

Criteria for Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Maine

Approved by the department Jan. 2023; revised March 2023

Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost 03.28.23

1. Introduction

This document establishes criteria and guidelines by which faculty in the Department of Mathematics & Statistics will be evaluated for purposes of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post tenure / just cause protection review. Such evaluations will be undertaken in accordance with the guidelines established in the contract agreement between the University of Maine System and the Associated Faculties of the Universities of Maine (AFUM).

The mission of the Department of Mathematics & Statistics encompasses all areas of the mathematical sciences: pure and applied mathematics, statistics, and mathematics education. It is to provide:

- *effective teaching in the mathematical sciences to the students of the University of Maine by means of rigorous and intellectually stimulating curricula,*
- *professionally recognized scholarship in the mathematical sciences, and*
- *effective professional support – as mathematicians, statisticians, and educators – to the University, the State of Maine, and regional, national, and international organizations.*

2. Peer Committee Structure

In this document, “**permanent faculty**” means faculty with tenure or just cause protection. “**Probationary faculty**” means ongoing lecturers who have not yet attained just cause status, as well as untenured tenure-track assistant professors. All other full-time faculty will be referred to as “**fixed length faculty**”.

The Peer Committee shall consist of all full-time permanent faculty with the exception of the Department Chair, who should not participate in the Peer Committee's review process except to provide clarification of administrative matters or procedures relevant to the process, or other similar matters that the Peer Committee deems pertinent.

Subdivision of the Peer Committee for different situations is as follows.

- *Permanent Peers*. Membership consists of the entire Peer Committee. It is charged with conducting evaluations for the reappointment and post-just-cause reviews of lecturers and fixed-length faculty. It also handles certain other matters such as the evaluation of sabbatical requests from Lecturers.
- *Tenured Peers*. A subcommittee consisting of all full-time tenured members. It evaluates assistant professors for reappointment and promotion and associate professors for post-tenure reviews. It also handles any other matters for which holding tenure is appropriate, e.g., a sabbatical request from an Associate Professor, or approving credit towards tenure for a new hire.
- *Senior Tenured Peers*. A subcommittee consisting of all full-time tenured Professors. It conducts evaluations for the promotion of Associate Professors and post-tenure reviews of Professors. It also handles any other matters for which the rank of Professor is appropriate, e.g., a sabbatical request from a Professor.

We note that in certain circumstances such as faculty with joint appointments, other Peer Committee formulations may apply, and will be regulated in other documentation. In no circumstances shall a faculty member serve as part of their own review or the review of a family member. If a review committee has fewer than three members, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Peer Committee Chair, may invite one or more AFUM members of appropriate rank from outside the department to assist with the review.

Every two years the Peer Committee shall elect a member of Tenured Peers to serve as chair of the committee. If the elected chair is not a member of Senior Tenured Peers, the Senior Tenured Peers will elect one of their own who will chair meetings on any matters under that committee's purview. In the case that no Peer Committee member of appropriate rank is available to act as chair, the Peer Committee will solicit the participation of an AFUM member of appropriate rank to serve in the role. The

committee chair is a full voting member of the committee. The committee chair is responsible for the formation of subcommittees, and the compilation of evaluation reports except when the committee chair is the subject of the review. In such cases, the appropriate subcommittee will elect one of its members to serve as acting chair for that review.

The internal discussions and deliberations of the Peer Committee reviews are confidential. In particular, members will not discuss these communications with the faculty member being evaluated.

Peer Committee decisions are determined by a vote of the subcommittee performing the evaluation. A majority vote is necessary for a positive recommendation.

3. Evaluation Procedure

3.1. Introduction.

All permanent and probationary faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the AFUM contract, by the appropriate subdivision of the Peer Committee. Fixed-length faculty may also request to be evaluated; in such instances the Peer Committee Chair will convene an ad hoc subcommittee to conduct the evaluation.

