

Review, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Procedures

Faculty members are reviewed in accordance with the provisions of the University of Maine System and the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System contract. Reviews are conducted annually for non-tenured faculty (both tenure track and non-tenure track), and every four years for faculty members with tenure.

The following guidelines pertain to the peer review process for all faculty members in the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD), and are designed to reduce the paperwork burden on new faculty, as well as to align the peer review process more closely with administrative and University review procedures.

1. OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCESS

Dates and timelines for the review of the faculty member are based on the AFUM contract. In addition to what is listed below, faculty members may submit additional supporting materials detailing information about scholarship, teaching, and service that they believe is relevant. All review materials must be submitted electronically in a PDF or Doc format and in paper copy where required by the Provost's Office.

The Peer Committee will also review the signed written comments by students that are included in the faculty member's personnel file in the Dean's Office. The Peer Committee may ask the faculty member for clarification or additional review materials if necessary. If the Peer Committee believes it to be necessary, it may, with the faculty member's permission, request additional information, including external reviews.

New faculty members will be invited to meet with the Chair and/or representatives of the Peer Committee in their home Department or School in early Fall of their first year. The purpose of this meeting is to explain and clarify the review process as necessary and to answer questions the faculty member may have regarding the process. This meeting will focus on questions about continuing contracts, promotion, and tenure (for those on a tenure-track). New faculty will have the opportunity to review sample dossiers that provide a sense of how to organize materials for their annual reviews.

1.1 Tenure Track Faculty

First Year. Currently, the first review for all new tenure track faculty members takes place in January. New faculty members must submit the following documents. Additional detail on the formatting and content of these documents is included in Section 3.2:

1. a one- to two-page cover letter that summarizes their plans for the following year. This letter should specifically describe plans for a programmatic research agenda, as well as anticipated teaching, and current and anticipated service;
2. an up-to-date CV with peer-reviewed presentations and publications marked with an asterisk (*);
3. teaching evaluations from the Fall semester if available, which may also be submitted in January when they become available;
4. texts of any manuscripts submitted, in press, or published since their hire at UMaine; and

5. any additional forms or material required by the University or University System.

Second Year. The second review for tenure track faculty members currently takes place during October of their second year at the University of Maine. Faculty members are expected to submit the following documentation:

1. a one- to two-page cover letter in which they reflect upon the work that they have completed during their first year at the University of Maine and any adjustments to their plans moving forward;
2. an up-to-date CV with peer-reviewed presentations and publications marked with an asterisk (*);
3. a one-page summary of numerical teaching evaluations based upon the format denoted in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines;
4. texts of manuscripts submitted, in press, or published since their prior review;
5. any additional forms or material required by the University or University System.

Third Year. A major review of tenure track faculty takes place during the spring of their third year at the University of Maine. This third-year review is intended to be comprehensive. The submission should be a complete electronic copy of the University's official tenure and promotion document in the standardized format required by the University of Maine System. Faculty members are expected to submit the following materials:

1. a one- to two-page cover letter in which they reflect upon the work that they have completed during their first two and a half years at the University of Maine;
2. an up-to-date CV with peer-reviewed presentations and publications marked with an asterisk (*);
3. a summary of numerical teaching evaluations based upon the format denoted in the University's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*; and
4. texts of accepted publications and those under review.

The Peer Committee review will indicate the degree to which, and whether or not the faculty member appears to be making satisfactory progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion. The written review from the Peer Committee will be detailed, comparable to the letter written during a promotion and tenure review. The candidate will also have a meeting with the Dean after the pre-tenure review to discuss her or his progress and performance to date.

Fourth and Fifth Years. In the fourth and fifth years, tenure-track faculty members will undergo additional reviews, submitting their materials following the same format they have used for the third-year annual reviews.

Sixth Year. Review for promotion to Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure is conducted in the Fall of the sixth year. See the detailed process described under Promotion to Associate Professor (Section 6) below.

