

PEER COMMITTEE GUIDELINES
AND
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND/OR
TENURE

SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES

University of Maine

Orono, ME

November 1, 2006

Approved: Steven Sader, PRC Chair **Date:** November 1, 2006

I. Peer Committee Membership

A. Membership and Voting

A quorum of two-thirds of the voting members of the Peer Committee is required for decisions on promotion and/or tenure, sabbatical leave, or any other Peer Committee matters requiring a vote of its membership.

The Peer Committee of the School of Forest Resources (School) shall consist of all tenure-track faculty members in the School and non-tenure track faculty members as specified below. Decisions on inclusion of non-voting, non-tenure track faculty members on the Peer Committee will be made based on the majority vote of the tenure-track School faculty. The School Director or Acting Director shall be an *ex officio* committee member who does not participate in peer evaluations but whose role shall be to provide the committee with the informational resources they deem necessary. All other members of the Peer Committee (with the exceptions noted below) have the privilege of full participation in Peer Committee business, voting, and routine faculty member evaluations.

No member of the Peer Committee shall be present during evaluation of that member's spouse or other family member. No member of the Peer Committee shall vote on a promotion and/or tenure decision involving that member's spouse or other family member, or where a conflict of interest may exist. Only tenured faculty members may vote on promotion and/or tenure decisions and only those with the rank of Full Professor may vote on promotions to the rank of Full Professor.

B. Peer Committee Chair and Vice Chair

The Vice Chair of the Peer Committee shall be elected by a vote of the Peer Committee members for a one-year term. The Vice Chair automatically advances to the position of Chair the following year and serves for a one-year period in that position. The Chair has the responsibility to ask for candidates willing to serve as Peer Committee Vice Chair and to organize the election for the Vice Chair position.

The Peer Committee Vice Chair is responsible for keeping the notes of meetings and other administrative duties as appropriate

The responsibilities of the Peer Committee Chair include scheduling Peer Committee meetings as needed, convening the meetings, and making sure all agenda items are covered. Peer Committee members shall receive not less than 10 days notice for Peer Committee meetings at which decisions on promotion and/or tenure shall occur. For other Peer Committee meetings the Peer Committee Chair will strive to give all faculty members at least a one-week notice.

The Chair of the Peer Committee is responsible for making certain that evaluation, reappointment, and promotion letters are properly prepared, reviewed, and signed by the Peer Committee. The Peer Committee Chair is also responsible for submitting the letter and any documentation to the School Director prior to required deadlines. All Peer Committee members, as well as the faculty member being evaluated, shall receive a copy of the evaluation letter.

II. Responsibilities of the Peer Committee and the Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

A. Performance Evaluation

The Peer Committee shall complete an evaluation of the performance of faculty members in accordance with Article 10 of the Association of Faculty at the University of Maine (AFUM) Agreement. The purpose of the evaluation is to critique, in a supportive, positive fashion, demonstrated strengths and weaknesses of the individual's performance and to recommend, when needed, how improvement can be instituted. The evaluation goal is to enable each faculty member to become a more effective professional and thus enhance the School's productivity so that it might better meet its stated goals. The Peer Committee is responsible for reviewing the progress of each faculty member including the School Director and recommends reappointments, promotions, and/or tenure.

Since faculty members in the School have varied responsibilities and academic appointments, performance evaluation criteria will not be applied equally to all areas but instead will reflect the faculty member's duties and position description. Therefore, the School Director in consultation with the faculty member shall provide a written description of each faculty member's areas of responsibility and include duties and goals. These duties and goals in most cases will reflect the mutually agreed upon position description in force during the evaluation period. For split appointments, as indicated on the Employee Data Change Form, more weight will be given to performance in the area where the greatest percentage of the appointment lies. However, all faculty are required to participate to some degree in all areas associated with the University of Maine mission, i.e., teaching, research/creative works in discipline, and public service. It will be recognized that some faculty members have greater loads in some areas (teaching, research or public service) than others and the Peer Committee will consider this in tenure and promotion evaluations. However threshold levels of activity in all areas are required, and faculty members will be discouraged from overloading in one area with respect to their faculty appointments, particularly if such overload negatively impacts their ability to perform duties in other areas as prescribed in their position description.

The categories for evaluation in Teaching, Research and Public Service will be Excellent, Good, or Unsatisfactory. Written evaluations from the peer committee will be provided for all categories for each evaluation year. The intent of the written evaluations is to provide feedback to the faculty member for assistance as needed in improving their evaluation in the next cycle.

