

Review, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures

[Version 8. 2/17/12]

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, and every four years for associate professors, full professors, and non-tenure-track faculty with 6 or more years of service.

The following guidelines pertain to the peer review process for all faculty 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.

I. Review Process for Tenure Track Faculty

First Year

New faculty will be invited to meet with members of the Peer Committee in early fall of their first year to outline the review process. This meeting focuses on questions about continuing contracts, tenure, and promotion. New faculty will have the opportunity to review sample dossiers that provide a sense of how to organize materials.

The first review for all new tenure track faculty takes place in January. New faculty submit a vita; teaching evaluations from the fall semester, if available; and a one to two-page cover letter and relevant supporting materials detailing information about service, teaching, and scholarly plans.

Second Year

The second review for new tenure-track faculty takes place during October of their second year at UMaine. Faculty again submit a one to two-page letter reflecting upon the work completed in the first year. Faculty also submit a vita, one-page summary of numerical teaching evaluations based upon the format denoted in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, texts of accepted publications and those under review, if applicable. On the vita, peer-reviewed presentations and publications should be marked with an asterisk. Faculty may also submit relevant supporting materials detailing information about service, teaching, and scholarly plans. The review materials should fit easily into a small binder or folio.

The Peer Committee will also review the written comments by students that are included in the candidate's personnel file in the office of the Associate Dean for Instruction. The Peer Committee may ask for clarification or additional review materials if necessary.

Third Year

A major review of tenure-track faculty takes place during the spring of the third year. This review is comprehensive. Peer Committee review will indicate whether or not the candidate appears to be meeting 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 progress and performance to date.

If the Peer Committee's third-year review recommends reappointment, the candidate will be released from six credits of teaching at some point during the following year (either one course per semester, or two courses during one semester, to be negotiated with the dean).

Fourth and Fifth Years

In the fourth and fifth years, tenure-track candidates will undergo additional reviews, submitting their materials following the same format they have used for the previous reviews.

Sixth Year and Beyond

Review for promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure are conducted in the fall of the sixth year. See the detailed process described below under Promotion to Associate Professor. Post tenure reviews are conducted every four years subsequent to this promotion.

II. Review Process for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

First Year

New faculty will be invited to meet with members of the Peer Committee in early fall of their first year to outline the review process. This meeting focuses on questions about continuing contracts, , and promotion. New faculty will have the opportunity to review sample dossiers that provide a sense of how to organize materials.

The first review for all new non-tenure track faculty takes place in January. New faculty submit a vita; teaching evaluations from the fall semester, if available and applicable; and a one to two-page cover letter and relevant supporting materials detailing information about service, teaching, or scholarly plans.

Second Year

The second review for new non tenure-track faculty takes place during the spring of their second year at UMaine. Faculty, again, submit a one to two-page letter reflecting upon the work completed in the first year. Faculty also submit a vita, one-page summary of numerical teaching evaluations based upon the format denoted in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, texts of accepted publications and those under review, if applicable. On the vita, peer-reviewed presentations and publications should be marked with an asterisk, if applicable. Faculty may also submit relevant supporting materials detailing information about service, teaching, or scholarly plans. The review materials should fit easily into a small binder or folio.

If applicable, the Peer Committee will also review the written comments by students that are included in the candidate's personnel file in the office of the Associate Dean for Instruction. The Peer Committee may ask for clarification or additional review materials if necessary.

Third Year

A review of non tenure-track faculty takes place during the spring of the third year and is otherwise similar to the second year process. Non-tenure faculty will also have a meeting with the dean after the third year review to discuss progress and performance to date.

Fourth to Sixth Years

Non-tenure track faculty are reviewed annually each spring from their fourth to sixth years based upon their assignment and follow procedures similar to tenure-track faculty. The Peer Committee reviews the written comments by students that are included in the candidate's personnel file in the

office of the Associate Dean for Instruction when applicable. The Peer Committee may ask for clarification or additional review materials if necessary.

