

**School of Economics  
The University of Maine**

**(excerpt from SOE merger document)**

VI. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure/Promotion, and Post-tenure Review

1. General Procedures

All tenure-track faculty members are required to submit an annual report of professional activities for the preceding year to the School Director. In the annual report, faculty members provide information on their activities in each of the following areas:

- A. research and scholarly activities including progress on projects, publications completed and in progress, grants, contracts and other external funding awarded;
- B. teaching activities including courses taught, course modifications, and student advising activities;
- C. professional, university, and public service activities performed; and
- D. activities undertaken for professional improvement.

2. Tenure and/or Promotion

The tenure decision is the ultimate decision to reappoint non-tenured faculty. The Peer Committee, therefore, should be guided by the standards for tenure when voting to reappoint or not to reappoint. In order to be reappointed, a non-tenured faculty member should have demonstrated that progress towards satisfying the standards for tenure has been made. Satisfactory annual evaluations in themselves do not guarantee the awarding of tenure. Only faculty members who have demonstrated high quality performance in carrying out their responsibilities will be recommended for tenure by the Peer Committee.

Three types of faculty activities are evaluated by the School: teaching (including student advising), funded and unfunded research, and service (to the School, College, University, profession, and public). The evaluation of a faculty member's teaching and research activities is weighted in accordance with the percentage of time assigned to each activity in their appointment mix. However, all faculty are expected to perform scholarly activity. In addition, all tenure-track faculty are expected to perform service (some combination of public, professional, and University service activities).

The Peer Committee must be instructed of any impending tenure and/or promotion actions by the date stipulated under the current AFUM agreement, and the Peer Committee recommendation must be forwarded to the School Director and faculty member by the subsequent AFUM Agreement defined date. All members of the Peer Committee must sign the recommendation (both majority and minority views) and a record of the vote must be included.

### 3. Evaluation Criteria for Teaching Performance

#### A. Elements of Teaching Effectiveness

The primary consideration in the evaluation of teaching performance will be the instructor's ability to communicate material effectively to students and the instructor's ability to inspire and lead students. Effective teaching requires the use of a variety of skills which cannot be precisely enumerated, but which must be included in any evaluation process. There are, however, some components of the teaching process which we can specifically identify:

- a) Clear communication of course objectives by the instructor to students at start of course;
- b) Broad consistency between course objectives and school descriptions of course;
- c) Accomplishment of course objectives;
- d) Implementation of a course design which challenges students to learn and yet is tailored to the needs and capabilities of the students;
- e) Fair and understandable grading policy, including examination processes which are related to course objectives and which provide effective feedback to students;
- f) A sense of responsibility in class attendance, office hours availability to students, and sensitivity to student concerns;
- g) Efforts to improve the quality of courses taught, based upon an on-going self-evaluation, exposure to new developments in one's field, and the infusion of personal scholarly development into one's teaching wherever possible.

#### B. Teaching Effort

The effort required to teach effectively is not simply a function of total number of courses taught or number of students enrolled in those courses. The school recognizes both the importance and difficulty of teaching classes with large enrollments. Providing individualized instruction, as in readings or theses courses at either graduate or undergraduate level, places special demands on the instructor and also meets special needs of

the School. The level of effort necessary for the preparation of new courses and development of innovative approaches should be recognized.

#### C. Advising

The school considers school and college advising responsibilities to be important elements in the workload of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Effective advising requires that the faculty member be available to meet with advisees at appropriate times, to be able to communicate the requirements of the school, college, and university to the student, and to demonstrate an interest in each advisee's academic progress and concerns.

#### D. Methods of Evaluation

The primary evaluation tool will be the standard form for student evaluation of teaching. When deemed appropriate by the Director and the Peer Committee, the faculty member may be offered the option of in-class peer observation or one or more video recordings of classroom presentations.

