

College of Education Post-Tenure Review Policy

Approved by COE Senate on February 7, 2014
Revision approved by COE Senate on March 25, 2016

In accordance with the University Policy II-1.20(A) *On Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance* and USM Policy 19.0 II-1.19 *On the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty*, this document outlines the College of Education post-tenure review policy. Post-tenure reviews supplement other evaluative reviews including reviews for promotion and merit pay.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of post-tenure review, as stated in the campus guidelines is “to enhance professional and scholarly productivity of the tenured faculty, recognizing both meritorious performance and/or problematic situations as they may emerge.”

Types of Evaluation

All tenured faculty must be reviewed on a regular basis, as described below. Faculty members who have announced retirement or who are on leave may be exempt. Post-tenure reviews must consider teaching, research and service. The candidate’s review materials include the annual report (AR), an updated CV, an optional written statement, and other materials required by the department (e.g., a self-evaluation). In addition, the Chair should provide a description of modified duties, if relevant. Failure to submit materials for review will result in rating of “fails to meet expectations.”

“Periodic post-tenure reviews” consist of standard annual merit reviews spanning three years of productivity data. Two consecutive unsatisfactory periodic reviews (“fails to meet expectations” on the final overall rating) trigger a comprehensive review.

“Comprehensive post-tenure reviews” must occur at least once every five years for each faculty member. These reviews will occur on rotating basis such that approximately 20 percent of the faculty in each department will be reviewed each year. The Dean’s Office maintains the schedule for comprehensive reviews. Comprehensive reviews involve, at minimum, the productivity data from the past five merit reviews.

Review Procedures

Each September, the Dean’s Office sends a list of individuals for comprehensive review to each Department Chair. Chairs notify the faculty to be reviewed and the review committee.

Faculty members complete their AR and submit required review materials, as specified in Department policies.

The review committee prepares a “written appraisal” and provides categorical ratings for each component of the professorship (teaching, research and service), and an overall categorical rating. The categories for ratings include: meets expectations, does not meet expectations, and exceeds expectations. The overall rating is a holistic appraisal of the extent to which the candidate meets, does not meet, or exceeds expectations.

Faculty members review the peer appraisal and may submit an optional written response to the review committee within 14 calendar days of receiving 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 written response, if that option has been exercised” – is submitted to the Department Chair (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)). The Chair reviews the materials, provides an overall categorical rating, and a final written evaluation.

The Chair meets with each faculty member who received a *comprehensive review* to discuss the results of the review. In addition, if at least one area of a *periodic review* (i.e., scholarship, teaching, service) is rated “does not meet expectations,” the Chair meets with the faculty member. This meeting “should concentrate on the future professional development of the faculty member. The faculty member and the unit administrator shall prepare a firm written development plan, with timetable, for enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance” (UMCP Policy II-1.20(A)). The plan should include a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals, and should be signed by both the Chair and the faculty member. The Chair documents and dates the meeting outcome (e.g., development plan, modified duties); a copy is given to the faculty member and another is included in the faculty member’s personnel file. If decisions made have implications for the following year’s review, the document is included in the review materials.

The Chair submits component and overall ratings from the committee and the Chair’s final categorical rating to the Dean’s Office by April 1. The full portfolio, including any developmental plan, is made available for the Dean’s review, upon request. The Dean reviews the evaluations and discusses faculty reviews with the Chair annually.

If no appeal, notification of the outcome of the review is sent to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Review Committee

The review committee is determined by the department chair in accordance with department policy.

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

Appeal Procedures

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the final evaluation, a written appeal may be filed with the Dean by April 15.

The Dean reviews the portfolio, the peer-authored written report, the faculty member's optional written response, the Chair's final written evaluation, and the faculty member's written appeal. The Dean meets separately with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.

The Dean issues a decision on the appeal and sends notification of the completion of the review to the Office of Faculty Affairs by May 1. No further appeal can be granted.

Consequences of the Review

Positive reviews may result in promotional/leadership opportunities, nominations for awards, etc. Reviews may also be used for allocation of merit when such funds are available.

Negative reviews result in detailed development plans and, potentially, loss of sabbatical privileges.

Notice of Where Evaluation Reports are Maintained

All materials relating to the post-tenure review are maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the department and the final evaluations are also kept in the Dean's Office.