Seventh Year and Beyond

After six years of service, non-tenure track faculty are eligible for continuing contracts. If awarded a continuing contract, faculty submit materials for peer review every four years.

III. Principles of Review

- Faculty promotion and review are tied both to the College and University mission.
- There is no single definition of scholarship or professional activity. Both vary by discipline. Both should be evaluated within the discipline, College, and broader national and international academic context.
- 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 is evaluated accordingly.

IV. Attributes of the Review of Professional Activity

In general, 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 sense and to allow for the diversity of contributions that characterize the variety of disciplines represented by faculty. More detailed performance criteria, which are elaborated in the next sections, illustrate the typical applications of the core attributes. The core attributes are the following:

- 1) level of discipline related experience required by the activity
- 2) degree of innovation
- 3) extent of peer review
- 4) impact on communities directly affected by the efforts
- 5) Extent of effort as indicated by authorship order or degree of contribution

V. Review Procedures

Each fall, faculty members in need of review will receive a letter from the Associate Dean's office indicating their review status for that year as well as describing the materials required and the deadline for their submission. The faculty member will assemble his/her papers and submit them for review by the Peer Committee by the announced deadline. These materials will 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. (The period under review typically entails the

period of time since the last review. Tenure reviews are typically limited to the previous five years, unless probationary period extension has been granted in accordance with the AFUM contract. Reviews for promotion to 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. Suggestions regarding a person's progress toward promotion and/or tenure will be provided as appropriate and as a normal part of the mentoring and review process.

A meeting with the Peer Committee may be requested by any faculty member during the review process. The faculty member may also write a letter in response to the Peer Committee's recommendation. 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 noted below and 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:

- A cover letter to the committee: The letter will be read by the Committee, and is likely to be important at each of the other levels of review. The letter should clearly state the nature of your appointment, what you teach and how often, whether you engage significant time in programmatic or administrative matters, how many students you routinely advise, your research agenda and related activities, and service to professional groups. It should be abundantly clear to anyone reading this letter, both within and outside of the College, just what the faculty member does and what he or she understands as important or noteworthy.
- A current vita
- Previous Peer Committee review letters

VI. Performance Standards

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 is evaluated accordingly.

A. Teaching

Teaching is of major importance to the College and University. Faculty should strive to serve as model educators for students and University colleagues. Although exemplary teaching is difficult to define, it is recognized as including the following:

- Clarity of course purposes and presentations
- Organization of material and class times
- Openness of the instructor to others' views
- Up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter and pedagogy
- Fair and regular assessment

For all those who have teaching responsibilities in the College, student evaluations of each course must utilize University-approved forms. (Faculty should clearly detail when such forms are not appropriate and describe alternate forms of evaluation.) In addition, a second form of evaluation is required. 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, the second

assessment may occur at any time during the semester and can take many different forms (e.g., narrative evaluations by students, mid-term evaluations, observations by other faculty).

Review of Teaching — 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 are encouraged to describe any innovations in their teaching including the use of new technologies.

- A narrative summary of the faculty member's organization of courses, goals and learning outcomes;
- A reflection on any problem areas and 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, means, and enrollment numbers are presented for each class for items reflecting 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 appropriate;
- A select sample of written comments from signed student evaluations. (One page of comments is sufficient.);
- Documentation of other forms of teaching evaluation such as mid-course feedback or observations by other faculty;
- Clear accounting of the proportional responsibility for classes team taught.

All of these components contribute to the assessment of a faculty member's teaching and all can be difficult to assess. Faculty members are encouraged to provide material they believe illustrates their contributions.

B. Student Advising

Advising is expected of nearly all faculty with teaching appointments. Activities that reflect advising include, but are not limited to, program advising and the supervision of dissertation and theses. The quality of advising is difficult to judge but is reflected in the reporting of activities by the faculty member and comments of students as they are available. Indicators of quality advising at the undergraduate and graduate level are based upon an advisor's availability, posting and keeping regular office hours, and knowledge of unit, College, and university policies.