B. Evaluation Report Preparation and Evaluation Schedule

Peer evaluation reports completed by each faculty member will describe their activities for the evaluation period and how their responsibilities and objectives were met. Guidelines for tenure and promotion timetables, report preparation and application formats can be found at the UMaine (Office of Human Resources) web site: <http://www.umaine.edu/hr/>. It is the responsibility of all faculty members to provide an accurate and complete peer evaluation report for review by the Peer Committee at least two weeks prior to the evaluation date (6 weeks for faculty members coming up for promotion and/or tenure). This report will usually include accomplishments since the last review as outlined in “Section 3. Candidates Profile” of the UMaine Tenure and Promotion Format documentation that can be found at: <http://www.umaine.edu/hr/>. However, in the tenure and/or promotion review year documentation will include accomplishments over a longer time period. The latter is expected for promotion and/or tenure reviews.

Peer evaluations will proceed every four years for tenured faculty members. Assistant Professors and other faculty members who teach or conduct research within the School are reviewed annually. The deadline for completion of routine evaluations will fall approximately on November 10 of each year. However, the evaluation deadlines for probationary faculty members and promotion and/or tenure recommendations are established by AFUM contract (Articles 7 and 9) and will be given priority over other evaluation deadlines in the year for promotion or tenure evaluation. The faculty member under review, in the year of a tenure and/or promotion decision, will provide potential evaluator names to the Peer Committee for solicitation of letters of support internal and external to the University as outlined in the UMaine Tenure and Promotion Format. These names must be provided to the Committee at least 6 weeks prior to the evaluation by the Peer Committee. The Peer Committee is not restricted to requesting evaluations from the list of names provided by the faculty member under review.

Faculty members submitting applications for Tenure and/or Promotion must follow the UMaine Tenure and Promotion Format guidelines. For all other faculty members reviews a condensed form of this Format is requested and is outlined in Appendix A.

Evaluation is not required for faculty members whose appointments will cease (due to retirement or resignation) by the end of the current academic/fiscal year.

Faculty members are responsible for adhering to the prescribed format for peer evaluation reports and for the accuracy of the information in their reports. Improperly formatted or inaccurate reports may form a basis for rejection of the report if it constitutes either an early application for tenure or an application for promotion. If the improperly formatted or inaccurate report constitutes an on-time application for tenure, then the Peer Committee may return the report to the applicant for correction and resubmission within one week.

C. Annual Reappointment of Probationary Faculty members

Following the performance evaluation of each probationary faculty member, the Peer Committee shall advise the School Director of its recommendation regarding reappointment or non-reappointment for that faculty member in accordance with Articles 7 and 9 of the AFUM Agreement. The recommendation of the Peer Committee, although not binding on the School Director and College Dean, should be a major factor in their decisions to recommend or not recommend reappointment. A simple majority vote in favor will constitute the Committee's recommendation for reappointment to the Director. Lack of a majority in favor constitutes a recommendation not to reappoint. All members of the Peer Committee participating in the report must sign the recommendation which may include both majority and minority views. A tally of the vote record without specific voter names must be included. The report must also include all names of the peer committee.

In order to be reappointed, a probationary faculty member should have demonstrated that progress towards satisfying the standards for tenure has been made. The varied nature of the School's missions and individual faculty member responsibilities preclude rigid and uniform performance standards for reappointment.

The Peer Committee's annual evaluations of probationary faculty will be sent to the Dean along with the School Director's recommendation concerning annual reappointment. For untenured faculty the School Director and/or Dean will review the Peer Committee's evaluation with the faculty member at that faculty member's yearly evaluation meeting. Other faculty members may have a similar evaluation at their request. In the case of review of the School Director, the Peer Committee Chair may also serve to provide evaluation council. Although this process does not guarantee a positive outcome for the tenure and/or promotion decision, it should allow sufficient time for adjustments to be made prior to the end of the probationary period.

D. Evaluation of Instructors

In accord with Article 8 of the AFUM Agreement, Instructors shall be appointed as either tenure track or non-tenure track at the time of appointment. Those with tenure track appointments shall be evaluated in accord with the guidelines for tenure track candidates as described in this document.

Instructors without tenure or tenure track appointments shall be evaluated every two years using the same criteria as tenured or tenure track applicants with regard to teaching, research and service.