1.2. Review Process for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

First - Sixth Year. First through sixth year reviews for all non-tenure track faculty (fixed-length and lecturers) takes place in January. New and returning non-tenure track faculty members must submit the following materials:

1. a one- to two-page cover letter and relevant supporting materials detailing information about their teaching and service plans and updated job description;
2. an up-to-date CV with peer-reviewed presentations and publications marked with an asterisk (*);
3. teaching evaluations from the Fall semester if available, which may also be submitted in January when they become available; and for those returning, their previous Spring semester teaching evaluations; and
4. any additional forms or material required by the University or University of Maine System.

Optional

Texts of any manuscripts submitted, in press, or published since their hire at the University of Maine and professional presentations are not typically required of lecturers and are therefore not factored into the formal review process.

In some cases, this may be the first year of a new contract where the faculty member had a similar contract for the previous year. In such situations, the faculty member should address the previous 12 months and include related supporting material (e.g., teaching evaluations from the prior spring or summer terms).

2. PRINCIPLES AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

There are three broad principles that guide the review of all faculty members in the COEHD:

- Faculty review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure decisions should be based on and tied to the Mission of the COEHD and University. The University of Maine is both a Land/Sea Grant and research-intensive institution, and both of these facts are core to our Mission.
- There is no single definition of scholarship or professional activity, and it is clear that definitions and understandings of research and scholarship can vary extensively by discipline. Thus, the scholarly and research productivity of faculty members must be evaluated within their specific disciplines, as well as in the academic context of broader national and international academic institutions and criteria.
- The professional activity of faculty members occurs in several domains, including teaching, advising, scholarship, and service. Of these domains, teaching and scholarship are typically the most important and time intensive. The balance of professional activity will vary according to the faculty member's contract and assignment, and should be evaluated accordingly.

Furthermore, the teaching, scholarship, and service of faculty members can be evaluated relative to five core attributes. These attributes are intended to guide peer reviews in a very general manner and to allow for the diversity of contributions that characterize the variety of disciplines represented by faculty members in the COEHD. More detailed performance criteria, which are elaborated in the following sections, illustrate the typical applications of these core attributes. The five core attributes are as follows:

1. the level of discipline-related expertise and competence required and demonstrated by the activity;
2. the degree of creativity and innovation demonstrated by the activity;
3. the role and extent of peer review in the activity;
4. the impact on constituencies and communities directly affected by the activity; and
5. the extent or degree of the faculty member's effort.

3. ADDITIONAL DETAIL ON REVIEW PROCEDURES AND REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

Each Fall semester, faculty members under review will receive a letter from their Department or School office indicating their review status for that year, which will include a description of the materials required and the deadlines for their submission. The faculty member will assemble her or his materials and submit them electronically to the Department Chair or School Director's office. The materials will then be shared with the Peer Committee for review by the announced deadline, following the format stipulated by the University and Peer Committee. Materials should outline the faculty member's appointment/job description and provide other information that clarifies the faculty member's activities during the period under review in the core areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. Faculty with more narrow job descriptions (e.g., teaching full-time), are not required to address areas outside of those identified in their job description but can include such material if they desire.

3.1 Period of Review

The period under review typically entails the time since the last review. Reviews for tenure are typically limited to the previous five years unless a probationary period extension has been granted in accordance with the AFUM contract. Reviews for promotion to Full Professor typically encompass the faculty member's entire career.

In the area of teaching, the period of review includes only the semesters completed since the last review, although reference to a prior year can be included for context or follow-up. Suggestions regarding the faculty members progress toward promotion and/or tenure will be provided as appropriate and as a normal part of the mentoring and peer review process.

