

## UMES POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR COMPREHENSIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW

### Introduction

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**

Each Department shall develop a faculty-approved Post Tenure Review (PTR) Document based on the Department's promotion and tenure criteria that 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: (1) Teaching, (2) Research/Scholarship, and (3) Service to the University and the broader community. The PTR should take the relative allocation of faculty responsibilities in each of these areas into account.

The PTR Document should be approved by the departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty. The Dean shall forward the PTR Documents for each department to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs along with verification that the standards have been approved by the tenured departmental faculty. At the beginning of each fall semester, the PTR Document shall be distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Departments shall review their standards at least once every five years and follow the process for approval as set forth above. Faculty shall be reviewed according to the PTR Document that was in place in the first year of their five-year PTR cycle.

## **3. Professional Review Committee**

A standing five-member Post-Tenure Review School Professional Review Committee (SPRC) shall be constituted in each School. Three of the members of the committee shall be selected by vote of the tenured faculty in the School and the remaining two members will be chosen from names submitted by the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member being reviewed shall submit the names of three tenured faculty members from his or her department to the Department Chair. The Chairperson shall select and submit two of those names to the Dean to serve on the SPRC. Faculty may serve on multiple SPRC committees. Tenured faculty in all departments in a School shall constitute the pool eligible to serve as members of the SPRC. The Office of the Dean shall verify annually the eligibility of all committee members and maintain records of the members of the School-wide SPRCs. From this pool, three faculty members shall be selected to serve on the five-member SPRC in accordance with the selection process and term of service agreed upon by the tenured faculty in the departments in the School. All three members of the standing committee shall come from different departments. The selection process shall provide for the replacement of a SPRC member in the event of illness or separation from the University. The three standing committee members shall select a chairperson of the SPRC. Administrative tenured faculty (chairs and deans) are ineligible to serve on a SPRC.

## **4. Notification**

Each Faculty Member must be given notice of a pending review no later than the first business day of April of the academic year prior to the academic year of review. The Provost shall notify the Dean of faculty members who are scheduled for PTR in accordance with the five-year cycle. The Dean shall then notify the Department Chairperson of the

faculty in the department who are scheduled for review. The Department Chairperson shall notify the faculty member(s) in writing that a PTR will be conducted. The notification letter should include the copy of the Department's PTR Document.

## **5. Schedule of Evaluation**

In accordance with USM and UMES policies, faculty shall undergo PTR every five years following the awarding of tenure. A successful review for promotion, after a faculty member receives tenure, satisfies the requirements for the faculty member's PTR. If the faculty has an unsuccessful review for promotion, that faculty member shall undergo a PTR the next academic year. Similarly, a faculty member who establishes a Professional Development Plan (PDP) following a PTR shall undergo his/her next PTR five years after satisfactorily completing his/her Professional Development Plan. The five year counting process shall be put on hold 1) while a faculty member is on an official leave of absence, or 2) while a faculty member serves in administration. The post-tenure review clock will resume when the leave or administrative appointment ends.

When necessary, a faculty member may make a written request to the Dean with a copy to the Chairperson for a delay of his/her PTR up to one year.

Review of a faculty member with a joint appointment shall be conducted in the primary department where the faculty member's tenure was granted with input from other departments in which the faculty member holds a joint appointment.

Faculty who have submitted to their Department Chairperson and Dean a certified letter of irrevocable intent to retire and/or resign, effective within one year of their scheduled PTR, may elect not to undergo a PTR.

## **6. PTR Evaluation Timeline and Procedures**

The calendar for PTR evaluation procedures shall be as follows:

<b>Dates</b>	<b>Evaluation Procedures</b>
First Department meeting in the Fall	Department Chairperson shall distribute the department Post-Tenure Review Document to all tenured and tenure-track faculty
Last Friday in February of the prior academic year	The Provost shall notify the Dean of faculty members who are scheduled for Post-Tenure Review in accordance with the five-year cycle.
By March 15 <sup>th</sup>	The Dean shall notify the Department Chairperson of faculty in the department who are scheduled for review.