Evaluations shall be based on an assessment of the faculty member's contributions to each area of the department's mission, using the criteria below. In the period during which the evaluation is conducted, the faculty member may request to meet with the committee or its chair to discuss their performance. After the Peer Committee completes its evaluation, the faculty member, if they so choose, will have one week to supply a written response addressed to the Department Chair which, if provided, would then be attached to the Peer Committee's evaluation.

3.2. Definitions of performance levels and evaluation criteria.

3.2.1. *Teaching.*

The Department of Mathematics & Statistics expects its faculty to conscientiously

promote learning and the appreciation of ideas in the mathematical sciences. A faculty member's teaching performance is rated as *effective* or *excellent* as follows. A rating of *ineffective* will be given if a faculty member's teaching performance fails to meet the criteria for effective teaching.

Effective: The primary criterion for *effective* teaching is instruction of high quality as evaluated by students and peers. Additional support for an evaluation rating of *effective* may include evidence listed below as evaluation factors.

Excellent: The rating of *excellent* is granted if instruction is of very high quality as evaluated by students and peers. The faculty member consistently presents challenging material in an engaging learning environment and serves as a role model for effective teaching practices. This rating should be supported by evidence from the additional teaching evaluation factors below.

Additional Teaching Evaluation Factors

- Evaluations of instruction by students.
- Mentoring students in scholarly work, e.g., capstone or thesis direction.
- Participation in workshops or conferences whose purpose is the improvement of the participants' teaching (as distinct from scholarship of pedagogy).
- Receiving or being nominated for awards for teaching or mentoring.
- Written reflections on the faculty member's teaching practices with concrete ideas for improving student learning; documented implementation of teaching practices designed to improve student learning.
- Documented discussion of teaching improvements with other instructors or teaching assistants.
- Having one's teaching and/or teaching materials observed and critiqued by peer faculty, and incorporating the feedback into one's teaching practice.
- Visiting other instructors to learn from their practice and/or offer critique.

Faculty being evaluated may present other teaching-related activities for the Peer Committee's consideration as evidence of effective and/or excellent teaching.

In each evaluation report, the Peer Committee will include information obtained from student evaluations of courses taught during the evaluation period. Average scores from questions about how clearly ideas were presented, the concern of the instructor for the

quality of teaching or learning, and the overall instructor rating will be presented in the evaluation letter. Other questions may also be included at the discretion of the committee. At least two members of the Peer Committee shall read the signed student comments and provide a written narrative summarizing the overall tenor of the comments and addressing specific concerns or praiseworthy points. The Peer Committee letter will also summarize any other teaching evaluation factors, including, in the case of evaluation of probationary faculty, reports from classroom observations.

3.2.2. *Scholarship.*

In this document, “mathematical scholarship” and “scholarship in the mathematical sciences” refer to the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge in mathematics education, statistics, pure mathematics, or applied mathematics.

The expected primary outlet for faculty members to express their scholarship is through the publication of their work in peer-refereed journals. The faculty member being reviewed shall present appropriate evidence to indicate the stature of the journals in which they have published, and the peer committee shall take this into consideration in forming their opinion on the same. In the case of co-authored publications, the faculty member should give some indication as to their role in the research and writing process.

A faculty member’s performance is rated *recognized* or *excellent* as follows. A rating of *unrecognized* will be given if a faculty member’s scholarship does not meet either set of criteria.

Recognized: Mathematical scholarship of high quality as recognized by peers both in the University and in the professional community outside the University. Evidence of recognized scholarship must include activity as listed under the primary evaluation factors below, and can be supported by activities listed under secondary evaluation factors.

Excellent: Creative mathematical scholarship of very high quality as recognized by peers both in the University and in the professional community outside the University. This scholarship shall be recognized nationally and internationally. Evidence of excellent scholarship goes beyond recognized scholarship by the inclusion of substantial activity from the primary evaluation factors given below, and by demonstrating the faculty member’s ability to independently conduct all

phases of the research process (leading to scholarly output such as publications, grant proposals, etc.) without over-reliance on mentors.