3.2 Documentation Included in the Review Process.

Performance reviews are commensurate with a faculty member's appointment but typically include documentation of contributions to teaching, advising, research and scholarship, and service. The materials required for each area are summarized in Section 1, with additional detail provided below, as well as in the University's guidelines for the preparation of papers for promotion and tenure, available from the Office of Human Resources. In addition, the following material should be provided:

1. A cover letter to the committee. The letter should clearly state the nature of the faculty member's appointment, what the faculty member teaches and how often, whether the faculty member is engaged to a significant extent in programmatic or administrative matters. It should also address how many students the faculty member routinely advises,

the faculty member's research agenda and related activities, and an indication of the faculty member's service to the Department, School, College, University, state, and/or profession. It should be abundantly clear to anyone reading this letter, both within and outside of the COEHD, just what the faculty member does and what they understand as important or noteworthy. This letter will be read by the Peer Committee and is likely to be important at each of the other levels of review.

2. An up-to-date CV. On the CV, peer-reviewed presentations and publications should be marked with an asterisk (*). The CV must include complete citations, including all authors, titles, dates, page numbers for all publications. It must also cover the faculty member's complete professional career, not just the review period.
3. A summary of numerical teaching evaluations using the format denoted in the University's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*. This summary must cover the period since the most recent review for non-promotional reviews, and the period since appointment to one's current rank for promotion reviews.
4. Full texts of accepted publications as well as those under review (not just the abstract or a description). This must cover the period since the most recent review for non-promotional reviews, and the period since appointment to one's current rank for promotion reviews.
5. Any additional documents required by the School, University, or University System. Faculty members are encouraged, but not required to use the University's Tenure and Promotion document beginning no later than their third-year review.

Note that the University of Maine System, the University of Maine, or the College of Education and Human Development policies and procedures may change over time, and all dates, formats, and specific requirements are subject to change.

3.3 Option to Meet with the Peer Committee and Respond to Review

Any faculty member may request a meeting with the Peer Committee during the review process. The faculty member may also write a letter in response to the Peer Committee's recommendations, that will be sent forward with those materials and recommendations.

4. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The professional activity of faculty occurs in several domains, including teaching, advising, scholarship, and service. Of these domains, teaching and scholarship are typically the most important and time intensive. The balance of professional activity will vary according to the faculty member's contract and assignment, and will be evaluated accordingly.

4.1. Research and Scholarship

Faculty members differ with regard to specialty area within the discipline, the types of scholarship emphasized, investment in service and engagement, and the balance created between research and practice. The College of Education and Human Development seeks to recognize and build on these strengths, and to honor differentiated practices. The review of scholarship should reflect differentiated strengths while acknowledging that teaching, scholarship, and service are connected. While this process is complex, often abstract and difficult to quantify, it is essential to provide faculty members with guidelines to help develop productive and gratifying

careers. The guidelines are intended to be practical and flexible enough to promote individual differences within all faculty members.

Scholarly contributions must include peer-reviewed publications. These can be in a variety of venues. The ways faculty members utilize research and scholarship to contribute to their fields and profession include, but are not limited to, the following:

- publications in refereed, high quality (i.e., non-predatory) national or international journals;
- invited or peer-reviewed book chapters;
- invited talks at national or international conferences;
- scholarly books;
- published conference proceedings;
- monographs;
- curricular material distributed by a national publisher;
- grant applications; and
- conference presentations.

The review of scholarly activity in and among these domains is based on the attributes described in Section 2. Additional detail regarding expectations for these various forms of scholarship in relation to promotion and tenure is provided in Section 6.

4.2. Teaching

Teaching is of major importance to the COEHD and the University. Faculty should strive to serve as model educators for students and colleagues. Although exemplary teaching is often difficult to define precisely, it typically includes the following:

- clarity of course purposes and objectives,
- clarity and organization of class presentations,
- organization of course material,
- effective and appropriate use of class time,
- openness of the instructor to the ideas and views of students (and others'),
- instructor's up-to-date expertise in the subject matter and pedagogy, and
- fair, regular, and appropriate assessment of student learning by the instructor.