April 1	The Department Chairperson shall notify the faculty member in writing that a performance review will be conducted. The notification letter should include a copy of the Department's PTR Document.
September 30	The Dean will call a meeting of the tenured faculty who will select three tenured faculty to serve on the School Performance Review Committee (SPRC). The Department Chairperson shall select two members from the three tenured faculty named by the faculty member being reviewed to serve on the SPRC.
Last Friday in October	The faculty member being reviewed shall submit his/her Dossier in accordance with the department standards to the Department Chairperson.
Last Friday in November	The Department Chairperson or academic unit head will forward the Dossier to the Dean. The Dean will forward the Dossier to the SPRC and charge the SPRC to begin review.
January 15 <sup>th</sup>	The SPRC will submit its report to the Department Chairperson or academic unit head and the faculty member being reviewed.
Within 7 days after receiving the SPRC report	The faculty member being reviewed may respond in writing to the SPRC Report with copies to the SPRC and the Department Chairperson.

February 1 <sup>st</sup>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department Chairperson shall write a letter to the faculty member indicating his/her response to the SPRC findings.</li> <li>2. The Chairperson will forward a copy of the SPRC's Report to the Dean along with the Chair's response, a copy of the PTR Document, and any response from the faculty member. The faculty member's Dossier will be forwarded to the Dean if applicable.</li> </ol>
March 1 <sup>st</sup>	The Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson indicating his/her response to the SPRC's findings.
Within 7 days after receiving the Dean's response	The faculty member being reviewed may respond to the SPRC Report, the Chairperson's Response and the Dean's letter in writing to the Dean.
April 1 <sup>st</sup>	The Dean will notify the faculty member by letter of the Post-Tenure Review decision.

## **7. Documents to be Reviewed**

The performance review focuses on the faculty member's (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research/Scholarship Performance and 3) Service to the University and broader community, based on the department standards.

Materials submitted to the School Performance Review Committee by the faculty member may 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. 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 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.

## **8. Evaluation of the Dossier**

Upon receiving a Dossier, the Dean shall forward it to the Chairperson of the SPRC who will convene the SPRC.

The SPRC shall render a judgment of **Exemplary**, **Satisfactory** or **Does Not Meet Departmental Standards** in each of the three faculty areas of responsibility. Considerable justification must be given if findings of the Post Tenure Review differ substantially from the findings of the four most recent annual reviews.

Additionally, the review is to provide informed and candid feedback to the faculty member concerning the quality of his/her contributions, as well as any weaknesses or deficiencies in performance, along with constructive recommendations. If the faculty member has received a judgment of Does Not Meet Departmental Standards in any single component, recommendations for the Professional Development Plan (PDP) must be included in the report. The SPRC, after reaching its decisions, shall collectively draft its findings. The Chairperson of the SPRC shall write a finished version of the committee's report and circulate it to committee members for agreement and/or suggested changes. The finalized report shall be signed by each of the three committee members. By January 15<sup>th</sup> the Chairperson of the SPRC shall, on the same day, give the report to the faculty member and a copy to the Department Chairperson.

In keeping with standard practice, post-tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels and the Department Chair or academic unit head must consult with the SPRC.

## **9. Post-Tenure Review Outcomes**

The Performance Review shall result in one of three possible assessments in each area: Exemplary, Satisfactory, or Does Not Meet Departmental Standards. An assessment of Exemplary or Satisfactory in all three areas (teaching, research/scholarship, service) concludes the faculty member's PTR for the current five-year cycle. An assessment of Does Not Meet Departmental Standards in one or more areas shall result in the faculty member having to address the deficiencies. The assessments are outlined as follows:

### **1. Exemplary (Exceeds Departmental Standards)**

Based on the departmental standards the faculty may be judged exemplary in teaching, research/scholarship and/or service to the University and greater community. An assessment of Exemplary in all three areas concludes the PTR process for the five-year cycle.

