**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND MODERN LANGUAGES
POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES**

**Introduction**

This document presents the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines of the Department of English and Modern Languages at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. These guidelines are intended to assist the candidates for Post-Tenure Review in understanding the criteria by which they will be evaluated and to assist them in preparation of the Post-Tenure Review documents. These guidelines are also intended to assist the evaluators of those candidates as they assess faculty members' performance. Three areas are evaluated for Post-Tenure Review decisions: Instruction and Student Advising (Teaching), Research and Scholarship, and Service. Point assignments are provided for each area in these guidelines. Both quality and quantity of the three areas are important considerations in evaluation as are cooperation, collaboration, and collegiality, which should be integral components of all three areas.

A *comprehensive post-tenure review* of tenured faculty will be undertaken as part of the University's overall efforts to promote excellence in teaching, research and service at University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES). **This review shall be part of a larger faculty development program at UMES designed to enhance the professional advancement of the faculty as teachers, scholars and members of the academic community and to uncover impediments to faculty effectiveness, productivity and currency in professional subject matter.** To enable this review process, UMES shall commit appropriate resources not only to the process itself, but also to its accompanying faculty development programs. The *comprehensive post-tenure review* shall be a formative process for future faculty development, for enhancing the learning environment of students, and for improvements of the academic programs to which the faculty member contributes. The comprehensive review shall include an evaluation of instruction, research/scholarship and service and shall be consistent with the preservation of academic freedom. This comprehensive review process will not be substituted for UMES and University System of Maryland (USM) policies and procedures relating to promotion or to the termination of tenured faculty appointments, which are in no way amended by this policy. The *comprehensive post-tenure review* shall be conducted as a process of collegial assessment, take place at the school level and be consistent with the general principles of peer review. No procedure in this document can contradict the *USM Policy on the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty* (II-1.19) on this subject.

**Purpose**

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) of tenured faculty is intended to assure continuous improvement in the performance of the faculty as they carry out the institutional mission of teaching, research, creative work and service. The objectives of the post-tenure performance review are to
   a. Recognize and reward exemplary faculty performance.
   b. Identify and plan to improve less than satisfactory faculty performance.

**Review Process**

**1. Time of Review**

Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed once every five years. In addition, if two consecutive *department annual reviews* find that the faculty member is materially deficient, as specified by the UMES Faculty Handbook, a *comprehensive post-tenure review* shall be conducted.

Faculty members who are tenured at the time these policies are approved shall be reviewed using a "staggered" process spread over five years with one fifth of the faculty in each department being reviewed

each year. These reviews will evaluate the faculty member's performance since the last comprehensive (post tenure or promotion/tenure) review.

Each Department Chair shall maintain a record of the dates of review for that Department's Tenured Faculty members, and shall be responsible for the notification described in Section 4 below.

## 2. Standards of Review

These Post-Tenure Review Guidelines (PTRG) are based on the "UMES Post-Tenure Review Policies and Procedures" and the "Department of English and Modern Languages Promotion and Tenure Guidelines." It includes measurable criteria and expectations based on the department's mission. Standards for Exemplary and Satisfactory performance are established for each of these areas: Instruction and Student Advising, Research and Scholarship, and Service. The PTRG take into consideration, in the point allocations for each area, the relative allocation of faculty responsibilities in each of those areas. These PTRG were approved by the departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty as indicated by their signatures at the end of the document.

*The sections Professional Review Committee, Notification, Schedule of Evaluation, PTR Evaluation Timeline and Procedures are detailed in the "UMES Post-Tenure Review Policies and Procedures" and are not, therefore, repeated in this document.*

## 3. Documents to be Reviewed

The performance review focuses on the faculty member's (1) Instruction and Student Advising Performance, (2) Research and Scholarship Performance and 3) Service Performance based on the department standards.