Assessment of teaching is based on the required materials detailed below, but faculty should feel free to provide additional material that best illustrates their work. Faculty members are encouraged to describe any innovations in their teaching, including not limited to the use of new technologies. These materials may include the following:

- a narrative summary of the faculty member's organization of courses, goals and learning outcomes;
- a reflection on any problem areas as well as efforts or plans for resolution;
- an account of courses taught by semester and numbers of students in each course;
- course syllabi;
- outcomes of student evaluations organized in tabular format and consistent with university requirements. Course numbers, course names, means, and enrollment numbers

are presented for each class for items reflecting the overall rating of instructor and overall rating of the course, and three additional items. In the case of small classes (i.e., 20 or fewer), medians may be more appropriate than means;

- a select sample of written comments from student evaluations when available (one page of comments is sufficient);
- description or documentation of systematic strategies to solicit other forms of student feedback on teaching such as mid-course feedback, student check-in, or exit questions; information from observations of teaching practice or review of materials by other COEHD faculty;
- a clear accounting of the proportional responsibility for team-taught classes; and
- documentation of any professional development and efforts to learn about and implement strategies to improve teaching.

Student evaluations of each course must utilize University-approved forms. In addition, a second form of student evaluation is encouraged. Its purpose is to provide instructors with additional information on the quality and conduct of their teaching. As a supplement to the University-approved form, additional assessments may occur at any time during the semester and can take many different forms (e.g., narrative evaluations by students, mid-term evaluations, or observations by faculty peers).

4.3. Student Advising

Advising is expected of nearly all faculty members with teaching appointments. Activities that reflect advising include, but are not limited to, program advising and the supervision of dissertation and theses. In order to assess the quality of student advising, the faculty member should ensure that the following appear somewhere in their review material (e.g., the University of Maine System tenure/promotion form or cover letter if the tenure/promotion form is not used):

- a summary of the number of their undergraduate and graduate advisees; and
- a summary of the faculty member's work on graduate committees denoting theses chaired and committees served.

4.4. Service

Service is expected of all faculty members and encompasses three major types of professional activity.

First, fundamental work supporting the faculty member's disciplinary area or degree program, such as program planning, course coordination, etc., is a basic requirement of holding a tenure-track position at a land grant university. All faculty members carry a responsibility for the development and quality of the programs in which they work, and the professional decisions regarding academic policy and practice, including accreditation. Active membership on Department/School, College, and University committees and task forces are examples of such service.

Second, faculty members contribute to the University's Land Grant and Sea Grant missions by providing service to the state and nation as their particular talents, background, and specialties permit. COEHD faculty typically provide service to schools, state agencies, and other profession-related groups and individuals. Faculty members are expected to make themselves

available for service activities (paid and unpaid) and to carry such activities with diligence and according to the highest ethical and professional standard.

Third, faculty members are encouraged to provide service to their professional organizations through membership on committees and serving in leadership roles, as well as reviewing journal articles, grants, and books.

5. ACADEMIC RANK DEFINITIONS

5.1 Assistant Professor

Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor assumes that the individual possesses the potential which, when further developed, is likely to merit promotion in rank to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure. For appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, the faculty member must have advanced training, normally indicated by an appropriate terminal degree in her or his field (usually a Ph.D. or Ed.D). The individual must also have a demonstrated interest in maintaining and improving her or his professional competence. The initial appointment of an Assistant Professor from outside the University is for one year. Reappointment may be for a one- or two-year term, providing the probationary period, including any credit for prior service, does not exceed seven years. Tenure is not ordinarily granted at the rank of Assistant Professor.

5.2 Associate Professor

Associate Professors shall normally hold the appropriate terminal degree in their disciplines. Further, to be appointed or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, an individual must have demonstrated successful performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service as appropriate to previous positions. It is assumed that the appointment or promotion of any individual to the rank of Associate Professor indicates a strong belief by the COEHD that the faculty member shows high promise for continued academic development. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor from within the University is accompanied by the granting of tenure. Appointment from outside the University is for an initial two-year probationary term. Reappointments may occur for any number of one or two-year terms provided the probationary period, including any credit for prior service at another institution, does not exceed seven years. An individual from outside the University who has been appointed to the rank of Associate Professor may apply for tenure at any point after the completion of one year of service at the University of Maine.

