UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Engineering Technology - Only

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR COMPREHENSIVE

POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. Introduction

A comprehensive post-tenure review of tenured faculty in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering Technology will be undertaken in accordance with the UMES Policies and Procedures for Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review 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 is 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. This 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 will 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. Faculty members are responsible for reviewing the UMES Policies and Procedures for Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review to be familiar with the expectations of a candidate preparing for the Post-Tenure Review process.

2. 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 satisfactory and reward exemplary faculty performance.
b. Identify and plan to improve less than satisfactory faculty performance.

3. Review Process

3.1 Time of Review

Each tenured faculty member in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering Technology shall be reviewed once every five years. In addition, if two consecutive *department annual reviews* find that a 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 the department being reviewed each year. These reviews will evaluate the faculty

member's performance since the last comprehensive post tenure or promotion and tenure review or for the past five years prior to the review.

The Department Chair shall maintain a record of the dates of review for all Tenured Faculty members, and shall be responsible for the notifying faculty when they are due for post-tenure review.

3.2 Standards of Review
The post-tenure review will be based on the Department's promotion and tenure criteria and will include measurable criteria and expectations based on the Department's mission. Standards for **Exemplary** and **Satisfactory** performance shall be established for **each** of the areas: (A) Instruction and Student Advising, (B) Research and Scholarship, and (C) Service and Contributions to University and Community.

4. Documents to be Reviewed
The performance review will focus on the faculty member's (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research/Scholarship Performance and 3) Performance in Service to the University and broader community, based on the department's standards.

Materials submitted to the School Performance Review Committee by the faculty member may include the following information for the time period since tenure, the last post-tenure comprehensive review or the last five years prior to a review, with relevant documentations:

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. 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/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 School Performance Review Committee (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

A. Instruction and Student Advising

The following criteria shall be used to review and classify faculty performance in this area as follows.

i.	**Exemplary**	**greater than 60 points**
ii.	**Satisfactory**	**between 42-60 points**
iii.	**Does not meet Department Standards**	**less than 42 points**

Candidates for the post-tenure review shall be judged and receive points from the following areas in this section. Points must be received from all areas shown.

Note: The points shown shall be the maximum points for all qualifying activities in each Criterion.

(a). Student Evaluations

Based on the student evaluation of instruction form, an arithmetic mean of the Overall Rating Average for all classes taught will determine the number of points awarded for this criterion:

Average	Points
3.75– 4.00	20
3.50– 3.74	18
3.00– 3.49	16
2.50– 2.99	14
2.00– 2.49	12

(b). Instruction and Course Content

Note: The points shown shall be the maximum points for all qualifying activities in each Criterion.

Examples of Activities for which credit should be given may include but are not limited to the following;

Criteria	Points
Comprehensive course syllabi	5
Pre-assignments, grading and timely return of assignments back to students	5
Use of Technology for Instruction	5
Library & Internet related assignments	3
Computer based assignments	3
Team building activities	3
Real-world cases and handouts	3
Course Assessments	3
Online Course Reviews	3
Peer reviews (Three Class Observations by Faculty)	3
Outside/special assignments	3
Involvement with students in and out of the classroom	3
Writing across the curriculum	3
Global perspective's	3
Diversity issues	3
Ethics	3
Term Papers (assigned papers on a relevant course topic/area)	2
Field Trips	2

(c). Student Advising

Note: The points shown shall be the maximum points for all qualifying activities in each Criterion.

Program Advisement	6
Professional/Personal Development Advisement	2
Career Advisement	2
Administrative Advising including degree audits, transfer credit evaluations and course substitutions	2

(d). Curriculum/Course Design, and Implementation

Note: The points shown shall be the maximum points for all qualifying activities in each Criterion.