Review of Advising — In order to assess the quality of student advising, the committee asks faculty to provide:

- A summary of the number of undergraduate and graduate advisees;
- A summary of work on graduate committees denoting theses chaired and committees served;
- A summary of solicited evaluations and unsolicited evaluations as they are available.

C. Research and Scholarship

The College values scholarly activity that contributes to theory and/or practice, research that involves systematic inquiry, and scholarly forms of communication that enhance professional

service through original and insightful thinking. Scholarly contributions should include peer-reviewed publications in a variety of venues. The ways faculty utilize research and scholarship to contribute to their fields and profession include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Authoring books, monographs, book chapters, journal articles, technical reports, and curricular guides;
- Editing journals or the work of colleagues;
- Presenting papers at local, state, regional, national or international conferences;
- Creating film presentations;
- Chairing scholarly conference proceedings and similar activity;
- Developing and securing grants.

Review of Research & Scholarship — Review of scholarly activity in and among these domains is based on the five core attributes mentioned earlier:

1. Level of discipline-related experience required by the activity
2. Degree of innovation
3. Extent of peer-review within the discipline
4. Impact on communities directly affected by the efforts
5. Extent of effort as indicated by authorship order or degree of contribution

To be considered for promotion, all tenure-track faculty are expected to meet the following criteria for high quality performance:

1. A clear programmatic focus of scholarship;
2. Sustained productivity with an average of at least one national publication per year;
3. A balance between independent and collaborative scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member's ability to serve as lead or solo author, such that at least half of the required national publications indicate the candidate is lead or solo author;
4. Demonstration of the faculty member's ability to be published in nationally recognized scholarly journals. The quality of publications 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 this and other institutions or the impact factor, acceptance rate, or other indicators of influence of the journal, as available;
5. Scholarly publications and national or international presentations, as discussed below.

VII. Academic Rank Definitions

Assistant Professor – Appointment or promotion to the rank of assistant professor assumes that the individual possesses potential which, when developed further, will merit promotion in rank or the granting of tenure. The individual must have advanced training and a demonstrated interest in maintaining and improving his or her professional competence. Except in unusual cases, the assistant professor, whose duties include teaching upper division courses, should have the highest earned degree traditional to the discipline or should have made substantial progress toward its attainment. 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 will not ordinarily be granted at the assistant professor level.

Associate Professor – The associate professor shall normally hold the highest earned degree traditional to the discipline or have professional experience of an equivalent nature. An individual holding the rank of associate professor must have demonstrated creative performance in those areas required by the mission of the unit to which he or she belongs. The associate professor must show high promise for continued development. Appointment to the rank of associate professor from within the University is accompanied by the granting of tenure. Appointment from outside is for an initial two-year probationary term. Reappointments may be for any number of one or two-year terms provided the probationary period, including any credits for prior service, does not exceed seven years.

Professor – The professor must have demonstrated ability and scholarship of an exceptionally high order. As a teacher, he or she should show an extraordinary ability to stimulate in students a genuine desire for scholarly work. A professor 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 his or her peers should be more than local 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, initial appointment may carry tenure.

Additional Ranks – In addition, the current contract with the University of Maine and the Affiliated Faculties of the University of Maine, the following academic ranks are recognized: Lecturer (typically reserved for non-tenure track appointments), Instructor (typically reserved for tenure-track appointments), and three ranks associated with non-tenure track research appointments and including Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor. In the past, these ranks have not been applied consistently nonetheless they are all evaluated in light of the unit members' contract with the College and the applicable criteria detailed herein.

