

Policy on Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review of Faculty

I. Purpose of Review

All faculty members whose appointments carry either tenure or job security shall receive a formal comprehensive post-tenure review at intervals not exceeding five years, beginning from the date of their appointment with this status. The purpose of the review is to provide periodic evaluation of the performance of faculty after their achievement of tenure. Comprehensive post-tenure reviews shall be carried out through the combined efforts of a faculty review committee and the department chairperson.

II. Faculty Review Committee

A. Composition of Committee

The faculty review committee shall consist of two faculty members of the departmental APT Committee at or above the rank of the appointee, both chosen by the APT Committee Chair in consultation with the APT Committee. If two faculty members at or above the rank of the appointee are not available from the departmental APT Committee, the APT Committee Chair may seek reviewers from other departments at the University of Maryland. However, no individual chosen shall serve as a member of the review committee, if the appointee formally objects to his or her service. In cases where the appointee formally objects to one or both choices, objections shall be kept confidential and the APT Committee Chair shall make another choice to replace any individual to whom the appointee has objected. Should the appointee formally object to a second choice of the department chairperson, the impasse shall be reported to the dean, who shall select the committee member or members needed to fill the committee. The selection by the dean shall not be subject to objection by the appointee; however, the appointee may appeal the selection by the dean through the provisions of the grievance procedure (UMCP Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Grievances [II-4.00(A)]), insofar as the procedure is applicable.

B. Committee Report

The comprehensive post-tenure review shall be based primarily on the appointee's record of accomplishment in each of the three areas of (1) teaching and advisement, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity, (3) and service. The faculty review committee shall prepare and approve a written appraisal which describes the appointee's record of accomplishment during the review period.

The basis of the committee appraisal shall be documentary. Specifically, the appointee shall provide the committee with a written report, including a personal statement, a complete *curriculum vitae*, all Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) since the appointee's previous review, and syllabi for at least three courses taught by the appointee during the review period. The department chairperson shall provide the committee with teaching evaluations for all years. The committee shall receive the documents required for its

appraisal from the appointee and from the department chair by 15 September of the academic year in which the comprehensive review is carried out (hereafter "review year"). The committee shall make its approved appraisal available to the appointee no later than 1 January of the review year. The appointee shall have the right to examine the appraisal and, within 14 days of receipt of the appraisal, to append an optional statement that may indicate any disagreement with the appraisal and may add such other information as the appointee chooses (here and elsewhere "days" mean calendar days excluding Saturday, Sunday, and days on which the Campus is officially closed). The approved appraisal and any optional statement of the appointee shall be communicated to the departmental chairperson.

Final evaluations for the portions of faculty reviewed must be submitted to the College of Arts & Humanities Dean by 1 February of the review academic year.

B. Right of Appeal

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

The Dean must review 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, and meet separately with the faculty member and the administrator to discuss the evaluation. The Dean 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 1 May.

III. Criteria for Evaluation

A. General Criteria

Each comprehensive post-tenure review shall render an assessment of the faculty member's performance as outstanding, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in the three areas of (1) teaching and advisement, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity, (3) and service. The standard of performance to be applied to the appointee in the committee appraisal shall be continuous demonstration of the qualifications for appointment at the appointee's current rank (as specified in the UMCP Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty, I.A.2-4).

B. Criteria for Teaching and Advisement (Associate Professor)

1. A faculty member shall be evaluated as "outstanding" in teaching and advisement if she or he demonstrates a high level of competence in teaching and advisement (manifested by consistently high student and peer evaluations) and demonstrates a high level of competence to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research.

2. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “satisfactory” in teaching and advisement if he or she demonstrates a sufficient level of competence in teaching and demonstrates a minimal level of direction of graduate research.
3. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “unsatisfactory” in teaching and advisement if she or he demonstrates consistently poor teaching abilities and engages in little or no direction of graduate research.

C. Criteria for Research (Associate Professor)

1. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “outstanding” in research accomplishment if he or she has demonstrated continuous and significant research, scholarship, or artistic creativity in the field and demonstrates the likelihood and promise of continued productivity.
2. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “satisfactory” in research accomplishment if she or he has demonstrated occasional research, scholarship, or artistic creativity in the field and demonstrates the possibility of continued productivity.
3. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “unsatisfactory” in research accomplishment if he or she has demonstrated little or no ongoing research, scholarship, or artistic creativity in the field and demonstrates no promise for continued productivity.