All faculty members whose performance is judged Exemplary must receive:

- A letter of Commendation from the Provost's Office
- Recognition in the local newspapers and the campus newsletter, the KEY
- Recognition at the Honor's Day Convocation (names submitted by the Provost's Office) with a University lapel pin and a plaque.

## **2. Satisfactory (Meets Departmental Standards)**

Based on the departmental standards the faculty may be judged satisfactory in teaching, research/scholarship and/or service to the University and greater community. A faculty member who is judged Satisfactory will receive a letter from the Provost with copies to the Dean and Chairperson. An assessment of Satisfactory in all three areas concludes the PTR process for the five-year cycle.

## **3. Does Not Meet Departmental Standards**

A faculty member who is **not** judged Exemplary or Satisfactory does not meet the standards of the department and must develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP). A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty members assigned duties. The recommendations for the PDP shall be included in the report. The SPRC will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson.

The Administration shall review the rank and salary of each faculty member who undergoes the five year review and shall make upward adjustments and recommendations as necessary and as funds allow.

## **10. Recommendations**

The faculty member may challenge the assessment of the SPRC by sending written notice to the Department Chair within 7 days after receiving the committee's assessment. The faculty member must include the reasons for disagreeing with the assessment and may attach additional supporting documentation and send these to the Department Chair. After a careful review of the information presented by the faculty member, the Department Chair shall submit his/her recommendation supporting or rejecting the departmental review committee's assessment to the Dean of the School with a copy to the faculty member.

If both the Department Chair and the School Performance Review Committee determine the faculty member does not meet departmental standards, the faculty member will work

with the Department Chair and the Dean to develop a Specific Development Plan for improvement, using as a basis the evaluation provided by the SPRC.

The outcome of this review must be treated as confidential.

#### **11. Department Chairperson and Dean Responses to a SPRC Report**

Post-Tenure Review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. The Department Chairperson shall write a letter to the faculty member indicating his/her response to the SPRC's findings. The Chairperson will forward a copy of his/her response and the SPRC's Report to the Dean along with a copy of the departmental standards, and any response from the faculty member. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory review, the Chairperson will forward the faculty member's Dossier.

The Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson indicating his/her response to the SPRC's findings. The letter should include a copy of the SPRC report and any correspondence between the faculty member being reviewed, the Department Chairperson and members of the SPRC. When the Department Chairperson or the Dean disagrees with the SPRC report, he/she must consult with the SPRC. The consultation with the SPRC shall be done with all five SPRC members present and the department standards must frame the discussion. The Chairperson or the Dean may ask the SPRC to reconsider its findings when the Chairperson or the Dean believes the SPRC has misapplied a department standard or provides evidence that the faculty member's Dossier upon which the SPRC based its report, contains inaccurate information.

#### **12. Professional Development Plan**

When the faculty member is judged **Does Not Meet Departmental Standards**, the faculty member must address each deficiency and establish a Professional Development (PDP) in consultation with the Department Chairperson in accordance with the recommendations of the SPRC. If duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, then the development plan should so indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities. The PDP should be formulated within 30 days of the faculty member's receiving the SPRC report and shall be designed for completion within a three-year period.

The mutually acceptable Professional Development Plan should outline the steps the faculty member and the Department will together take to help the faculty member meet departmental standards. The plan must include adequate resource commitment by the Department, School and Institution to provide the resources necessary (such as release time, travel to professional meetings, and seed money for research) to the faculty member to complete the steps outlined in the plan.

#### **13. Developing the Professional Development Plan**

The Department standards for Satisfactory Teaching, Research/Scholarship and Service shall form the basis for the PDP criteria. Although each PDP is tailored to individual circumstances, the PDP will:

- Identify specific strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance



- Define specific measurable and objective goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies.
- Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes.
- Set appropriate time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes.
- Indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member could monitor progress
- Identify institutional resources to support the PDP
- Outline a clear statement of consequences should improvements not occur within designated time.