VIII. Promotion to Associate Professor

Scholarly Publications

The primary currency for demonstrated productivity in publications is refereed scholarly publications with a target *average* of at least one per year. Scholarship is assessed according to the five standards noted above and in terms of their content, quality, and intended audience. The general guideline for this area includes at least five published or in-press publications by the end of the probationary period for faculty with a 25% research appointment and a higher or lower quota for those with research appointments greater or less than 25%. The general guidelines are as follows:

1. At least three (published or in press) in refereed journals with national or international audiences.
2. At least two national publications (published or in press) that can be any of the following or combination thereof:
 - a. Other articles in refereed journals
 - b. Book chapters
 - c. Books

- d. A refereed research, model demonstration, or teaching and training grant application that is funded, approved but not funded, or unfunded
- e. A publication in conference proceedings if refereed for publication separately from a conference proposal
- f. A technological product (e.g., curriculum materials, assessment instrument, course materials) disseminated by a national publisher
- g. A monograph

No doubt there are other outlets for the scholarly work of faculty. All can be important in assessing scholarship and clearly some outlets are more consequential than others. Faculty are encouraged to detail all forms of publication.

For journal articles, please note the sponsoring organization if any, as well as noting acceptance rates as available and any available statistics that illustrate a journal's impact (e.g., citation rates, journal half-life). Some forms of publications such as book reviews, published commentaries, and blogs can be useful contributions, but they are typically not considered major contributions nor do they have the weight or influence of books, book chapters or referred journal articles. For instance, while a book review can be written in a relatively brief period of time, a referred journal article can be very labor intensive. Furthermore, books, book chapters, and monographs that undergo extensive review, are published by prominent national or international publishers, or sponsored by national or international professional organizations are given more weight. For publications that do not fall into the typical categories, faculty are encouraged to explain the purpose and importance of the item in question.

In exceptional cases, the quality and significance of the candidate's overall scholarship record can compensate for a lesser number of publications.

Scholarly Presentations

Refereed or invited presentations do not replace the target number per year of refereed publications but are important outlets for disseminating one's scholarship. A general guideline would be, on average, one national or international presentation per year provided adequate College or grant funding is available to subsidize travel.

Letters from External Evaluators

Letters from external evaluators are required of all faculty applying for tenure and promotion. Generally, the Dean's office is responsible for soliciting such letters from senior faculty who are recognized for their expertise in the faculty member's specialization. Letters are solicited during the summer preceding the application. Reviewers are asked to evaluate the faculty member's research contributions given the nature of the faculty appointment and the College'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. Further guidelines for the selection of reviewers are detailed on the Human Resources web site.

IX. Promotion to Professor

Scholarly Publications

The primary currency for demonstrated productivity in publications is refereed scholarly publications with a continuing target *average* of at least one per year since the last promotion. The general guideline for this area includes at least five national publications since the end of the

last promotion for those with a typical 25% research appointment and a higher or lower quota for those with research appointments greater or less than 25%. The general guidelines are as follows:

1. At least 3-6 (published or in press) in refereed journals with national or international audiences.
2. At least two national publications (published or in press) that can be any of the following or combination thereof:
 - a. Other articles in national, refereed journals
 - b. Book chapters
 - c. Books
 - d. A refereed research or model demonstration, or teaching and training grant application that is funded or approved but not funded
 - e. A publication in conference proceedings if refereed for publication separately from a conference proposal
 - f. A technological product (e.g., curriculum materials, assessment instrument, course materials) disseminated by a national publisher
 - g. A monograph
 - h. A submitted research grant application to an external funding agency

No doubt there are other outlets for the scholarly work of faculty. All can be important in assessing scholarship and clearly some outlets are more consequential than others. Faculty are encouraged to detail all forms of publication as noted above.

In exceptional cases, the quality and significance of the candidate's overall scholarship record can compensate for a lesser number of publications.

Scholarly Presentations

Refereed or invited presentations do not replace the target number per year of refereed publications but are important outlets for disseminating one's scholarship. A general guideline would be, on average, one national or international presentation per year provided adequate College or grant funding is available.