Materials submitted to the School Performance Review Committee by the faculty member must include the following information for the time period since tenure or the last comprehensive review, with relevant documentation:

A. Current Curriculum Vitae
B. Department Chair's Annual Evaluations since tenure or last post-tenure review.
C. A narrative of fewer than 2500 words that describes the professor's philosophy of teaching, a description of courses (how they are conducted), scholarly work and service and student advising activities, as well as anything else the faculty member wants to include.
D. Instruction and Student Advising (Teaching) Performance (A list of courses taught along with an indication of team-taught courses should be included):
    a. Include selected syllabi of courses taught.
    b. Assessments from courses taught.
    c. Online courses. The candidate should have a colleague review the on-line material and write a one page summary.
    d. Candidates should include three peer class observation summaries by faculty members.
    e. Student Evaluation summaries.
E. Research and Scholarship Performance
    a. A listing of all grant proposals submitted and/or funded as Principal or co-Investigator and a summary of all grant awards including amount and a brief description of the work.
    b. A listing of publications from recognized scholarly journals and publishers, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, or performances, exhibitions and any other measures of research and scholarly productivity as applicable. The first page of articles and the title

page for an author or title and Table of Contents in the case of a contributor to a volume are to be included.
c. A listing of professional achievements relevant to the particular field.

F. Service Performance
a. A description of any collaborative efforts, both intramural and extramural.
b. A list of professional service activities including campus committees and community service.

A faculty member being reviewed is encouraged to provide any additional information that he/she believes would be relevant to this process. The SPRC members may request any supporting documentation necessary to complete the evaluation by giving 5 days' notice to the faculty being reviewed.

The School Performance Review Committee may meet with the faculty member being reviewed or other faculty member(s) in the department in order to obtain additional information. The faculty member being reviewed will be provided complete details of these meetings in sufficient time to respond with or without additional documents if necessary. The faculty member being reviewed shall have access to all written reports of the SPRC and shall have ample opportunity to formally respond to such reports, prior to the review committee's final report. The SPRC will complete the review and submit its recommendations to the Department Chair within 45 days after the receipt of the initial document from the faculty. The SPRC may, under unusual circumstances, request an extension of time from the Department Chair.

## 4. Criteria for Post-Tenure Review
The following are the criteria for review for the Department of English and Modern Languages. They are the same criteria used for Promotion and Tenure within the DEML.

The Department Review Committee will submit a written evaluation based on these quantitative scores. This evaluation will be presented to the department chair by the date indicated on the University calendar.

**Instruction and Student Advising (50 points)**
- **Exemplary: 40 points or more (80%)**
- **Satisfactory: 35-39 points (70-79%)**
- **Does not Meet Departmental Standards: fewer than 35 points (below 70%)**

Teaching, advising, and other student-related assignments should be demonstrated through a variety of activities. Documentation must be shown for each activity. Only those activities completed at UMES since the candidate's last promotion will be considered.
NOTE: Each instance of a quantifiable activity receives separate points.

Instructional Materials, Design, and Performance
| | |
|---|---|
| 5 | Effective instructional materials |
| 5 | Effective instructional design |
| 5 | Effective teaching methods |
| 5 | Effective use of instructional and class management software |
| 5 | Effective use of learning outcomes assessment |

Curriculum / Course Design and Implementation
| | |
|---|---|
| 5 | Development of a new course |
| 5 | Development of an online or hybrid version of an existing course |
| 5 | Development of significantly new materials for an existing version of a course |
| 5 | Inclusion of new or revised instructional duties |
| 5 | Development of a service-learning activity |

5        Development of a new program
Student Advising
    5        Program advisement to include catalog updates, retention and graduation
             initiatives
    5        Personal / academic/ post-graduate advisement
    5        Advisement regarding internship opportunities
    5        Advisement regarding extracurricular research and scholarly activities
    5        Writing reference letters for employment, career and postgraduate
             opportunities
Student Evaluations (average for all semesters during the evaluation period)

| Points | Mean |
|---|---|
| 10 | 3.75-4.00 |
| 9 | 3.50-3.74 |
| 8 | 3.00-3.49 |
| 7 | 2.50-2.99 |
| 6 | 2.00-2.49 |

## Research and Scholarship (35 points)
- **Exemplary: 28 points or more (80%)**
- **Satisfactory: 24.5-27 points (70-79%)**
- **Does not Meet Departmental Standards: fewer than 24.5 points (below 70%)**

Scholarship should be demonstrated through a variety of research, scholarly, and creative activities. Documentation must be shown for each activity. Only those activities completed at UMES since the candidate's last promotion will be considered. Self-published works and works published by "vanity presses" will not be considered.
NOTE: Each instance of a quantifiable activity receives separate points.