5.3 Professor

The rank of Professor is the highest faculty rank. The position indicates that one's contributions as a teacher, scholar, and in service are of an exceptionally high order. As a teacher, the faculty member will have demonstrated a recognized ability to stimulate a genuine desire for scholarly work in their students. She or he should have a reputation for making creative contributions to scholarship in his or her field and, where applicable, should possess the ability to direct the research of advanced students. The Professor's professional reputation among peers should be at the national and international levels and should enhance the reputation of the University of Maine. Appointment to the rank of Professor from outside the University is normally for an initial two-year period, with reappointment carrying continuous tenure. In unusual cases, an initial appointment at the rank of Professor may carry tenure.

5.4 Additional Ranks

In addition to the ranks identified above, the current contract between the University of Maine and the Affiliated Faculties of the University of Maine recognizes the following academic ranks: Lecturer (non-tenure track), Instructor (tenure track and evaluated according to their appointment contract), and three ranks associated with non-tenure track research appointments, including Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor. Individuals holding any of these ranks will be evaluated as outlined here, in light of the faculty member's contract with the COEHD and the applicable criteria detailed therein.

A fixed length position is appointed for a specified duration of up to 3 years. If there is a compelling rationale, AFUM and UMS may enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to extend the position beyond the 3-year appointment.

6. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

6.1 Scholarly Publications

The primary evidence for demonstrating scholarly productivity in universities with strong research missions and traditions, such as the University of Maine, is in scholarly publications, most often in refereed national and international academic journals. Scholarship is assessed according to the attributes described in Section 2. The general guidelines with respect to scholarly publication over the five- year probationary period for a faculty member with a 2:2 teaching load are as follows:

1. At least five articles – published or in press – in refereed, high quality (i.e., non-predatory) journals with national or international audiences. This total can include one invited and/or peer-reviewed book chapter.
2. At least three national publications (published or in press) that can be any of the following or combination thereof:
 - a. additional national or international peer reviewed publications;
 - b. additional invited and/or peer reviewed book chapters;
 - c. invited talks at national or international conferences;
 - d. scholarly books;
 - e. published conference proceedings (i.e., not simply a published abstract);
 - f. monographs;
 - g. curricular material distributed by a national publisher; and
 - h. awarded externally-funded grants or contracts on which one is the PI and/or made significant contributions, that can be documented to the grants authorship.
 - i. There is the expectation that the faculty member will submit at least one external grant application. This does not need to be funded, but does need to be a substantive proposal (i.e., more than a limited pre-proposal) similar to an IES application or major foundation final proposal.

Note: Items in “i” cannot be counted in “h” and no more than one can be counted toward the total.

3. There is the expectation that faculty will regularly attend and present at national and international conferences, commensurate with available college support. This is seen as a fundamental part of disseminating one's work and building a scholarly network and reputation.

There are other outlets for the scholarly work of faculty members. All can be important in assessing scholarship, and clearly, some outlets are more consequential than others. Faculty members are encouraged to provide details about all publications they wish the Peer Committee to consider. The evaluation of the quality of articles will be based on the reputation and editorial standards of the journals in which the articles are published, the impact of the publications on the discipline, as judged by researchers at the University of Maine and other institutions, the impact factor rating of the journal, the journal's acceptance rate, and any other indicators of the influence and quality of the journal. Information about the publisher of book (e.g., university press vs. vanity press), the review process used for the publication of a book or a book chapter, and so on, will also be used by the Peer Committee in evaluating publications. Honors or awards related to scholarship will also be noted as evidence of impact.

It must be emphasized that this is strictly non-binding guidance. The recommendation for promotion and tenure is based on the totality of a faculty member's work effort during the probationary period. Similarly, in exceptional cases, the quality and significance of the faculty member's overall scholarly record, including external funding, can compensate for a lesser number of publications.

Similarly, there may be individuals who are hired or appointed into certain roles that require them to spend considerable time on other types of scholarship (e.g., technical research reports). In these situations, the faculty member and Dean should meet with the Peer Committee at the time of appointment to discuss how these expectations may be modified for that specific individual situation.