In the list below, the Peer Committee will consider as “published” an article that has been accepted for publication with no further revisions required. Faculty being evaluated may present (with justification) other scholarly accomplishments not listed below for the Peer Committee’s consideration as evidence of recognized and/or excellent scholarship.

Primary Scholarship Evaluation Factors

- Publication of mathematical scholarship in peer-refereed journals recognized by experts in the field.
- Publication of mathematical scholarship in peer-refereed conference proceedings, book chapters, or similar volumes. For such papers (i.e., those not appearing in regular research journals), the faculty member is advised to provide evidence to the Peer Committee as to the relative prestige of the venue.
- Publication of advanced surveys and/or monographs in the mathematical sciences through well-respected national/international publishing companies.
- Receiving external funding to support scholarly work in the mathematical sciences. In case of co-PI status, the faculty member should give some indication as to their percentage of responsibility, and their role in writing the grant proposal.

Secondary Scholarship Evaluation Factors

- Publication of peer-refereed scholarship outside the mathematical sciences, with relevance to the mathematical sciences. (For example, this could include statistical work on scientific papers outside the mathematical sciences.)
- Presentations at conferences/workshops/meetings/colloquia in the mathematical sciences.
- Receiving or being nominated for research awards.
- Submission of grant proposals to agencies external to the University of Maine System for funding to support scholarly work.
- Peer-refereed publication of mathematical problems/solutions in well-known periodicals like the *American Mathematical Monthly*.

- Published expository texts/articles in the mathematical sciences. Examples would include textbooks and basic survey articles.
- Receiving funding from within the University of Maine System to support scholarly work.

3.2.3. *Professional Engagement (for Lecturers).*

Scholarship is not required of lecturers, but the department does expect and encourage some professional engagement beyond classroom teaching and service. This encompasses efforts to improve teaching by engaging with the broader teaching community, and all forms of mathematical scholarship. Examples of professional engagement may include but need not be limited to:

- Participation in university-run programs or workshops of relevance to the nature of the faculty member's appointment.
- Participation in or organization of other seminars/conferences/workshops of relevance to the nature of the faculty member's appointment.
- Applying for funding (whether internal or external to the University) for a project related to furthering the educational or outreach aspects of the Department's mission.
- Involvement with students in projects of a mathematical nature outside the context of usual coursework (e.g. advising a student on a capstone project).
- Any of the primary or secondary evaluation factors for scholarship.

Faculty being evaluated may submit (with justification) other activities for the Peer Committee's consideration as evidence of professional engagement. It is acceptable for certain activities to be considered as evaluation factors for both teaching and professional engagement.

3.2.4. *Service.*

All faculty are expected to constructively participate in department meetings and those committees essential to the functioning of the department on which they are eligible to serve. A faculty member's performance in service is rated *effective* or *excellent* as follows. The rating of *ineffective* will be given if a faculty member's service does not

meet either set of criteria.

Effective: Conscientious and effective professional involvement in support of the academic and non-academic endeavors of the students, department, university, profession, and/or public. Evidence of effective service shall include activity as listed under the evaluation factors below.

Excellent: Professional involvement of exceptionally high quality and impact. Evidence of excellent service shall include substantial activity as listed under the evaluation factors below.

Service Evaluation Factors

- Effective performance in a major role of departmental responsibility: Department Chair, Associate Chair, Peer Committee Chair, Graduate Coordinator, Service Course Coordinator, Hiring Committee Chair.
- Service on hiring committees.
- Organization of the colloquium or student lectures.
- Recording minutes of department meetings.
- Support and training of teaching assistants and/or MLA's.
- Participation in departmental peer review.
- Advising Pi Mu Epsilon or other student organizations.
- Other activity or committee work that enhances the quality and functioning of the department/university/profession, including but not limited to: academic advising of students, involvement with the Math Lab, oversight of departmental graders, organizing student mathematics contests, course coordination, curriculum development.
- Service on College, University, or System committees
- Consulting of a professional nature.
- Lecturing to public forums on topics related to mathematics or statistics.
- Public service and outreach. Examples include judging K-12 STEM contests, work to increase the participation of underrepresented groups in mathematics or statistics, volunteering for a quantitative literacy organization, etc.
- Serving on thesis committees.
- Reviewing and/or refereeing of papers.

