

Overview of Post-Tenure Review Process and Timeline, CLAS [rev. 1-6-25]

This document also applies to lecturers who have just-cause status and are due for four-year review.

The list of represented and non-represented CLAS faculty eligible for post-tenure review (PTR) is typically distributed to chairs and directors early January. Chairs/directors are responsible for ensuring that peer committee members are informed about the PTR process.

Timeline

A timeline with specific dates will be provided each year to faculty eligible for PTR and to chairs/directors. For planning purposes, the deadlines related to PTR generally align with the following timeline:

Approximate Deadline	Action
Early February	Chair notifies peer committee
Mid-March	Faculty materials due to peer committee
Early April	Peer committee recommendation due to chair
Mid-April	Chair recommendation due to dean

Non-represented faculty members will be reviewed according to the administrative review procedures posted at <https://umaine.edu/las/faculty-resources/human-resources/>. Generally, their review materials are due to the Dean's Office in early April. Non-represented faculty who wish to receive peer committee feedback (because they wish to apply for promotion to professor in the near future, for instance) should follow the timeline outlined above.

Faculty members on leave may request a one-year delay in the post-tenure review. However, any increase in pay will not be retroactive, and the delayed review will cover only the initial four years.

Materials to submit

While there is no standardized format for submission, candidates should ordinarily provide the following for both peer committee and administrative review:

1. Their current curriculum vitae.
2. Covering the four-year period of review only:
 - A. A letter or narrative highlighting major accomplishments and activities, a maximum of four pages in which the faculty member addresses achievements in teaching, research/creative work (if applicable), and service. This letter must be cc-ed to the candidate's personnel file.
 - B. A list of courses taught and a student evaluation score summary. The teaching evaluation template linked at <https://umaine.edu/las/faculty-resources/human-resources/> should be used to summarize student evaluation scores. Full sets of comparative scores for the review period (preceding four years), excluding the pandemic semesters of spring 2020, fall 2020, and spring 2021 can be found on the AG SharePoint website: <https://umainesystem.sharepoint.com/:f/s/UM-CLAS/EuwnttkNA6ZLkOCBsgP-YNYBBORXk55-FDKOGMkliBrCUQ?e=1bmw4v>
 - C. Annual activity reports. Annual activity reports must be updated electronically at <https://library.umaine.edu/fsprofile/login.aspx>. The Dean's Office will access these reports electronically. However, to ensure that peer committees have access to the reports, candidates may provide them to the committees in pdf format.

Personnel file

Peer committees and chairs/directors may access candidates' personnel files as part of the evaluation process. Candidates are encouraged to review their files before they submit their materials to the peer committee.

Peer committee and chair/director letters must be copied to the faculty member and the personnel file.

Electronic submission is required

Candidates will submit their materials to a Google Drive folder set up by Kelly Gilks in the Dean's Office. Kelly will provide access to this folder for the PTR candidate, the members of the peer committee, and the chair/director.

Outcome of evaluation by peer committee and chair/director

The peer committee should indicate whether the faculty member's performance, as a whole, over the past four years has been satisfactory or above satisfactory, or is not found satisfactory. The peer committee letter should include an explanation of how the unit's performance criteria were used to determine the level of performance. The criteria applied should be specific to post-tenure review; the standard is not that of promotion or tenure.

The chair/director should also indicate whether performance during the past four years has been satisfactory or above satisfactory, or is not found satisfactory—either ratifying the peer committee's determination or recommending that it be overturned. Chairs/directors are encouraged to share comments on the merit of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service. Faculty who are jointly appointed should ordinarily receive a single, co-signed letter from both of their chairs/directors. When a chair/director's recommendation differs from the peer committee's, Article 20.G.5 of the AFUM agreement requires the administrator to provide "compelling reason(s)," which must be clearly stated in the chair/director's letter.