E. Tenure and/or Promotion

Granting of tenure to any tenure track faculty member will be in accordance with Article 9 of the AFUM Agreement. The tenure decision is the ultimate decision to reappoint. 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 probationary faculty member should have demonstrated that progress towards satisfying the standards for

tenure has been made. Any concerns about a faculty member or his/her program noted by the Peer Committee in the years leading up to a tenure and/or promotion decision should have been addressed and rectified prior to making the tenure decision. 'Good' annual evaluations in themselves do not guarantee the awarding of tenure. Only those faculty members who have demonstrated a high degree of competence in carrying out their responsibilities will be recommended for tenure by the Peer Committee.

The Peer Committee must be instructed of any tenure and/or promotion actions by the School Director by the date stipulated under the current AFUM agreement (Article 9), and the Peer Committee recommendation must be forwarded to the School Director and faculty member by the subsequent AFUM defined date. These dates will also be found at the University's web site for Tenure and/or Promotion Format: <http://www.umaine.edu/hr/>. All members of the Peer Committee present during the evaluation must sign the recommendation, which may include both majority and minority views, and a record of the vote must be included. Dissenting opinions can also be submitted if signed by dissenting faculty members

Faculty members applying for full professor or early tenure may withdraw their package at any time during the deliberations.

Prior to submission for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, a probationary faculty member should:

1. Have completed the terminal degree in his/her discipline.
2. Have demonstrated a high degree of competence, as judged by the Peer Committee, in his/her professional activities that address the responsibilities of the position and the mission of the School. In addition the faculty member in the year prior to application, must have peer ratings of excellent in the categories specified in the position description (at least two of the three categories of teaching, research, and public service). For split appointments, as indicated on the Employee Data Change Form, more weight will be given to performance in the area where the greatest percentage of the appointment lies. An unsatisfactory rating in any category in the year the faculty member is being reviewed for promotion will result in the faculty member not being considered for promotion.
3. Have demonstrated a teaching ability that stimulates in students a genuine desire for scholarly work, that draws on current developments in their field of science, and that embraces progressive methods of instruction.
4. Possess a reputation for making creative contributions to scholarship in his/her field and, where applicable, should possess the ability to direct the research of graduate students.
5. Meet the specific criteria as outlined in the section 'Performance Evaluation' below.

To be considered for promotion to Professor, a faculty member should have maintained the above criteria for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor and also:

1. Have consistently demonstrated a continued high degree of competence in performance in the fulfillment of the basic responsibilities of their position as defined in their current position description. In addition the faculty member should have peer ratings of excellent in the three categories of teaching, research, and public service.
2. Have statewide recognition as well as a regional, national, and international professional reputation among his/her peers to enhance the reputation of the University.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

I. INSTRUCTION

A. Teaching Load

Faculty members with teaching appointments are expected to participate in formal classroom instruction, academic advising, and other teaching-related activities. Field and laboratory, teaching experiences may be critical for quality instruction in many disciplines encompassed by the School.

The level of activity in teaching programs is expected to reflect the percent teaching appointment of the faculty member. As a general guideline, the School expects an academic-year, 100% teaching appointment to average 12 credit hours of formal instruction per semester. Adjustment of this general guideline is expected dependant upon a number of factors including course level, number of students in the class, and whether a laboratory or field experience is offered. Other factors to be considered include the number of advisees a faculty member oversees, the number of graduate students advised, and whether these students are MS level or PhD. The number of advisees may be an important factor when programmatic demands require heavy advisee loads on specific faculty members. However, the School Director is expected to balance advisee loads whenever possible, and a faculty member will not be penalized for having low advisee numbers when the issue is beyond his/her control. Specific teaching expectations for each faculty member vary and reflect programmatic needs, expectations upon hiring, administration, research, University service, and public service.

B. Evaluation Reports for Teaching Performance Evaluation

The specific format for Peer review can be found in Appendix A of this document.