- Reviewing grant proposals for funding agencies.
- Editorship of journals.
- Service to professional societies and conferences.
- Assistance to academic programs outside the department.
- Organizing or helping to administer seminars/conferences.
- Receiving or being nominated for a service award.

The dates of service for each item should be documented by the faculty member. For example, the date of each referee report that was submitted during the period of review should be given.

4. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

4.1. Lecturer.

For initial appointment as Lecturer in the department, an individual shall have a graduate degree at the master's level or higher in mathematics, statistics, mathematics education, or a closely related area, along with the experience to indicate potential for excellence in teaching mathematics and/or statistics.

As described in the union contract, lecturers are evaluated for reappointment during their first six years of service (discounted by any prior years of credit toward just cause status awarded at the time of hire for previous service to the University of Maine). If reappointment is granted in the sixth year for a seventh year of service, then the lecturer is promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, and from that point forward has just cause protection, and is no longer subject to reappointment.

In each reappointment cycle, the Peer Committee shall evaluate the lecturer and assign a rating in teaching, service, and professional engagement for that period. As part of this evaluation, two or more members of the committee will observe the faculty member's teaching and review their course materials. For reappointment, a lecturer must normally exhibit **excellent** teaching, **effective** service, and **some evidence** of professional engagement. Leeway may be granted to a new Lecturer in the first two years; for instance, reappointment in the second year of service may be recommended even if teaching is merely effective, if there is sufficient evidence of growth toward excellence, along with indication that further improvement is likely.

4.2. Assistant Professor.

For initial appointment as Assistant Professor in the department, an individual shall have a doctoral degree in mathematics, statistics, mathematics education, or an equivalent field.

In each reappointment cycle, the Peer Committee shall evaluate the assistant professor and assign cumulative ratings in teaching, scholarship, and service for the period since the time of hire. In addition, the committee will provide a narrative assessment of the cumulative progress towards tenure. As part of the evaluation, two or more members of the committee will observe the faculty member's teaching and review their course materials. In evaluating scholarship, the Peer Committee will judge the quality of the work, informed in part by the prestige of the venue(s) in which it is published. Published work with a formal electronic or print publication date prior to the start date of the candidate's tenure-track appointment will not be considered in the reappointment process. Work that was already completed or submitted prior to that date will normally not receive as much weight as work completed after that time.

As an assistant professor progresses towards tenure, the Peer Committee will expect them to demonstrate the ability to conduct all aspects of the research process that leads to scholarly output such as peer-reviewed publications or successful grant proposals. This autonomy may be demonstrated by publication of single-authored papers, papers with student coauthors, or having equal partnership collaborations leading to co-authored publications (rather than over-reliance on co-authorship with research mentors). In case of co-authorship, the faculty member should describe their particular contributions to published work. Collaborations where the faculty member's contribution is marginal will carry less weight.

In order to be reappointed, an assistant professor must demonstrate **effective** (or better) teaching and service, and **recognized** (or better) scholarship. In the event the Peer Committee does not consider that adequate progress is being made towards promotion and tenure, then they may recommend against reappointment on those grounds even if the standard for **effective** or **recognized** work, respectively, has been met.

4.3. Associate Professor with tenure.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, **recognized** scholarship, **effective** teaching, and **effective** service are required. Furthermore, the individual shall have demonstrated the necessary **growth toward becoming excellent** in teaching and scholarship, the latter as regarded by peers in the academic discipline both in the department and external to the University.

