HDFS CUMULATIVE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

PREAMBLE

The Department of Human Development and Family Science review of tenured faculty includes three processes:

(1) annual review of faculty,
(2) cumulative review of faculty, and
(3) review for promotion.

The OSU Faculty Handbook describes each of these processes. The annual review focuses on evaluation, the cumulative review focuses on faculty development, and the promotion process allows the faculty member to be reviewed for promotion to the next higher faculty rank. This document describes the history, philosophy, guidelines, and procedures for the cumulative review of tenured faculty in HDFS. Cumulative review of tenured faculty (CRT) was approved in December, 2007 (OSU Policy and Procedure 2-0109). CRT in the HDFS Department should be consistent with OSU’s document and the review philosophies of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 1999), and in line with review processes of other universities in the Big 12 (Phillips & Brown, 2006) and other land grant universities (Iowa State University, 1999). Specifically, the AAUP provides minimum standards for good practice. These include:

1. Post-tenure review must ensure the protection of academic freedom.
2. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation or revalidation of tenured status.
3. The written standards and criteria should be developed and periodically reviewed by faculty.
4. Post-tenure review should be developmental and supported by institutional resources for professional development or a change of professional direction.
5. Post-tenure review should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.
6. Outcome of evaluation should be confined to the faculty member and other persons with a right to know, e.g., the Cumulative Review Committee, the department head and the dean.
7. If a formal development plan supplements a post-tenure review, that plan must be a product of mutual negotiation.
8. Faculty members should have the right to challenge and comment on the findings and have an appeal process to a faculty committee.
9. Improvement efforts should be mutually agreeable plans; if unsuccessful, then peer consideration should be invoked for sanctions.
10. Standard for dismissal or other severe sanctions remains that of adequate cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not in any way diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum before an appropriately constituted body of peers convened for that purpose.

A review of CRT documents for Big 12 universities shows the documents provide information for review or evaluation, procedures for the review, a development plan for the faculty member, and follow up to insure completion of the plan. As a department engaged in fostering human development across the lifespan, the HDFS Department uses a developmental perspective on cumulative review of tenured faculty. The creativity and development of each faculty member contributes to the vitality of the HDFS Department and the cumulative review of tenured faculty is a mechanism for departmental reflection on
faculty members’ accomplishments and plans for the future. Thus, the HDFS Department adopted the philosophy of faculty development as the primary goal of the CRT process as described by Iowa State University (1999):

“The purpose of post-tenure review shall first and foremost be to encourage the creative renewal of the individual faculty member through a self-directed review that respects the right of each tenured faculty member to exercise personal choice over scholarly activities, within the general bounds of professional conduct.”

Thus, the HDFS Department affirms the values of AAUP and distinguishes CRT from other reviews of tenured faculty.

A critical part of the success of the CRT process in fostering faculty development is how faculty view the process. Montell (2002) considered the expectations of persons about to undergo, and who had undergone, their first post-tenure review. As might be expected, the experiences varied widely. Several noted its helpfulness in subsequent promotions attempts. At other institutions, in which money was tied to faculty development grants for senior faculty, faculty regarded the effects positively. Other faculty members were less kind, noting it was an exercise without any payoff. Some felt it to be demoralizing, with a focus more upon quantity of output rather than quality.

Cumulative review of tenured faculty was instituted at OSU to ensure that we are responsible to our various constituencies in the provision of our academic services. In addition, it can provide a variety of positive outcomes for faculty, including the refocusing of efforts, reallocation of resources, provision of new resources, and formative evaluation at various stages of one’s career. Cumulative review will not substitute for procedures OSU has in place for dismissal and discipline of faculty.

In accordance with OSU policy 2-0109, a cumulative review of all HDFS tenured faculty members is conducted every five years following initial tenure. Policy 2-0109 also states that performance standards and expectations must be approved by departmental faculty. Nevertheless, the intent of CRT is formative in nature, emphasizing faculty strengths and accomplishments in pursuit of professional and departmental goals. The review for promotion also serves as a cumulative review but is summative in nature.

**HDFS Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty Committee Composition:**

The HDFS CRT committee:

- The committee will be composed of three tenured faculty members not under review (at the same rank or higher than the faculty member under review).
- In years when faculty members of different ranks are under review, there may be a need for additional individuals to serve on the committee. The department head will determine which three individuals will review each faculty member.
- The committee members will be elected by all tenured faculty.
- In the event that an elected faculty member declines to serve or needs to be replaced for other reasons, the department head will replace the elected faculty member with the faculty member with the most votes received after the three originally elected members.
- The department head will not serve as a member of the CRT committee.
RESPONSIBILITIES:
The CRT committee will review the materials submitted by the tenured faculty member under review and prepare written feedback, a Cumulative Review Report, which includes a description of accomplishments and growth areas, and assesses the faculty member’s overall performance during the review period in relation to the department’s performance standards and expectations. This written feedback will be submitted to the tenured faculty member under review and to the HDFS Department Head. The purpose of this feedback is to further career development for the faculty member. The feedback may be especially important for changes in career direction or in focus.