The research and scholarly activities include the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| 20 | Author of a book by a refereed press |
| 20 | Author of a creative work either published or performed |
| 15 | Editor/Co-editor of a book or a journal |
| 15 | Translation of a book |
| 5 | Associate, book review, contributing or copy editor of a book or a journal |
| 7 | Author of a refereed journal article in print or online |
| 2 | Author of a non-refereed journal article in print or online |
| 7 | Author of a refereed book chapter |
| 5 | Recipient of a fellowship awarded for scholarly accomplishment |
| 5 | Author of an externally funded research grant |
| 3 | Author of a book review in a refereed journal in print or online |
| 3 | Member of an editorial board in discipline |
| 2 | Author of a multi-media (non-print) product, such as websites, videos |
| 2-4 | Presenter of paper at professional meeting: 4 for international/national; 3 for regional; 2 for local |
| 2 | Session chair or moderator at a professional meeting |
| 2 | Panelist on session or roundtable at a professional meeting |
| 1-2 | Attendance at a professional meeting: 2 for international/national; 1 for regional/local |
| 3 | Author of an internally funded research grant |
| 5 | Author of program or accreditation materials or rejoinder |
| 5 | Author of a national certification or placement exam |
| 5 | Chair of a dissertation committee |
| 2 | Member of a dissertation committee |

2       Author of a submitted but not funded internal or external grant proposal

**Service (15 points)**
- **Exemplary: 12 points or more (80%)**
- **Satisfactory: 10.5-11 points (70-79%)**
- **Does not Meet Departmental Standards: fewer than 10.5 points (below 70%)**

Service to the department, school, and university should be shown through a variety of methods. Documentation should be shown for each aspect, illustrating the contribution by said faculty member in the respective category s/he is claiming in the dossier. No more than 5 points for each should be granted for service to the community; service should be demonstrated primarily to the University.
NOTE: Each instance of a quantifiable activity receives separate points, and service for each year receives separate points.

The service methods include the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| 10 | Officer in a national/international board or organization |
| 5 | Coordinating cross-curricular/interdisciplinary learning |
| 4-6 | Chairing a committee (department 4 , school 5, and/or University 6) |
| 3-4 | Member of a regional (3) or national board (4) in discipline |
| 3 | Mentoring colleagues |
| 3 | Advising student organization |
| 3-5 | Arranging and facilitating conference (5) and/or workshop (3) for the University |
| 3 | Arranging and facilitating intradepartmental professional development workshop |
| 3 | Contributing professional service to an organization within the school or community |
| 2 | Participating in retention and/or recruitment university initiative |
| 2 | Serving on a committee (department, school, and/or University) |
| 2 | Representing University in cooperative agreements |
| 4 | Consulting for accreditation |
| 2 | Scoring of national certification or placement exams |
| 2-4 | Coordinating a course (2) or program (4) |
| 2 | Service in community |

> *The sections Evaluation of the Dossier, Post-Tenure Review Outcomes, Recommendations, Department Chairperson and Dean Responses to a SPRC Report, Professional Development Plan, Developing the Professional Development Plan, Assessment, Assessment of Progress and Completion of a PDP, and Appeal are detailed in the "UMES Post-Tenure Review Policies and Procedures" and are not, therefore, repeated in this document. This includes **specific dates in the process**, which will be announced by the Office of Academic Affairs.*

Approved by the tenured and tenure-track DEML faculty:                    signature/date

Dr. Carole Champagne, Associate Professor _____ 10/4/16

Dr. Dean Cooledge, Associate Professor/Interim Chair _____ 10/4/16

Dr. Cynthia Cravens, Assistant Professor _____ 10/4/16

Dr. Amy Hagenrater-Gooding, Associate Professor _____ 10/4/16

Dr. David Johnson, Assistant Professor [absent]

Dr. Barbara Seabrook, Associate Professor _____

Dr. Terry Smith, Associate Professor _____ 10/4/16