Publications with a formal electronic or print publication date prior to the start date of the candidate's tenure-track appointment (adjusted back the appropriate number of years if credit towards tenure is used) will not receive consideration. **Within this time frame, the successful applicant will have accumulated a substantial body of published work, and provided compelling evidence of ongoing productivity and strong potential for future productivity.** A recommendation for tenure conveys that the committee believes that the candidate has met the above criteria and will sustain activity in these areas over the course of their career. A majority of the votes from *Tenured Peers* shall be in favor of granting tenure in order for a recommendation for tenure to be given.

4.4. Early Tenure.

Early tenure is the process of awarding tenure and promotion to assistant professors based on fewer than five full years of service (including any years of credit towards tenure). Assistant professors wishing to apply for early tenure and promotion must meet all of the usual criteria for teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, they must demonstrate exceptionally broad national and/or international recognition of their work, as substantiated by measures that may include significant national awards for teaching and/or scholarship, invitations to speak at prestigious conferences or institutions, frequent citation of their work, or a publishing and/or teaching record beyond that required of a typical successful applicant. Those considering early tenure should be aware that only one tenure decision by the Board of Trustees is allowed.

4.5. Professor.

Although there is no mandated time-frame, candidates for Professor normally serve at

least five years at the rank of Associate Professor before initiating the promotion process by notifying the Department Chair. The candidate will have a substantial post-tenure publication record and receive excellent assessments of that record from external reviewers. It is also expected that service to the university and department will have increased, with a greater emphasis on service and leadership than would be expected from an untenured faculty member. A majority of the votes from the *Senior Tenured Peers* shall be in favor of granting promotion to Professor in order for a positive recommendation to be given. If unsuccessful, the candidate may apply again in a subsequent year.

For promotion to Professor the scholarly output since promotion to Associate Professor shall be **excellent** as regarded by peers in the academic discipline outside the University. The Professor's reputation among peers shall be national and/or international and, moreover, shall enhance the reputation of the University of Maine. In the categories of teaching and service, the candidate must, at a minimum, be rated as **effective**, with an **excellent** rating in at least one of these areas.

4.6 Fixed Length Faculty.

Evaluations of fixed length faculty will be handled as needed by an ad hoc subcommittee of the Peer Committee.

5. Post-Tenure and Post-Just-Cause Reviews

It is expected that all faculty will remain productive, participatory, and collaborative after receiving tenure or just cause protection. As required by contract, the Peer Committee will review each such faculty member every four years. The faculty member will submit documentation to the committee attesting to their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship (for tenured faculty), professional engagement (for lecturers), and service for the (roughly) four year period since the date of the previous review. The Peer Committee will conduct a review of the faculty member's work over the four-year period, and assign an overall rating of *not found satisfactory*, *satisfactory*, or *above satisfactory*, using the criteria outlined below.

5.1. Senior Lecturers and Principal Lecturers.

For an overall rating of **satisfactory**, it is necessary and sufficient that teaching and service be rated (at least) effective. A rating of **above satisfactory** is given to faculty members meeting the criteria for satisfactory who have had noteworthy success in one or more of the three areas (teaching, service, professional engagement). Excellence in any of the three areas (teaching, service, professional engagement) would of course be noted to support an above satisfactory rating, but excellence is not required to achieve this rating. Upon receiving their first satisfactory or above satisfactory evaluation, a Senior Lecturer will receive promotion to Principal Lecturer in accordance with the union contract.

5.2. Tenured faculty.

For tenured faculty, an overall rating of **satisfactory** is warranted if teaching and service are **effective** (or higher) and there is scholarship activity as exemplified in the evaluation factors. A rating of **above satisfactory** is given to faculty members meeting the criteria for satisfactory who have had noteworthy success in one or more of the three areas (teaching, service, scholarship). This should normally include some activity from the primary evaluation factors for scholarship. Excellence in any of the three areas would of course be noted to support an above satisfactory rating, but excellence is not necessary to achieve this rating.