

Graduate College Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty Members

Approved by the Graduate College Faculty (11/30/12)

Introduction

In accordance with the University of Iowa Operations Manual (section III-10.7; Review of Tenured Faculty members), all tenured faculty members in the Graduate College shall receive both Annual Reviews, conducted by the departmental DEOs, and a five-year review, conducted by one's peers.

Annual review of tenured faculty

The main purpose of the annual review is to be evaluative, but it may also be formative and developmental. An annual performance review of all tenured faculty members is conducted by the DEO as part of the salary-setting process. Annual review of tenured faculty shall include an evaluation of research/scholarship, teaching, and service according to the expected standard of performance for the faculty member's unit. As part of this review, each faculty member must make available to the DEO materials specified in the statement of the department's annual review process (e.g., vitae, teaching evaluations, etc.).

If, as a result of an annual review, the DEO concludes that there are significant deficiencies related to teaching, research, or service, the DEO shall provide written notifications of these conclusions to the faculty member being reviewed, and the faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond in writing. The final report and the faculty member's response will be sent to the dean and will be kept with the faculty member's personnel records.

Faculty members being reviewed by their department for the special purpose of promotion may be exempted from this annual faculty review requirement.

Five-year peer review of tenured faculty.

The main purpose of the five-year review is to be formative and developmental, and should facilitate and encourage professional vitality. Post-tenure peer review is intended to acknowledge achievements and to provide an appropriate mechanism to encourage constructive responses to normal changes that are likely to occur over the course of a successful academic career. All tenured faculty members will undergo a peer review once every five years subsequent to their most recent tenure or promotion review. Faculty members are exempted from their scheduled five-year peer review if they: are being reviewed for promotion to a higher rank during the year of the scheduled review, are within one year of announced retirement, are on phased retirement, or they serve as DEO, assistant dean, associate dean, or dean.

(a) selection of the five-year peer review committee:

The five-year peer review committee will be composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty peers from the Graduate College at the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member undergoing the review (i.e., "the faculty member"). The committee will be chosen by the DEO in consultation with the faculty member, and approved by the Dean. The committee should consist of peers with interests and expertise similar to the faculty member. DEOs and other administrators may not serve on peer review committees.

(b) committee procedures and timelines:

The Dean's office will notify departments of the names of faculty members due for their five-year peer review in the spring prior to the fall five-year review. All materials to be considered in the review should be submitted to the DEO by January 1st. The committee shall review the faculty member's five-year record in accordance with the performance standards in the faculty member's department. The committee shall prepare and sign a written report

that summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. The written report will be completed and submitted to the faculty member and DEO by March 1st.

A positive report may not include recommended actions if no areas of improvement are identified. However, only in rare cases will no areas for improvement be identified. The report should provide specific recommendations for improving the faculty members' performance. In certain instances, the report may indicate that a faculty member's performance has fallen below the standard of performance for a significant period of time. In such instances, procedures under (f) will be followed.

The committee report will be conveyed to the faculty member, with information regarding his/her right to respond.

The faculty member will have until March 15th to respond, if desired. The faculty member may correct any factual errors in the report or if the faculty member disagrees with the conclusions of the report, he/she may present additional evidence for consideration. Except in "special cases" in which procedures in (f) apply, the DEO will meet with the faculty member to discuss the report and the recommended actions, if any. If recommendations for improvement are made, the DEO will develop an agreement with the faculty member identifying how areas for improvement are to be addressed. The committee report and recommendations, the DEO/faculty member agreement and the faculty member's response should be forwarded to the Dean by April 15th.

(c) materials to be reviewed:

The faculty member being reviewed will submit the following materials to the DEO and review committee:

- A statement describing his/her accomplishments over the past five years, and five year plan in the areas of teaching, research and service
- A current curriculum vitae
- Samples of representative course materials
- Records of student evaluations in each course taught since the previous five year review, or promotion review
- Copies of scholarly or other publications
- Any other supporting materials the faculty member deems important

(d) distribution and use of the committee's written report:

See (b) above. Also, as per university regulations, the outcome of this peer review is confidential and confined to the faculty member being reviewed, the review committee, the DEO, the Dean and in special circumstances, the Office of the Provost.

(e) mechanisms for the faculty member to respond:

See (b) above. In addition a faculty member who believes that he/she has been treated unfairly at any point in the five year review process may seek redress of such grievance with the scope and framework of III- 29.6 Faculty Dispute Procedures.

(f) Special cases procedures:

If, after receiving the results of the five-year peer review, the dean, on advice of the peer review committee and in consultation with the DEO concludes, on the basis of the peer review's findings, that the faculty member's performance has fallen for a significant period of time below the expected standard of performance for the faculty member's unit, then the dean will initiate discussions with the faculty member concerning the development of a plan to address problems uncovered in the review. Such discussion may focus on the faculty member's individualized portfolio. The plan will be put in writing, will contain a justification for its implementation, will provide a specific timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress (normally to occur at the faculty member's next

five-year review), and will provide a description of possible consequences for not meeting expectations by the time of that evaluation. The DEO and/or dean may monitor progress through the annual review and give feedback to the faculty member.

If the plan prepared by the peer review committee and the dean is not agreed to by the faculty member, then the faculty member will provide a written justification for not agreeing to the plan. The plan and the faculty member's response will be submitted to the Provost, who will make the final determination as to whether the plan should be implemented. If the faculty member believes that there are grounds for grievance, then the faculty member may seek redress of his or her grievance within the scope and framework of [III-29.6 Faculty Dispute Procedures](#).

In deciding whether or not to implement such a plan, it is important that the dean and DEO respect the importance of tenure and the academic freedom it is designed to protect. With respect to research, there is a critical distinction between a faculty member who has ambitious research programs that they are actively pursuing and the very few faculty members who have no such plans and who have had no work in progress for a substantial period of time. It is expected that if plans envisioned focus on research productivity, they would typically be appropriate only for the latter group.

If the plan is implemented, then the dean (or dean's designee) and the DEO will oversee the faculty member's progress under the plan. If after the agreed-to time period, the dean and the DEO, in consultation with the peer review committee, find no acceptable progress, then the DEO, the dean, the Provost, and the peer review committee will meet to decide which of the consequences described in the plan will go into effect. The consequences will be implemented by the dean, in consultation with the DEO, and monitored by the Provost.

Use of the special review procedures described above does not preclude deans from utilizing available, alternative procedures for addressing problems of unacceptable performance of duty ([III-29.7](#), [III-29.8](#)). On those rare occasions where a faculty member has proved unwilling or unable to benefit from developmental assistance to improve his or her performance, the administration may feel compelled to proceed against the faculty member in a disciplinary or unfitness proceeding, where the burden of proof is on the administration to show that the proposed sanction is justified. However, deans are strongly encouraged to proceed with formative and developmental plans before resorting to such measures.