When the Department Chairperson and the faculty member have developed a PDP, the Department Chairperson shall submit the PDP, to the Dean. When the Dean accepts the PDP, the faculty member, and the Department Chairperson are so informed in writing by the Dean, who also forwards a copy to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Failure of the faculty member and the Department Chairperson to reach an agreement on a PDP shall necessitate mediation by the Dean. When the PDP is accepted, the faculty must comply with the PDP. When the PDP is rejected, the Department Chairperson and the faculty member must revise the PDP and submit it to the Dean.

#### **14. Assessment**

A PDP requires periodic assessment. This assessment must include accomplishments relative to:

- the measurable and objective goals and outcomes
- activities to be undertaken
- timelines for accomplishment of activities and achievement of outcomes
- criteria by which the faculty member can monitor progress; and
- institutional resources that will support the PDP including mentoring peers.

#### **15. Assessment of Progress and Completion of a PDP**

The faculty member and the Department Chairperson shall meet semiannually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying the identified deficiencies. The second meeting of the year shall determine whether the annual progress on the PDP is acceptable. The Department Chairperson will forward the PDP progress report to the Dean at the end of the academic year.

If the Dean does not agree with the annual assessment of the Department Chairperson, the Dean shall notify the Chairperson and the faculty member in writing within 14 days and shall initiate a consultation with the Department Chairperson and the faculty member.

In the last year, the faculty member and the Department Chairperson shall meet by the last Friday in February. The final meeting and report may come earlier if the faculty member is ahead of schedule in completing his/her PDP. When the Department Chairperson concludes that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Department Chairperson shall

make a final report to the Dean and send a copy to the faculty member. When the Dean accepts the report, the faculty member and the Department Chairperson are so informed, by the first Friday in March, and a copy is forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This ends the PDP assessment process. The PDP is a cumulative review and the faculty member's next PTR evaluation shall come five years after this cumulative review.

When the Dean disagrees that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Dean shall initiate a consultation with the Department Chairperson and the faculty member.

When the conclusion of the meeting is that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member with copies to the Department Chairperson, the SPRC and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This ends the PDP assessment process. The PDP is a cumulative review and the faculty member's next PTR evaluation shall come five years after this cumulative review.

When the outcome of the vote is that the faculty member has not satisfied the objectives of his/her PDP, the Dean's letter to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the faculty member shall recommend an appropriate action. **Any action shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in the UMES Faculty Handbook.** The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall, by the third Friday in May, write a letter to the Dean supporting his/her recommended action or replacing it with an alternative action. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall send a copy of his/her letter to the faculty member, the Department Chairperson, and the Dean. The faculty member may appeal the action. (See the **Appeal** Section).

## 16. Appeal

If the faculty member believes the post tenure review process and resulting actions have been unjustly or arbitrarily applied, within five days after receiving a written notice of the penalty, he/she may request, in writing, a private conference with the Dean. This request shall be granted, and the conference held forthwith, within five days after receipt of the request, if possible.

Within five days after the conference, the Dean shall give the faculty member a written statement of whether the original decision remains in effect. Within five days after receiving notice that the original decision remains in effect, the faculty member may in writing request a conference with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This request shall be granted, and the conference held forthwith, within five days after receipt of the request, if possible.

Within ten days of this conference, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall send a written evaluation of the matter to the faculty member, the Dean and the Department Chairperson. The evaluation may be in the form of a concurrence with the decision; an expression of disagreement with the decision, with or without supporting

reasons; or a recommendation for reconsidering the decision, with or without suggestions for specific procedures in doing so.

Within five days of receiving an evaluation from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs that disagrees with the decision or recommends its reconsideration, the Dean shall give the faculty member and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs a response in writing.

For a grievance pertaining to this process **prior to imposition of other actions**, the full faculty grievance process becomes operative as prescribed in the UMES Faculty Handbook.

This policy was approved by the Faculty Assembly on January 13, 2015.