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I. Procedures for Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty (Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure):

1. The department chair shall notify the faculty member under review of the evaluation procedures and timetable in accordance with the AFUM agreement and the university faculty policy.

2. The chair shall appoint a Peer Review Committee which consists of 3 tenured faculty members from the department, taking into consideration the recommendation from the faculty under review. The committee will select a chair to coordinate the review process.

3. The faculty member under evaluation shall follow the AFUM-approved evaluation guidelines and timetable to have her/his complete presentation materials (narratives and supporting documents) available to the peer committee.

4. For tenure and promotion decision, the faculty member under review will provide to Peer Committee and the Dean by September 15th the names and contact information of up to 6 external experts who are qualified to evaluate the faculty’s scholarly work. The faculty member needs to coordinate with the Peer Committee Chair, the Deans Office and the External Reviewers to provide external review letters to the Peer Committee in accordance with USM faculty policy.

5. Peer review shall follow the evaluation criteria outlined below (see II) which cover 3 areas of consideration: teaching, scholarship and professional service. The member under review shall have the opportunity to address the committee to present his/her case.

6. Upon completion of the review process, the Peer Committee Chair shall prepare a detailed written evaluation which should be approved and signed by all committee members. The faculty under review shall have an opportunity to respond to the evaluation outcome and provide her/his written comments which will be attached to the Peer Committee’s evaluation document.

7. The packet of the faculty under review, complete with all the evaluation and support documents, shall be forwarded to the Dean for final action.

II. Criteria for Faculty Performance Evaluation

Recommendations regarding reappointment, tenure and promotion within the Department shall be based on accomplishment in three areas: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. It is acknowledged that at different points in a faculty member's career, the distribution of academic activities and achievement across the three categories may vary substantially. However, the cumulative record should demonstrate substantial accomplishments in all three categories. To be recommended for tenure, a faculty member must have made significant academic achievement that contributes to the advancement of the department and must have demonstrated capability and productivity as an independent researcher. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, the faculty member must have a strong record of sustained and nationally recognized contributions to his or her discipline.

1. Teaching
   The facets of teaching that are deemed important by the department include the following: remaining current in the sub-disciplines that the faculty member is responsible for teaching; developing lecture, laboratory, and/or seminar courses that are well-organized and challenging and that provide students with knowledge and skills appropriate to contemporary graduate-level education; and mentoring students through their development and execution of scientifically sound original research.

In judging teaching effectiveness major consideration will be given to course quality, student evaluation and peer evaluation.
a. Course quality. Course syllabus, instruction materials, assignments and examinations will be evaluated for their quality, appropriateness and the instructor’s effort in keeping content current.

b. Student evaluation. Evaluation results (scores and written comments) generated from standard course evaluation questionnaires distributed by the university and student comments in letters are acceptable for consideration.

c. Peer evaluation. Peers shall make class visits to judge the pedagogy skills and class management ability of the faculty under review. Written evaluation based on the visit shall be signed by the peers and made available to the faculty under review.

2. **Scholarship**

   The evaluation shall consider overall achievements in a wide range of scholarly activities that gain recognition in the field of the faculty under review. Specific expectations are listed below with the realization that successful faculty members need not excel in all categories at the same level.

   a. Accomplishments in the area of research are reflected by the reports of original research investigations published in peer-reviewed biomedical journals and/or in peer-reviewed general scientific journals;

   b. Presentations of original research at national and regional meetings of major scientific organizations;

   c. Procurement of funding for research via grants and contracts from public agencies and/or major private foundations

   d. Reviewing of scientific papers for publication in professional journals

   e. Reviewing of grant applications for major funding agencies.

3. **Service**

   Faculty are expected to make their contribution to the academic operation of the university—within and outside the department—and to provide professional service to the public.

   a. Within the department, faculty shall participate in faculty meetings and volunteer for committee assignments. They are encouraged to assume a leadership role in departmental activities which could include serving as chair, curriculum development, student recruitment, research facility management and educational outreach.

   b. Faculty shall make contributions to academic programs outside of the department by representing the department in committee work and other campus-wide events. They are encouraged to serve in university government, facilitating university’s advancement.

   c. Outside the university, faculty shall use their expertise and experience to serve the needs of the local community and public in general. Examples include collaborations between the University and other educational institutions (K-12, technical colleges, other colleges and universities), private research institutions, the public sector in Maine and beyond, and area businesses; and provision of uncompensated consultation in the faculty member’s area of expertise

III. **Post-tenure review**

   The review criteria in Section II will be applied to post-tenure review in accordance with USM faculty policy and AFUM agreement. The faculty under review shall demonstrate cumulative achievements in all three categories of Teaching, Research and Service, at a level appropriate for her/his rank.
VI. Review of non-tenure-track research faculty

Non-tenure-track faculty including fixed length research faculty will be reviewed using similar criteria in Section II, but with different emphasis on the three areas of Teaching, Research and Service, depending on the job description of the position which shall be specified during appointment. Within ~3 months following the appointment (initial or reappointment, whichever appropriate), the AMS faculty supervising the research faculty shall develop a review plan for the appointee, complete with a review criteria document and the assembly of a Peer Committee consisting of 3 experts within or outside the department. The review plan shall consider inputs from the research faculty; the review process shall follow USM policy for fixed-length faculty and AFUM regulation.