C. Broad Goals for Teaching Effectiveness Considered in Evaluations

The specific format for Peer review can be found in Appendix A of this document. The broad goals for teaching effectiveness are listed below and may also be viewed in Appendix B:

1. Knowledge in the Field is demonstrated by evidence that the faculty member has kept up with current developments in the area of expertise (e.g. scholarly writing, regularly attending professional meetings, taking part in workshops/symposia and short-term team projects, and remaining current in the literature of one's discipline) and that course content reflects such activity.
2. Classroom Effectiveness is demonstrated by evidence that the faculty member meets the course objectives outlined in the syllabus. Faculty members are expected to vary teaching techniques and the style of presentation when appropriate to ensure that the educational objectives of the course are met. Interaction with students during and outside

class periods should demonstrate a respectful and caring attitude toward students' opinions and problems. The faculty member under review or the Peer committee may request that a senior faculty member provide direct observation of teaching performance. If the faculty member under review agrees to observation the written evaluation of performance will be given to the faculty member being observed. It will be included with the faculty member's documentation at the discretion of the faculty member.

3. Laboratory Instruction is a valuable tool that can be used to reinforce and illustrate principles of theory presented in the classroom. Laboratory exercises must involve current techniques to take full advantage of this different method of teaching. Properly designed and presented laboratory exercises can at once solidify students' grasp of theory and encourage further inquiry.

4. Class Preparation is essential to classroom or laboratory effectiveness. Faculty members are expected to maintain a level of organization and preparedness that allows course objectives to be met at a reasonable pace.

5. Course and Curriculum Development should reflect the faculty member's contribution to School educational goals. Courses developed should be at a level of difficulty that challenges the best students, yet not be beyond the abilities of most students.

6. Exams and Grading should reflect the principles and objectives for the portion of the course material being tested. Generally graded exams should be returned within one week.

7. Student Advising and Activities constitute the portion of time spent while interacting with students outside of the classroom. The faculty member is expected to be available for personal consultation at announced times and places. These periods of personal attention are important in the growth and intellectual development of all students. The faculty member is expected to demonstrate the same caring attitude used in the classroom. Advising consists of giving accurate information on curricular and other University requirements and helping the student choose electives that maximize intellectual growth in the University setting. Faculty should participate in and support student activities that foster a good learning environment.

8. Graduate Student Advising carries unique responsibilities and rewards for a faculty member involved in research and graduate education. As the major thesis advisor, a faculty member has a commanding influence on the development of the professional-in-training. A graduate student's advisor should serve as mentor, advocate, teacher, and role model. The major advisor plays a strong role in the student's successful completion of the project and in the quality of the work accomplished. Faculty must take seriously their responsibilities in graduate education and demonstrate a record of success in this professional activity.

II. RESEARCH OR CREATIVE WORKS IN DISCIPLINE

A. Research Load

Faculty members with research appointments are expected to pursue a vigorous research program in their area of expertise and to address the areas of responsibility described in their position description, unless otherwise approved by the School.

The level of research activity is expected to reflect the percent research appointment for each faculty member. Responsibilities and the balance between basic research, and applied research activities vary widely by necessity among School faculty. Expectations for faculty members with split appointments between research and other duties (administrative, teaching, and/or service) should be reduced proportionately to reflect the nature of the appointment.

B. Evaluation Reports for Research Performance Evaluation

The specific format for Peer review can be found in Appendix A of this document; however, materials to be submitted for each review period should include:

- Percent research appointment
- A statement of research duties, goals, and accomplishments
- Publications and creative works (e.g. refereed journals, bulletins, books, book chapters, patents, abstracts, etc.), specifying joint authorship where applicable
- Grants submitted and awarded, including:
 - Co-investigators
 - Project title
 - Organization or agency
 - Requested funds (indicate distribution, if multi-PI)
 - Status (funded, not funded, pending; if funded indicate amount of award and any changes in distribution of funds and responsibilities)
- Research meetings/seminars/workshops attended, research presentations, meetings or symposia organized.
- Sabbatical leaves for research activities
- Scientific or scholarly visitations or sabbaticals sponsored
- DIC contracts or other consulting activity resulting in a scholarly public presentation, publication, or other scholarly work

- Prizes, etc.
- Other documentation of research activity (e.g. conferences, workshops, seminars attended, etc.)

C. General Criteria for Research Performance Evaluations

The general criteria for research performance are listed below and may also be viewed in Appendix B:

1. Knowledge in Field requires a thorough understanding of both basic and applied principles as well as current, state of the art techniques and methodology in the field of expertise and their application to the field of endeavor.