In addition, the Director and/or Peer Committee may request that tenure-track faculty submit for consideration a self-evaluation of teaching performance. For each course taught during the period covered by the evaluation, the self-evaluation will contain, but will not necessarily be limited to, the syllabus, a description of any instructional aids, and a narrative describing the instructional techniques used in the course. In addition, if deemed appropriate to the professional development of the faculty member, the peer committee may by agreement with the faculty member, appoint a mentor to assist the faculty member in developing his or her teaching program.

When a faculty member is hired under terms that count some years of prior service toward the date for promotion and/or tenure, the new faculty member will be required to provide documentation of teaching performance, including student evaluations if available, during those years of prior service and this information will become part of the faculty member's personnel file and will be used for personnel decisions.

#### 4. Evaluation Criteria for Research and Scholarship Performance

The evaluation of qualitative content by the School is necessarily an imprecise task. However, there are some objective criteria which are important to the evaluation process. Work that has been subjected to external evaluation will tend to be weighed more heavily. Similarly, works which have been published usually represent a more substantial contribution than those which have received

more limited circulation. Somewhat greater emphasis is placed on original scholarly work than upon texts or editorships of collections of readings. The School also recognizes the special significance of invited contributions. In the case of jointly conducted research and scholarly activities and co-authored publications, the School will assess relative contribution. Professional recognition is reflected by the standards of review imposed by the publishers of a faculty member's materials. The School utilizes these implicit evaluations in its own evaluation process. Specific attention is paid to the generally acknowledged ratings of professional journals and to the editorial standards (such as acceptance rates) of journals.

The following list suggests an implicit ranking; however, in evaluating each of these criteria, prime consideration must be given to qualitative differences.

- a) Articles in refereed professional journals and refereed scholarly books and monographs.
- b) Accepted peer or panel reviewed major research funding.
- c) Texts and unrefereed books.
- d) Invited journal articles and chapters in monographs.
- e) Refereed comments, notes, and replies in professional journals, and encyclopedia entries.
- f) Editorship of monographs.
- g) Book reviews in professional journals.
- h) Grant and technical reports.
- i) Scholarly participation in professional meetings, including presenting papers, organizing and/or Chairing sessions, and serving as a discussant.
- j) Unpublished papers and unfunded grant proposals.
- k) Research in progress.
- l) Other professional and scholarly activities such as participation in colloquia, on-campus paper presentations, and development of software.

## 5. Evaluation Criteria for Service

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to provide service to the University, as described below. All faculty are expected to demonstrate a willingness and ability to work constructively and cooperatively in matters related to School and University service. Tenured faculty are expected to be responsive to reasonable opportunities to engage in service to the public and service to the profession. The service activities of faculty will vary widely depending on the nature of the position. Non-tenured faculty should be especially careful in providing service, however, so that service responsibilities do not overwhelm their primary responsibilities in research and instruction.

Service to the University includes such activities as: participation in and service to the school Policy Advisory and Peer committees, where appropriate; holding School support positions such as School Director, Graduate or Undergraduate Coordinator, or student association advisor; participation in college, university, or system-wide committees or assignments.

Service to the public includes such activities as: membership in State and Federal committees and task forces, publication of analyses of public policy issues, uncompensated consulting with State or Federal agencies or officials or with non-profit organizations, and interviews with the news media.

Service to the profession includes such activities as: leadership positions in professional associations; membership on editorial boards of professional journals, and editorial work for journals or publishers.

## VII. Standards for Evaluation and Post-tenure Review

The standards for annual evaluation shall apply to Peer Committee evaluations conducted for each cycle pursuant to the terms of the AFUM agreement and the university's guidelines for faculty evaluations.

1. For tenure-track faculty: The faculty member will submit a report of activities and accomplishments in each of the categories listed above and a plan stating his or her intentions with respect to activities and achievements in each of these areas for the upcoming evaluation period. In a year in which the faculty member is not currently subject to a personnel action decision, the Director with peer committee advice shall inform the faculty member of its assessment of his or her performance in regard to each of the criteria listed above and of its assessment of his or her progress toward meeting the standards for reappointment and promotion as they apply to reappointment and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The Director with peer committee advice shall inform the faculty member of those areas in which improved performance is expected. The School may work with the faculty member, at his or her request, to devise a plan for improving performance in the areas in question.