The department CRT committee will elect a tenured faculty member to serve as committee chair. The committee will meet and hold a confidential discussion of each reviewed faculty member’s submitted documentation in relation to the approved criteria. Upon conclusion of the discussion, the committee chair, in consultation with the committee members and department head, will develop a Cumulative Review Report. Committee members are to keep the content and process of the discussion confidential.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION:
The tenured faculty member under review is responsible for providing the following documentation for review:

- A current curriculum vitae;
- Annual appraisals and development letters, and faculty response if submitted, for the period under review (available in the department office);
- A copy of the faculty member’s official assignment for the period under review (percent research, extension, instruction, service) provided by the department office with comments from the faculty member as appropriate;
- A copy of the faculty member’s last cumulative review report or promotion recommendation;
- Description by the faculty member of goals, accomplishments, and other information for the current review period; change - 2 page summary of key goals and accomplishments
- For faculty engaged in interdisciplinary, cross-institutional, or other relevant partnerships, appropriate input from out-of-department faculty or other collaborators may be included by the faculty member under review. Delete
- An individual development plan stating the faculty member’s professional goals and objectives for the next review period. change - 1 page summary of faculty member’s professional goals and objectives for the next review period.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS:
Documents provided by the faculty member will be evaluated by the CRT committee given the faculty member’s current rank while considering the faculty member’s career development and individual career path. It should be recognized that meaningful contributions to the department, college, university, and profession can be made in a variety of ways. Consistent with the faculty member’s official assignment, for the purposes of a satisfactory rating for cumulative review, the faculty member should demonstrate the following for the period under review.

- Teaching effectiveness, achieved by at least two of the following:
  - sustained record of positive teaching evaluations;
  - created and effectively taught a new course;
actively mentored junior faculty and/or graduate students in their teaching;
contributed to significant curricula changes and their implementation;
developed and implemented innovative teaching techniques and approaches;
provided leadership in recruiting and retaining students;
other departmentally recognized instructional contribution.

Service activities, achieved by at least one of the following:

- chaired or was an active member of a departmental committee;
- chaired or was an active member of a college committee;
- chaired or was an active member of a university committee;
- advisor for departmental club or honor society;
- elected or appointed to a leadership position in a professional association;
- other departmentally recognized service contribution.

Involvement in outreach/extension activities, achieved by at least one of the following:

- provided professional consultation for outreach group or organization;
- provided training for outreach group or organization;
- gave a scholarly talk to an outreach group or organization;
- designed and implemented, or evaluated an outreach program;
- other departmentally recognized outreach contribution.

Substantive contribution to scholarship (research or application), achieved by at least two of the following:

- published a peer-reviewed journal article;
- published a chapter in an edited book;
- chaired a dissertation or two theses to completion;
- submitted a substantive grant proposal;
- received a substantial grant from a recognized funding agency;
- presented a paper or poster at a recognized conference;
- served as a journal editor or associate editor;
- served on the editorial board of a journal;
- published a scholarly book or textbook;
- other departmentally recognized scholarly contribution (research or application).

HDFS PROCESS:

The department will maintain a list of tenured faculty members with dates of tenure. A list of tenured faculty members eligible for review during the academic year will be published, and the faculty involved notified, by May 1st of the academic year prior to cumulative review. The cumulative review process...
should follow a similar schedule as the promotion and tenure review process. Reviews should be completed no later than May 30th of the academic year in which cumulative review occurs.

The CRT committee will meet at a time scheduled by the department head to elect a chair and to discuss the procedures to be followed in the review.

The written review by the CRT committee will be provided to the faculty member, who may attach comments, explanations or rebuttal prior to being forwarded to the Department head. A written review by the Department head will be provided to the faculty member after reviewing the dossier and CRT committee’s written review. The faculty member will have 10 days to offer comments in response to the Department Head’s review. Both the CRT committee and the department head will provide overall performance ratings. These ratings should be Extraordinary, Strong and Positive, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. Both Extraordinary and Strong and Positive ratings merit consideration for monetary reward. These documents will be part of the faculty member’s personnel file, as is required in OSU’s Policy and Procedures 2-0109.

In the event of an unsatisfactory rating, the faculty and committee will draft a professional development plan to meet the specific deficiencies and provide support for accomplishing the development goals. A timetable to meet these goals, no longer than 3 years, should be provided. The department head and CRT committee will monitor the plan annually for accomplishment of the development goals. The annual appraisal will be used by the department head to monitor progress toward achieving the specified goal(s).

**HDFS Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty Outcome:**

According to OSU policy the outcome of the review can include:

- rewarding faculty for outstanding performance;
- a change in the distribution of the faculty member’s time in the official assignment;
- the development of a corrective/professional development plan;
- dispute resolution initiated by the faculty member (Section 2.3 of the Dispute Resolution Policy); or
- disciplinary action initiated by the department head.
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