2. Program Development pertains to an individual faculty member's ability to organize a coordinated research program with a well-defined focus. Planning and organization of a program includes identifying a problem, anticipating the requirements necessary for its solution, and disseminating the results through appropriate channels. As a Maine Agricultural and Forest Experiment Station (MAFES) scientist, research is expected to address problems of importance to the nation, and most importantly to Maine. Faculty members are encouraged to seek research grants that complement their MAFES projects. Release time should be included in grant requests where the research for the grant does not build upon the faculty member's current MAFES project(s) objectives. Regular communications through meetings and correspondence with colleagues working on similar problems, as well as communications with potential users of research results, is encouraged.

3. Publications, Papers, and Creative Works and Communications in the Discipline. Publications and creative works can be judged as a pattern of achievement over time. Accordingly, the quality and number of publications a faculty member could reasonably be expected to publish in refereed journals or bulletins during an extended period depends on the type of appointment or percent of time designated to research, and the nature of the research. Quality is considered in determining the significance of a faculty member's performance with regard to publications and other vehicles of communication. Quality of performance is evaluated by factors such as (a) the reputation of the journals in which papers are published, (b) the significance of individual contributions to a scientific field or identified information need, (c) the reputation of meetings or symposia where papers are presented, and (d) recognition by scientists in the faculty member's field. A faculty member on a 100% research appointment should average a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications per year (or the equivalent in the judgment of the Peer Committee) for a 'good' rating. The expectation is that an untenured faculty member with a 50% research appointment (the norm for the School) must at a minimum have 6 refereed publications or the equivalent, in the judgment of the Peer Committee, for evaluation at the time of evaluation for tenure or promotion. Faculty members being evaluated for tenure or promotion must also have demonstrated a level of grant activity, professional

presentation activity, and other scholarly activity as outlined in Appendix A of this document. Faculty members are urged to exceed these minimum guidelines, and must do so for an excellent rating. Promotion and/or tenure are not based solely on publication number. Faculty members are expected to continuously engage in communications other than publications in refereed journals. Such communications may include publishing in MAFES publications, other scholarly publications, presentation of papers before professional societies, presentation of research progress reports and final reports, newsletters, participation in state and federal initiatives, and attending/presenting School seminars (undergraduate and graduate).

III.SERVICE

A. Service Load

All School faculty members are expected to participate in the University of Maine's service mission. Each University faculty member is expected to dedicate their professional expertise and some portion of their time to serve the needs of professional organizations, the University, the School, and the public; especially the Maine public. The service activities of faculty members will vary widely depending on the nature of the position. Probationary faculty members should be especially careful in providing service, however, so that service responsibilities do not overwhelm their primary responsibilities in research and instruction. Service should be in the areas of the faculty member's expertise.

B. Evaluation Reports for Professional Activity and Public Service Performance

The specific format for Peer review can be found in Appendix A of this document; however, materials to be submitted for each review period should generally include:

- Percent service appointment and a summary of any formal administrative, service, and/or program coordinator responsibilities
- A paragraph describing service duties, goals, and accomplishments
- A list of professional affiliations, service to these organizations, and meeting attendance
- Summary of manuscript and proposal review
- Service to the University and School
- List of public service activities
- DIC activities where these activities may be considered to be of a service nature
- Other documentation of service

C. General Criteria for Professional Activity and Public Service Performance Evaluations

The general criteria for professional activity and public service performance are listed below and may also be viewed in Appendix B:

1. Contribution to Professional Groups includes membership in such groups, presenting papers on non-research topics, and promoting the group's welfare through activities such as membership recruitment, planning of meetings, serving as an officer, or chairing

meeting sessions. It is also demonstrated through activities such as editorial work on non-research publications, notes, and replies in professional journals.

2. School, College, Campus and University Assignments and Service involves membership on School, College and University committees. Effectiveness in efforts to satisfy this criterion is measured by quality of service and effective reporting to the School and/or other constituencies.

3. Staff Cooperation (intra- and inter-unit) is demonstrated by working productively with other faculty professionals. This includes colleagues within the School, College, University of Maine, and with external professionals. Broadly speaking, it consists of time spent consulting with others or in working on collaborative projects.

4. Public service may be demonstrated by documentation of professional involvement with non-university groups as a representative of the University. For simplicity, it could be considered as involvement in non-appointed extension activities for those faculty members lacking a formal Cooperative Extension appointment. This public service activity may involve assisting in problem solving on a case by case basis, and differs from a Cooperative Extension appointment in that it is not considered an on-going educational activity. Paid consulting may be considered public service for the purposes of School Peer Committee reviews. Paid consulting cannot be pursued when it limits the ability of the faculty to meet his/her normal School responsibilities including teaching, research and, especially, other public service activities expected. If the paid consulting results in scholarly publication or presentations it may be best listed under Research.