6.2 Teaching

Teaching is an integral part of the COEHD, and faculty members are expected to maintain quality teaching following the award of tenure. The post-tenure expectations and performance standards continue to be those described in Section 4.1.

6.3 Service

As part of the review process, faculty members should document service activities as described in Section 4.4, as well as any other relevant types of professional service activities. Honors or special awards related to service should also be noted.

6.4 Letters from External Evaluators

Letters from external evaluators are required of all faculty members applying for tenure and promotion. The School Director or Department Chair is responsible for soliciting such letters from senior faculty at other institutions, both nationally and internationally, who are recognized for their expertise in the faculty member's area of specialization. The faculty member applying for promotion shall provide a list of at least 4-5 names of potential reviewers to the School

Director or Department Chair, who will select three reviewers to contact for recommendation letters. The School Director or Department Chair solicits letters from reviewers during the summer preceding the application for tenure and promotion. Reviewers are asked to evaluate the faculty member's scholarly contributions given the nature of the faculty appointment and the COEHD's criteria for promotion. Reviewers should not be individuals who have collaborated with the faculty member, served on graduate committees, or otherwise maintain a personal relationship with the faculty member. General guidelines for the selection of reviewers are detailed on the University of Maine System's website.

6.5 Documentation of Research and Scholarship

See Section 3.2 for details on required documents and material.

7. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Unlike the Associate rank, which has a specified timeframe for review, individuals wishing to advance in rank from Associate to Full Professor have no set time limit. In order for the Peer Committee to prepare for a review, potential candidates should notify the Department Chair or School Director in writing by March 1 of the year of potential review that he or she will be submitting materials for a Fall review. The candidate will be expected to create a portfolio outlining their work since the last promotion. Such a portfolio will include the following components:

7.1 Scholarly Publications

With respect to promotion to Professor, minimum expectations of scholarship productivity are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor (see Section 6) over the previous 5 years (post-promotion). Given the open time-frame for promotion to Full Professor, it is expected that this will also reflect a steady record of productivity throughout all or most of one's appointment as an Associate Professor. Scholarship is assessed according to the attributes described in Section 2, with the same guidelines as noted in Section 6.

It should be noted that as with promotion to Associate Professor, there is the expectation that tenured faculty will regularly attend and present at national and international conferences, commensurate with available college support. For promotion to Full Professor, invited presentations at national and international scholarly conferences are valuable evidence of one's role and impact within the field, and should be taken into account in evaluating an individual's scholarly output as well as their reputation.

7.2 Teaching

Teaching is an integral part of the COEHD, and faculty members are expected to maintain quality teaching following the award of tenure. The post-tenure expectations and performance standards continue to be those described in Section 4.1.

7.3 Service

Service activities as described in Section 4.4 also apply for promotion to Full Professor. In line with the awarding of tenure at a Land-Grant University, service expectations for tenured faculty are greater than those for Assistant Professors, particularly in regards to assuming more active,

leadership roles in one's program and Department/School, as well as in the COEHD and university.

7.4 Letters from External Evaluators

As with promotion to Associate Professor, letters from external evaluators are required of all faculty members applying for tenure and promotion (see Section 6).

7.5 Documentation of Research and Scholarship

See Section 3.2 for details on required documents and material.

8. POST-TENURE REVIEW

The COEHD, in accordance with the University's post-tenure review policy, seeks to encourage faculty members to achieve their professional goals and contribute to the COEHD's tripartite mission of scholarship, teaching, and service.

Post-tenure review criteria in the COEHD are based on the following principles:

- post-tenure review is a collegial process, the primary goal of which is faculty support;
- the review process is not intended to limit academic freedom;
- the review process is not intended to require the faculty member to re-earn tenure. All faculty members are expected to maintain satisfactory teaching, an active research agenda, and actively participate in service once tenured as they did prior to receiving tenure; and
- post-tenure review criteria must be periodically reevaluated to assess its effectiveness in aiding faculty performance.