2. For those holding the rank of associate professor: The faculty member will submit a report of activities and accomplishments in each of the categories listed above and a plan stating his or her intentions with respect to activities and achievements in each of these areas for the upcoming evaluation period. The Director with peer committee advice shall inform the faculty member of its assessment of his or her performance in regard to each of the criteria listed above and of its assessment of his or her progress toward meeting the Standards for Reappointment and Promotion as they apply to promotion to the rank of professor. The assessment of performance shall indicate, for each functional area, whether performance is considered to be superior, acceptable, or in need of

improvement. The peer committee shall inform the faculty member of those areas in which improved performance is expected.

3. For those holding the rank of professor: The faculty member will submit a report of activities and accomplishments in each of the categories listed above and a plan stating his or her intentions with respect to activities and achievements in each of these areas for the upcoming evaluation period. The Director with peer committee advice shall inform the faculty member of its assessment of his or her performance in regard to each of the criteria listed above. The assessment of performance shall indicate, for each functional area, whether performance is considered to be superior, acceptable, or in need of improvement. The peer committee shall inform the faculty member of those areas in which improved performance is expected.

#### VIII. Standards for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

These standards will apply beginning September 1, 2010, and all faculty will be evaluated according to their appointment mix. Until September 1, 2010, the standards that the School Peer Committee and Director will apply in evaluating each faculty member are those that exist at the end of 2006 in each faculty member's respective department (Economics or REP).

1. A candidate for reappointment at the rank of assistant professor is expected to demonstrate:

A. satisfactory teaching and advising performance,

B. a program of scholarly activity that is generating or, during the first and second years in the probationary period, holds promise of generating publications in refereed journals,

C. a level of service to the university that does not unreasonably impinge on the maintenance of satisfactory teaching and a successful program of research and publication,

D. candidates for a second reappointment must have completed the requirements for the Ph.D,

E. reasonable progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure.

2. A candidate for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure is expected to demonstrate:

A. high quality teaching and advising,

- B. a minimum research and publication quantity of five refereed articles in professional journals of acceptable standing, all judged as sufficiently high quality by the Peer Committee based on various measures including the written comments made by external reviewers.
  - C. a program of scholarly activity that holds promise of continuing achievement, and
  - D. an appropriate level of service
3. A candidate for promotion to the rank of professor is expected to demonstrate:
- A. high quality teaching and advising,
  - B. a minimum research and publication quantity of twelve articles in refereed professional journals of acceptable standing over the candidate's career, with at least five accepted for publication while at associate rank, all judged as sufficiently high quality by the Peer Committee based on various measures including the written comments made by external reviewers.
  - C. an appropriate level of service,
  - D. evidence of national and/or international recognition will constitute an important consideration for promotion to full professorship.
4. A candidate for tenure appointed at the rank of associate professor, but without tenure, is expected to demonstrate:
- A. high quality teaching and advising,
  - B. a level of research and publication assessed by the Peer Committee as equivalent to at least a combined total of five articles in refereed professional journals of acceptable standing, all judged as sufficiently high quality by the Peer Committee based on various measures including the written comments made by external reviewers, during the periods: (1) credited towards tenure, and (2) while at associate rank at the University of Maine,
  - C. a program of scholarly activity that holds promise of continuing achievement, and
  - D. an appropriate level of service.
5. A candidate for promotion to the rank of professor appointed at the rank of associate professor, but without tenure, is expected to demonstrate:

- A. high quality teaching advising,
- B. a minimum research and publication quantity of twelve articles in refereed professional journals of acceptable standing over the candidate's career, with at least five accepted for publication while at associate rank, all judged as sufficiently high quality by the Peer Committee based on various measures including the written comments made by external reviewers, during the periods: (1) credited towards tenure, and (2) while at associate rank at the University of Maine
- C. an appropriate level of service,
- D. evidence of national and/or international recognition will constitute an important consideration for promotion to full professorship.