5. Professional Improvement is demonstrated by remaining professionally current via regularly attending professional meetings, taking part in workshops/symposia, and remaining current in the discipline through other outreach activities

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF PEER REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Faculty submitting documentation specifically in a year for promotion and/or tenure decisions must follow the guidelines and application format outlined by the University of Maine at: <http://www.umaine.edu/hr/>. For other peer review evaluation submissions the following more condensed format based on the University guidelines should be followed.

NAME, PRESENT RANK, COLLEGE/SCHOOL:

RANK/TITLE HISTORY:

Example:

Sept 1. 2001. Associate Professor with Tenure or Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor.

Sept 1. 1994. Appointed Assistant Professor

A. DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING (INCLUDING ADVISING)

Please note the percentage of your time devoted to teaching

- List the numbers and titles of courses you have taught including graduate courses. Include the average number of students in each course. Indicate those courses you teach regularly, those you have developed, and those you have substantially restructured. Note: This information is requested in the Table in Section IV at <http://www.umaine.edu/hr/forms/evalsheet.pdf>
You may attach and refer readers to that table.
- Identify any special teaching assignments or innovations, including grants submitted on behalf of academic programs, participation in teaching workshops, etc.
- Provide a concise description of your strategies and approaches in the advising process. e.g. Do you have regular meetings? How do you make contact with advisees that don't come to your office? How do you ensure that your advisees are meeting the General Education requirements? How many undergraduate students (majors, undeclared students, honors students) do you typically advise during the academic year? Include the results of any evaluations by your advisees.
- Provide a brief statement describing your recent advising commitments for honors theses, master's, and doctoral dissertation committees (if applicable). Provide evaluative information on your teaching of graduate students in the classroom and on your thesis advising (e.g., student evaluations, peer evaluations, administrative evaluations, presentations and publications of your students (if not listed in the research section of this application already.)

- A summary of qualitative and quantitative student evaluations must be included here. Individual student evaluation forms should not be included. . Please use the form titled Summary of Courses Taught and Student Evaluations (page 5 of the UMaine application guidelines). Results of narrative evaluations should be presented as concisely as possible. If evaluations are uncharacteristically poor for one course or one semester, please explain. If some of the courses were taught in collaboration with others, note the percentage of the course taught by you in the remarks column of the table.
- List teaching awards, if any.
- Provide a recent condensed syllabus for each course taught.

B. DOCUMENTATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Please note the percentage of your time devoted to research.

1. Publication and Creative Works

Provide a full bibliography of published work cited in the standard entry form used in your field. Please sort the publications by type and list, and peer reviewed and/or non reviewed (noting with an asterisk those that were refereed), under separate headings for articles, (include those in press and note refereed articles), books and monographs, textbooks, technical reports, reviews, published computer software, chapters, conference proceedings, published abstracts, edited publications, and miscellaneous publications. Each entry should note all authors, date of publication, and page numbers.

2. Professional Presentations

List unpublished papers authored by you, delivered at professional conventions and before professional groups, noting with an asterisk those that were refereed. Indicate those for which you were the presenter. Invited talks may also be included in this section.

3. Other Scholarly Activity

- List professional organization memberships and activities, including offices held and committee memberships.
- List international, national and regional meetings attended and sessions chaired.
- List your service in reviewing papers submitted for publication, grant proposals, and/or service as a member of a review panel.
- List any other scholarly activity that you believe would support your candidacy for tenure and/or promotion.

C. DOCUMENTATION OF RESEARCH/TRAINING GRANTS

List grants, contracts, or fellowships for which you have applied and indicate those awarded, including agency name, date applied, and disposition. (Please include the dollar amounts of all proposals funded and unfunded.)

D. DOCUMENTATION OF SCHOOL/CAMPUS/COLLEGE SERVICE

Provide information about your contributions to School, college, and University affairs, including committee membership, and advising student organizations. Identify the group, activity, and date.

E. DOCUMENTATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE

List both compensated and uncompensated public service activities that utilize your professional expertise. Do not include service rendered in the role of a citizen. Include dates for each activity listed. (Particular emphasis should be given to service that contributes to the economy, culture, and quality of life of citizens of Maine, the region, and the nation.)