Criteria	Points
New curriculum and program design	5
Special teaching projects	2
Team teaching	3
Innovative teaching strategies	5
Use of Computer Aided Instruction/Software Applications	3
Learning outcomes assessment techniques	5
Participation in instructional development workshops	2

B. Research and Scholarship

The following criteria shall be used to review and classify faculty performance in this area as follows.

i.	**Exemplary**	**greater than 30 points**
ii.	**Satisfactory**	**between 21-30 points**
iii.	**Does not meet Department Standards**	**less than 21 points**

Candidates for the post-tenure review shall be judged and receive points from the following areas in this section.

Note: The points shown shall be the maximum points for all qualifying activities in each Criterion.

Scholarly Activity	Points
Peer reviewed journal publications	8
Peer reviewed proceedings publications	5
Non-peer reviewed publications	2
Presentations at local or state scholarly meetings	2
Presentations at national or international scholarly meetings	3
Funded proposal (PI/co-PI, state/federal, >=$10k)	5
Funded proposal (PI/co-PI, state/federal, <$10k)	3
Funded proposal (PI/co-PI, internal, >=$5k)	2
New Teaching/Research proposal submission	2
Author of a book, patents and/or copyrights	10
Outstanding and/or significant research discovery	10
Chapter in book	3
Invited paper/speaker	5
Research awards	3
Editor of a newsletter	2

Journal/proceeding paper reviewer	2
Research grant reviewer	1
Articles in newsletters, bulletins, fact sheets, trade journals and magazines	2
Editor of a book or peer reviewed journal	5
Professional achievement (certification/maintenance, license/maintenance)	3
Attendance/Participation in Professional Development Workshops and Webinars	1

C. Service and Contributions to University and Community

The following criteria shall be used to review and classify faculty performance in this area as follows.

i.	**Exemplary**	**greater than 10 points**
ii.	**Satisfactory**	**between 7-10 points**
iii.	**Does not meet Department Standards**	**less than 7 points**

Candidates for the post-tenure review shall be judged and receive points from the following areas in this section.

Note: The points shown shall be the maximum points for all qualifying activities in each Criterion.

Activity	Points
Chairing departmental, school, and or University committees	3
Member in departmental, school, and or University committees	2
Leadership positions in academic and professional organizations (Board Member)	4
Obtaining external funding for the support of research or instructional activities	5
Advisor for student organization	2
Developing and maintaining relationships with the business community	2
Providing continuing education relative to the candidate's teaching and research areas	2
Serving as session chairperson, discussant, or panel member	2
Establishing and maintaining collaborative programs with school systems and other higher education institutions	4
Consulting (Free) for business/economic development	2
Community involvement requiring expertise in candidate's teaching and research areas	2
Contributions to extra-curricular and Community Service activities	2
Organizer of conferences and Professional Development workshops	2
Development of new programs or courses	5
Lectures to community groups	2
Keynote speaker	2
Radio and TV presentations and contributions to Newspaper/School Newsletters	1
Regional and/or State wide taskforce assignments	3
Participation on Industry/School/Business Advisory Boards	2
Serve on Community/State/Regional Professional Organization Taskforce	2

5. **Professional Development Plan**

   When a faculty member is judged **Does Not Meet Departmental Standards**, the faculty member must address each deficiency and establish a Professional Development Plan (PDP) in consultation with the Department Chairperson in accordance with the recommendations of the School Performance Review Committee (SPRC) and the UMES Policies and Procedures for Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review.

6. **Preparation of the Post-Tenure Dossier**

   The Dossier must be assembled in a permanent binder, the number of volumes limited to two and the thickness of each dossier volume limited to 2" thick prior to binding. Divide each section with clear plastic tabs. Use consistent fonts throughout the document. If an Appendix is included, it should contain clean copies of materials including certificates and reference letters.

   Two copies of the Dossier packet must be submitted to the Chair of the Department for the School Performance Review Committee (SPRC).

Approved by:		Date
Dr. Arumala	*(signature)*	5/3/2016
Dr. Fotouhi	*(signature)*	5/5/2016
Dr. Love	*(signature)*	5/3/2016
Dr. Loveland	*(signature)*	5/6/2016
Dr. Molavi	*(signature)*	5/3/2016
Dr. Salgado	Abstained from signing	
Dr. Yilmaz	Abstained from signing	