Faculty members scheduled for Post-Tenure review prepare electronic portfolio.

Fall Semester

- As needed, tenured faculty members of each department/school elect a committee of tenured faculty members as described in the Definitions section to serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

By January 2nd

- Electronic portfolio for Post-Tenure Review due.

February (due by February 10th) (*)

- Departmental/School Review of Post-Tenure Faculty due.
- Department/School Committee Members submit ballot on Post-Tenure Faculty.
- Departmental/School Post-Tenure Review Committee Chair writes and forwards recommendation to Department Head/Dean and Faculty Member.
- Faculty member scans and uploads report to electronic portfolio.

By March 10th (*)

- Department Head writes and submits his/her written recommendation to the appropriate Dean and the faculty member.
- The faculty member scans and uploads the recommendation to the electronic portfolio.

By April 10th (*)

- The Dean informs the faculty member of his/her decision in writing.

April

- Faculty member receiving unsatisfactory rating may file an appeal.
- Appeals Committee convenes to address filed cases.
- Appeals Committee Members submit ballot.
- Appeals Committee Chair writes and submits recommendation to the Provost.
- Appeals Committee Chair meets with the Provost to discuss recommendation.

By May 10th

- The Provost notifies faculty member of his/her decision.

A. Portfolio

1. Content of Portfolio

Faculty members should submit a portfolio of professional materials for the post-tenure review. Only materials dating from the end of the previous review period should be included. Individual departments may specify particular types of materials in their departmental standards document, but at the very least the portfolio should contain the following items in the indicated subfolders:

- a. A current curriculum vitae (Introduction folder);
- b. A self-evaluation of three to five pages that addresses the areas of teaching, research, and service (Introduction folder);
- c. Summative PDS document (Introduction folder);
- d. Annual performance evaluations by the Department Head or Dean (Evaluations folder);
- e. Any responses by the faculty member to those annual evaluations (Evaluations folder);
- f. Computer summaries of Student Evaluations of Instruction for each course taught during the review period (Teaching folder);
- g. Evidence of Scholarship (Scholarship folder) and Service (Service folder);
- h. Any other data required by departments or schools.

2. Submission of Portfolio

The portfolio should be submitted electronically using the means established by FTPC. The Candidate must request a folder/access from ITS for this purpose. Once the Candidate has finished assembling the portfolio, the Candidate must give access to reviewers by the deadlines stipulated in *this policy*.

3. Organization of Portfolio

The portfolio should be organized into five general sections:

- a. Introduction
- b. Teaching
- c. Scholarship
- d. Service
- e. Evaluations

B. Review Process

1. Departmental/School Committee Review for Post-Tenure

By January 2nd, the Candidate will submit electronically a portfolio to the departmental/school committee for post-tenure review. Committee members will review the portfolio independently.

It is crucial to remember that in the post tenure review process, only candidates are being evaluated — not departments, curricula, or specialty areas within an academic unit. In other words, the evaluation must be based exclusively on whether or not candidates are doing their professional best in the capacities for which they were hired. As the AAUP states in their 1958 “Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings,” if there is a negative evaluation it must unequivocally be the result of an unbiased assessment of “individual human weakness” and not “an unhealthful [academic] setting” (p. 12).

If the committee has questions for the Candidate they may either be asked at a meeting of the committee with the Candidate or forwarded by the Committee Chair via email to the Candidate. The Candidate may either respond via email to the entire committee or to the Committee Chair who must then forward the response to the entire committee.

Following careful review of the portfolio, each committee member will submit a sealed ballot in accordance with Section B.2 of *this Annex* to the Committee Chair. The Committee Chair and one member of the committee will count the sealed ballots. The Chair will subsequently write a recommendation and forward it to the Dean of the School via the Department Head in the case of departments and a copy to the Candidate. The recommendation is written as described in Section B.3 of *this Annex*.

If the Committee has recommended an unsatisfactory rating, the Candidate may request a second review. Details for a second review are given in Section B.5 of *this Annex*.

The Departmental/School Review must be completed by February 10th. The Committee Chair will submit all physical documentation provided by the Candidate to the next higher authority for review, the Department Head or appropriate academic Dean.

2. Ballots by Departmental/School Post-Tenure Review Committee Members

Each Committee Member submits a confidential and anonymous written ballot to the Committee Chair. The ballot must contain an overall rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory; a rating of the same for each of the three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service; and a well-reasoned and professional assessment of the Candidate's qualifications in each of the three areas previously listed. The ballot must clearly explain the overall rating.