F. DOCUMENTATION OF SPECIAL RECOGNITION/AWARDS

List and comment on any prizes, special recognition, awards, or other honors you have won.

Deadline for Submission to Peer Committee by Faculty Member: (See UMaine guidelines and application format web site for specific date. Generally this will be on or around **October 1st** of each year).

APPENDIX B
TEACHING, RESEARCH AND PUBLIC SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS GUIDELINES

A. Teaching

Teaching is the primary mission of the University. Therefore, high quality teaching is expected of all faculty members and the development of a teaching portfolio should be encouraged.

Common teaching metrics include:

1. Maintenance of high academic standard for student performance.
2. Involvement in faculty development activities to improve teaching (attendance at workshops, seminars, or conferences on teaching; development of teaching skills in some manner that are brought to the classroom).
3. Evidence of efforts to develop new courses or revise and improve existing courses (course revisions, development of teaching aids, updates in course currency, etc.)
4. Development of teaching materials such as textbooks, workbooks, laboratory manuals and/or exercises, etc.
5. Quality and effectiveness of classroom teaching as demonstrated by student evaluations.
6. Quality and effectiveness of classroom teaching as demonstrated by peer evaluations when requested by a faculty member.
7. Demonstrated incorporation of modern technology into classroom teaching and student learning situations.
8. Authorship of proposals to obtain grants for teaching-related activities.
9. Successful direction of student's undergraduate research projects, special problems courses, internships or other scholarly activities.
10. Demonstrable evidence of excellence on standardized or normed tests.
11. Evidence of effective academic advisement and professional involvement with students in other out-of-class settings (clubs, organizations, field trips, etc.)
12. Receipt of awards for teaching.
13. Service as a teaching mentor to colleagues (conducting teaching workshops, presenting teaching-related seminars, mentoring new faculty members, etc.)

B. Scholarship and Professional Activity

Faculty members in the School are to be active scholars in their professional disciplines. Scholarly activity excellence may generally be demonstrated via publication in recognized, peer-reviewed outlets. Applied research publications in non-refereed outlets should be recognized as acceptable but do not carry the same level of credibility as refereed Journal publications. The order of authorship, first through last, and the contribution assigned to the faculty member under review in multiple-author papers, will reflect disciplinary norms.

1. Publication of original research results in professional journals. Authorship (or editorship, if applicable) of published scholarly books (including textbooks), book chapters, patents, computer software, peer reviewed technical reports or peer reviewed technical manuals.
2. Presentation of research results at professional meetings or conferences. This may include presentations given, session development, active participation in committees, meeting planning, etc. as opposed to attendance at a meeting.
3. Authorship (primary or co-investigator) of proposals to obtain grants for research-related activities.
4. Presentation of seminars or workshops related to research.
5. Reviews of journal articles, books, manuscripts, or grants proposals for external agencies.
6. Consulting or similar professional work with businesses, associations or governmental agencies that leads to identification and/or solution of real world problems. Written documentation (external whenever possible) of the nature, scope, and professional significance of the work must be provided.
7. Involvement in faculty development activities to improve research skills or competencies (attendance at workshop, seminars, or conferences on research; acquiring knowledge of new research techniques, training in how to run analytical equipment etc.)
8. Active involvement in professional organizations and societies related to the faculty member's area of expertise.
9. Evidence of successful progress in long-range research projects and programs which may include single or multiple foci.
10. Maintenance of successful research collaborations with colleagues internal or external to the University.
11. Receipt of awards and honors for scholarship or professional activity.

C. Service

Faculty members are expected to be involved actively in service to the School, the College, the University and the community. Service activities necessarily vary widely in scope but contributions are those in which the faculty member contributes his or her knowledge, time, and skills in work that betters the institution, the community or that strengthens the environment for the State's workers. Chairing, holding office, or otherwise directing or leading a committee, task force, organization, or activity group is more valuable than participation or membership alone.

Other metrics may include:

1. Involvement with University, or School committees or task forces ("University governance").
2. Involvement with community organizations, boards or activity groups.
3. Documented contributions to University or community betterment made by the faculty member as an individual.
4. Contributions of the faculty member's expertise to support the State's forestry or forest products infrastructure.
5. Assumption of leadership roles in service activities.
6. Receipt of awards and honors for service activities.