D. Criteria for Service (Associate Professor)

1. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “outstanding” in service if she or he demonstrates continuous and useful service to the campus, the profession, and the community.
2. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “satisfactory” in service if he or she demonstrates minimal and useful service to the campus, the profession, and the community.
3. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “unsatisfactory” in service if she or he demonstrates little to no service to the campus, the profession, and the community.

E. Criteria for Teaching and Advisement (Professor)

1. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “outstanding” in teaching and advisement if she or he demonstrates a distinguished record of teaching (manifested by consistently high student and peer evaluations, teaching awards and recognition, etc.) and if she or he demonstrates continuous and high levels of successful direction of graduate research.

2. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “satisfactory” in teaching and advisement if he or she demonstrates a minimally successful record of teaching and if he or she demonstrates occasional direction of graduate research.
3. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “unsatisfactory” in teaching and advisement if she or he demonstrates an undistinguished record of teaching and if she or he engages in little to no direction of graduate research.

F. Criteria for Research (Professor)

1. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “outstanding” in research if she or he demonstrates the maintenance and enhancement of a national and, where appropriate, international reputation for outstanding research, scholarship or artistic creativity through the continuous and sustained production of important research and scholarship.
2. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “satisfactory” in research if he or she demonstrates the development of a national reputation for outstanding research, scholarship, or artistic creativity through the publication and/or presentation of a sufficient level of research and scholarship.
3. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “unsatisfactory” if she or he demonstrates little or no research or scholarship activity.

G. Criteria for Service (Professor)

1. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “outstanding” in service if he or she demonstrates a record of continuing of relevant and effective campus, professional, and community service.
2. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “satisfactory” in service if she or he demonstrates a record of minimal and generally effective campus, professional, and community service.
3. A faculty member shall be evaluated as “unsatisfactory” in service if he or she demonstrates a record of little or no campus, professional, and community service.

IV. Procedures

A. The Written Plan for Professional Development

Based primarily on the appraisal provided by the faculty review committee and after discussion with the appointee, the department chairperson shall prepare a written plan for the future professional development of the appointee, with due consideration given to any optional statement appended to the appraisal by the appointee. The plan shall also reflect consideration of the appointee's complete record of performance in the tenured or secure appointment. The plan shall specify specific outcomes from the comprehensive post-

tenure review, including (but not limited to) incentives for “outstanding” evaluations and possible actions in the event of “unsatisfactory” evaluations. The written plan shall be shown to the appointee and discussed with the appointee by the department chairperson no later than 15 April of the review year.

B. Appointee's Right of Response and Challenge

The appointee shall have the right to respond in writing within 14 days of being shown the plan. Should the appointee respond, the written response shall become a permanent appendix to the plan. The appointee shall also have the right to challenge any evaluation, recommendation, or omission of recommendation contained in the written plan under the provisions of the grievance procedure (UMCP Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Grievances [II-4.00 (A)]), insofar as the procedure is applicable.

C. Disposition of the Written Plan for Professional Development

Once the appointee has had the opportunity to respond to the written plan of the department chairperson and any grievance regarding elements of the plan have been resolved, a full record of the appointee's comprehensive post-tenure review, including the appointee's written report, the committee's appraisal, any appointee statement, the written plan for professional development of the chair, and any response by the appointee shall be placed in the appointee's employment file. With due consideration for any response by the appointee and any outcome of a grievance brought by the appointee, the written plan shall be implemented by the department chairperson throughout the period which intervenes prior to the appointee's next comprehensive post-tenure review.

IV. Exceptional Circumstances

In a given academic year, if an appointee is reviewed for promotion in rank or for service as chairperson, that review may substitute for a comprehensive post-tenure review. Also, an appointee may request a single one year postponement of a comprehensive post-tenure review, if the scheduled year of the review falls in the same year that the faculty member is on leave or on sabbatical from the University.

Approved, March 15, 1996

Amended, November 1, 2013