8.1 Scholarship

The review of scholarly activity in and among these domains is based on the attributes described in Section 2. Tenured faculty members are expected to maintain an active research agenda. The COEHD community has a general expectation that faculty members with normal (2-2) teaching and research loads will produce an *average* of at least one refereed journal article, book publication, external grant submission or their equivalent, per year. Faculty members should be aware of the requirement to have at least one publication in a five-year period to maintain full graduate faculty status. However, it is also recognized that this may fluctuate depending on the nature of one's research work and distribution of service activity. For example, it is expected that one may publish fewer papers at the start of a longitudinal project, followed by more papers near the end. Furthermore, a central purpose of tenure is to allow faculty to engage in higher-risk, higher potential reward, research. Consequently, it is expected that some research efforts may not result in the same level of publishable scholarship as others. The key is documenting a well-developed, active research agenda.

8.2 Teaching

Teaching is an integral part of the COEHD, and faculty members are expected to maintain quality teaching following the award of tenure. The post-tenure expectations and performance standards continue to be those described in Section 4.1.

8.3 Student Advising

Advising is expected of nearly all faculty members with teaching appointments. The post-tenure expectations and performance standards for student advising continue to be those described in Section 4.2.

8.4 Service

The Peer Committee should recognize that a faculty member's appointment is typically divided between teaching and research, with no specific allocation for service activities. However, the School, COEHD, and University cannot function without the aid and willingness of faculty members to engage in service activities and, as a community, the COEHD considers service to be an essential component of good University citizenship. Consequently, the review of service is an important part of the post-tenure review process, and faculty should describe any service activities as summarized in Section 4.4.

8.5 Criteria for Post-Tenure Evaluation

After completing its post-tenure review, the Peer Committee will rank the faculty member 'Above Satisfactory', 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory'. The Peer Committee should weigh teaching, scholarly activity, and service in a manner that accurately and fairly recognizes the individual faculty member's load and other relevant issues. As part of this process, it is vital that the Peer Committee conduct an honest and accurate evaluation of faculty performance. This may sometimes involve providing uncomfortable, but important and valuable feedback to colleagues.

The following criteria are intended as guides to rating faculty work for the use of School Peer Committees.

1. Above satisfactory— The faculty member has demonstrated performance in teaching, research, and service for an individual at her or his rank that is substantially beyond what is normal for the unit.
2. Satisfactory— The faculty member has demonstrated an acceptable level of performance in teaching, has maintained an active research agenda and level of scholarship, and has actively participated in service activities.
3. Unsatisfactory— The faculty member has failed to meet expectations with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service or has engaged in professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or has demonstrated professional incompetence.

All post-tenure faculty members reviewed in a given year who are ranked 'Above Satisfactory' or 'Satisfactory' currently receive the 3.5% pay increase as dictated by the provisions of the University of Maine System and the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System contract. In cases in which the faculty member receives a rating of 'Unsatisfactory' from the Peer Committee, the 3.5% increase will not be awarded. This will constitute the consequence of an 'Unsatisfactory' rating.

Implementation of the Revised Review, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Policy

The implementation of this policy is guided by policies articulated in the AFUM contract (Article 10, Section 3). In accordance with the AFUM contract, the faculty of the COEHD recommends the following implementation schedule:

- February 2019--Approval of the revised *Policy* by the faculty and administration of the COEHD.
- February 2019— The revised *Policy* will be forwarded to the Provost or his or her designee and AFUM for review.
- September 2019— The revised *Policy* is phased in for all non-tenured faculty as per the schedules noted below in accordance with AFUM contract.
- September 2020— The revised *Policy* goes into effect for all tenured faculty and all full-time faculty with 6 or more years of continuous service in accordance with AFUM guidelines.

Individuals in their pre-tenure years of service may elect to be reviewed either under the newly established standards or those standards in place at the date of their initial appointment as a faculty member for the remainder of their probationary period for review, reappointment, and tenure or until the sixth year of service for those in non-tenure track positions.