3. Recommendation by Departmental/School Post-Tenure Review Committee Chair

The written recommendation must include the following items:

- a. the full name of each committee member
- b. an overall rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory
- c. a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory for each of the three areas, teaching, scholarship, and service
- d. a well-reasoned and professional assessment of the candidate's qualifications in each of the previously listed areas, which clearly explains the overall rating and
- e. a description of the review process followed by the committee.

All members of the committee must sign the committee's recommendation of the Candidate in order to ensure that the consensus vote was accurately represented. The Committee Chair must include the ballots from each committee member along with the committee's written recommendation.

4. Department Head's Review of Candidate for Post-Tenure (if applicable)

The Department Head reviews the submitted portfolio and the recommendation of the Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Department Head then writes a letter containing his/her recommendation with justification based on the three areas, teaching, scholarship, and service. A copy of the letter is sent to the appropriate Dean, Department Committee Chair, and the

Candidate. The Department Head's review must be completed by March 10th. The Department Head will submit all physical documentation supplied by the Candidate to the appropriate academic Dean.

5. Second Review by Departmental/School Post-Tenure Review Committee or Department Head

If the Candidate receives a rating of unsatisfactory from the department/school committee or the Department Head, then he/she may request a second review by the same party. The request must be made in writing within five business days of receipt of the written recommendation. The Candidate must stipulate in the request if a written statement of clarification will follow or an interview is desired. If an interview is requested, a mutually convenient meeting time will be arranged. This meeting must occur in a timely manner such that the new recommendation can be made within ten business days of receipt of the written request for a second review.

The purpose for a second review is to clarify anything that the Candidate believes was misunderstood or overlooked. The Candidate may submit missing or new evidence. The convening body will reevaluate the case following careful review of the new information. If further information is still needed, the Committee Chair or Department Head will contact the Candidate in writing.

a. Positive Recommendation

If a positive recommendation is made, then the new recommendation and ballots replace the original items. The new recommendation will not mention the need for a second review nor will it include the written request for the second review.

b. Negative Recommendation

If a negative recommendation is made, then the original recommendation, the new recommendation, and the request for a second review will be forwarded onto the next higher authority in the process, Department Head or Dean.

6. Dean's Review of Candidate for Post-Tenure

The Dean reviews the Candidate's submitted portfolio, including any physical evidence, and the Committee Chair's recommendation, and the Department Head's recommendation (if applicable). Subsequently the Dean sends a letter, which states his/her decision with accompanying justification, to the Candidate, the Committee Chair, the Department Head (if applicable), the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, and the Provost. The explanation must reflect a careful and thorough assessment of the Candidate's accomplishments in each

of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service). The Dean's review must be completed by April 10th.

C. Appeals

A faculty member has the right to appeal any recommendation made by his or her school Dean. The appeal must be made in writing to the Provost within five business days of written receipt of the Dean's negative decision. The grounds for appeal may be based on either or both of the following: procedural issues or the reasons given for an Unsatisfactory rating. Candidates who disagree with their evaluation may petition the Provost for a reevaluation of the evidence in their portfolio and may submit a written statement to the Provost giving their reasons for disagreeing with the evaluation. The Provost then makes the final decision on appeals. Appeals must be resolved by May 10th.

ANNEX B

Table of Contents

Purpose.....	1
Reference.....	1
Definitions	1
Policy.....	4
Standards for Post-Tenure Review.....	5
Departmental/School Standards.....	5
College-wide Standards.....	5
Timeline and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review of Candidates	5, Annex A, 1
Actions.....	5
Portfolio	Annex A, 3
Content of Portfolio	Annex A, 3
Submission of Portfolio	Annex A, 3
Organization of Portfolio	Annex A, 4
Review Process.....	Annex A, 4
Departmental/School Committee Review for Post-Tenure.....	Annex A, 4
Ballots by Departmental/School Post-Tenure Review	
Committee Members.....	Annex A, 5
Recommendation by Departmental/School Post-Tenure	
Review Committee Chair	Annex A, 5
Department Head's Review of Candidate for Post-Tenure	Annex A, 5
Second Review by Departmental/School Post-Tenure	
Review Committee.....	Annex A, 6
Positive Recommendation	Annex A, 6
Negative Recommendation.....	Annex A, 6
Dean's Review of Candidate for Post-Tenure.....	Annex A, 6
Appeals	Annex A, 7
Compliance	6
Notes.....	7
Dates of Official Enactment and Amendments	7
Responsible Department.....	7
Responsible Official.....	7
Cross References.....	7
Rescission.....	7
Review	7
<u>Annex A:</u> Timeline and Procedures for Review of Candidates for	
Post-Review	Annex A, 1
<u>Annex B:</u> Table of Contents	