

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CURRENT POST-TENURE FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

In 1995, the University adopted Policy II-1.20(A) on the [Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance](#), to facilitate the continued professional development of tenured faculty members. This policy was revised in 1998 in accordance with the requirements of the USM [Policy on the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty](#) (19.0 II-1.19). The purpose of comprehensive “post-tenure” review is to enhance the professional and scholarly productivity of the tenured faculty, recognizing both meritorious performance and/or problematic situations as they may emerge. Such “post-tenure” reviews supplement other periodic evaluative reviews, such as annual merit reviews. The present guidelines have been developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs to facilitate compliance with and implementation of the USM/UMCP policies and the [Provost’s memorandum](#) dated September 18, 2013. Evaluative procedures for post-tenure review must be adopted by and incorporated into unit plans of organization (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)). **In accordance with the Provost’s mandate, copies of plans of organization must be filed with the Dean’s office and the Office of Faculty Affairs by November 1, 2013.**

Frequency of evaluations:

“Comprehensive post-tenure reviews” of each tenured faculty member must occur no less frequently than every 5 years (USM Policy 19.0 II-1.19.5). Units can stagger comprehensive reviews so that all reviews do not coincide in the same year. Faculty with longer service since their last tenure or promotion review should be reviewed first.

“Periodic reviews” may consist of standard merit reviews (normally spanning 3 years of data) or any other relevant evaluative review leading to contract renewal. Units may determine the frequency of such “periodic” reviews, to conduct them either annually or bi-annually.

In addition to every 5 years, “two consecutive [periodic] reviews that indicate that a faculty member is materially deficient in meeting expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review” (USM Policy 19.0 II-1.19.5).

Required Elements of Post-Tenure Comprehensive Review Procedures:

Description of Timeline for Evaluations

No less frequently than every 5 years, or if two consecutive periodic reviews indicate that the faculty member does not meet expectations.

The procedures must also state how sabbatical and other leaves may impact the schedule.

Who Conducts the Review

The review should be conducted “consistent with the general principles of peer review” (USM Policy 19.0 II-1.19.3).

The composition of the faculty committee conducting the review should be set forth in the unit’s plan of organization.

Description of the Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Portfolio

At minimum, the portfolio should include:

- ³⁵₁₇ a personal statement from the faculty member,
- ³⁵₁₇ factual information in Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) reports and CV,
- ³⁵₁₇ teaching evaluations, and
- ³⁵₁₇ materials from all periodic reviews since the last comprehensive review.

Criteria for Outstanding, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory performance

To be determined by each unit.

Incentives for Outstanding Performance Ratings

For example: initiation of promotional opportunities, nominations for internal and external awards, and other forms of distinction.

Notice of Possible Actions to be Taken Following Unsatisfactory Performance Ratings

For example: detailed outcomes plan with required deliverables and due dates, loss of sabbatical privilege.

Description of Evaluative Report

A written “peer appraisal” report (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)) and overall categorical rating, such as outstanding, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, are recommended.

Description of the Process and Timeframes

- Portfolio of materials is submitted to peer review committee.
- Peer review committee submits peer-authored written report to faculty member.
- Faculty member submits optional written “response to the review committee within 14 calendar days of receipt of the appraisal” (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)).
- The “portfolio - consisting, at the minimum, of the faculty member's written report, the review committee's appraisal, and the faculty member's response, if that option has been exercised - shall be submitted to the unit administrator” (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)).
- Faculty member meets with Chair [Dean in non-departmentalized colleges] to discuss final evaluation (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)).
- If deemed appropriate by the Chair [Dean in non-departmentalized colleges], faculty member and administrator discuss and agree on a “firm written development plan, with timetable, for enhancing meritorious work” and a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)). Development/outcomes plan must be summarized in a written report signed by both the faculty member and the administrator.
- Chair [Dean in non-departmentalized colleges] issues final evaluation.
- The final evaluation and development/outcomes plan should be forwarded to the Dean’s office [Provost’s office for non-departmentalized colleges] by

February 1. The portfolio is made available for the Dean's [Provost's] review, upon request.

- Notification of the outcome of the review should be sent to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the Dean by May 1.

Appeal Procedures

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the final evaluation, a written appeal may be filed with the Dean [Provost, for non-departmentalized colleges] by February 15.

The Dean [Provost] must review the portfolio, the peer-authored written report, the faculty member's optional written response, the Chair's [Dean's] final written evaluation, and the faculty member's written appeal, and meet separately with the faculty member and the administrator to discuss the evaluation.

The Dean [Provost] should issue a decision on the appeal by April 15. No further appeal can be granted.

Following completion of the appeal, if any, a notification of completion of the review should be sent to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the Dean by May 1.

Notice of Where Evaluation Reports are Maintained

All materials relating to the comprehensive post-tenure review are maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the department. The Dean's office [Provost's office for non-departmentalized colleges] keeps the reports.