Review of Research and Scholarship

In general, faculty should provide documentation consistent with the requirements noted above and as required by the University's guidelines for the preparation of papers for promotion and tenure available from the Office of Human Resources. This includes the following:

- a. A narrative summary describing one's scholarship
- b. A list of all manuscripts for the period under review indicating the status of each (i.e., published, accepted for publication, under review)
- c. Copies of all manuscripts published since the last review
- d. A brief description of your current fields of scholarly work in progress including any manuscripts in progress
- e. A list of refereed presentations, indicating the name and level (local, state, etc.) of the sponsoring organization and including an abstract where possible
- f. A list of professional organization memberships and activities, including office(s) held and committee memberships
- g. A list of national/regional meetings attended and sessions chaired
- h. A list of service in reviewing papers submitted for publication, grant proposals and/or service as a member of a review panel
- i. A list of software developed, films made, or other pertinent materials

Service

Service encompasses two major types of professional activity and is expected of all faculty. First, and most importantly, faculty contribute to the University's land-grant and sea-grant missions by providing service to the state and/or nation as their particular talents, background and specialties permit. College of Education and Human Development faculty typically provide services to schools, state agencies, and other profession-related groups and individuals. Such service takes a variety of forms, ranging from conducting workshops to writing monographs, as well as providing expert advice and evaluation of individuals and programs. Faculty are expected to make themselves actively available for service activities (paid and unpaid) and to carry such activities through with diligence and according to the highest ethical and professional standard.

Second, service to the College and University and, where possible, to one's academic specialty are expected. All faculty carry a responsibility for the development and quality of the programs in which they work, the professional decisions of the faculty regarding academic policy and practice, and the quality of professional work life in the College and University. Active membership on College and University committees and task forces are examples of such service. Accreditation work is likewise a valued service to the College and University. Similarly, faculty are encouraged to serve their scholarship and practitioner associations through writing, leadership, and committee work.

Review of Service

Annual reviews of Assistant Professors and faculty with less than 6 years of experience in non-tenure track positions will recognize achievement in the areas of service listed below. Faculty should provide a summary of their activity in the following areas:

- Service on university committees
- Service on unit committees
- Consulting in a professional capacity
- Lectures, panel discussions, workshop presentations
- Service to professional or scientific organizations, as an office holder or committee member
- Reviewing of journal articles, grants, and books
- Honors and special awards

Consideration for promotion to Associate Professor is strengthened by an impressive record particularly if the candidate's work on service tasks has brought credit to the College and the university.

Consideration for promotion to Professor is strengthened by the attainment of a reputation as a leader in advancing disciplinary contributions to the public, the community, or the University. Promotion to Professor will be enhanced by exceptional, high quality contributions to public/community service.

Implementation of the Revised Review, Reappointment, Promotion, and 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 peer committee recommends the following:

- February 2012--Approval by the faculty and administration of the College of Education and Human Development
- March 2012—If so approved, the newly approved policy to be forwarded to the chief administrative officer or his/her designee and AFUM for review
- September 2012—New policy is phased in for all non-tenured faculty as per the schedules noted below.
- September 2015—New policy goes into effect for all tenured faculty and all full-time faculty with 6 or more years of continuous service.

For faculty who are serving in probationary appointments or with fewer than 6 years of continuous service at the time the standards and criteria for review, reappointment and tenure are changed the following shall apply:

1. Individuals in the third year 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 or until the sixth year of service for those in non-tenure track positions.
2. Individuals serving in the fourth year of service and above shall be evaluated for review, reappointment or tenure based upon the standards and criteria in place at the time of their initial appointment and until such time they are promoted, or until the sixth year of service for those in non-tenure track positions.
3. Individuals serving in the first or second year of probation or those in the first or second year of a non-probationary appointment shall be evaluated under the newly established standards for review, reappointment, and tenure.