

## **POLICY ON THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

Approved by the Provost's Council 4/2/97; reaffirmed 2/13/06

University Faculty Senate

Office of the Attorney General

Provost

President

### **I. PREAMBLE**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland (USM) established the principle of faculty evaluation in its policy on the Evaluation of Performance of Faculty (II - 1.20) and the principle of accountability for faculty workload and performance in its Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II - 1.25). To coordinate and implement these principles, as they apply to tenured faculty, the Board of Regents has required that each member institution shall establish a policy on the comprehensive review of tenured faculty, as well as procedures to implement such a policy.

This Policy Statement constitutes such principles and procedures for the University of Baltimore.

With the intent of facilitating continued professional development of the faculty, tenured faculty members shall undergo formal, periodic peer review of their professional activities. For the purposes of this policy, the term "faculty" shall be defined as tenured faculty and instructors or lecturers with job security.

The primary purposes of this periodic faculty review are to:

1. improve the quality of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship and service;
2. recognize long-term meritorious service;
3. increase opportunities for professional development; and
4. identify, if any, deficiencies in and impediments to faculty productivity and development, with a view toward facilitating improvement.

The review process described below shall be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the preservation of academic freedom. This review process is separate from and may not be substituted, directly or indirectly, for the USM and institutional policies and procedures relating to the termination of tenured appointments, which are in no way amended by this policy.

### **II. PROCEDURES**

#### **A. Timing of Review**

Faculty will be subject to this comprehensive review every five years, with the following exceptions:

1. Separate reviews mandated for promotion shall substitute for faculty review under this policy;
2. Two consecutive annual salary/workload reviews that indicate that a faculty member is materially deficient in meeting expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by this policy.

#### B. Unit of Review

1. The appropriate unit of review for the School of Law shall be the entire Law School faculty;
2. The appropriate unit of review within the College of Arts and Sciences shall be the divisions within the College.
3. The appropriate unit of review within the College of Public Affairs shall be the schools within the College.
4. The appropriate unit of review for the Merrick School of Business shall be the entire School of Business faculty.
5. The appropriate unit of review for librarians in the School of Law and in the Bogomolny Library shall be all librarian faculty.

#### C. Membership of Review Committee

1. Each faculty member's review committee shall be composed of tenured faculty within that member's unit of review;
2. The School of Law, the College of Public Affairs, the Yale Gordon College of Arts and Sciences, and the Merrick School of Business shall each determine the number of members and method of selection of all review committees within each school.

#### D. Method of Review

1. Each faculty member subject to review shall be notified in writing by May 1 of the previous academic year, by the School's Dean or Dean's designate.
2. Each faculty member under review shall supply, to the Review Committee, by October 1, a comprehensive written report, detailing, for the previous five years:
  - a. teaching, advising, and other educational activities;
  - b. research, scholarly, or creative activities; and
  - c. service to the School, University, and public and professional communities.

3. In addition to the faculty member's report, the review committee may consider other reliable sources of information, including, but not limited to: the faculty member's annual review by their immediate supervisor (dean or department chair), their annual personal faculty portfolio, classroom visitations, and student evaluations.

#### E. Review Committee's Report

The review committee shall give a written draft of the report to the faculty member under review by March 1.

1. The faculty member shall have fourteen days to give a written response to the committee, if he or she so wishes.
2. After giving consideration to the faculty member's response, the committee shall issue its final report by April 15, supplying a copy of the report to the faculty member and to the appropriate Dean and/or Department Chair.
3. The faculty member shall have fourteen days to give a formal written response to the committee's final report. Such response shall be appended to the committee's report.

#### F. Result of an Unfavorable Report

If a faculty member's performance is judged as not meeting expectations, a specific development plan shall be worked out among the dean, department/division chair, and the individual faculty member, consistent with the overall faculty development programs and resources of the University. This plan shall include a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals and shall be signed by all parties.

### III. POLICIES OF THE CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

- A. The College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Public Affairs, the School of Business, and School of Law shall each develop procedures, consistent with this policy, in order to carry out this system of periodic review within each school. The procedures for review of librarians shall be developed by the librarian faculty of the Bogomolny Library and the Library of the School of Law.
- B. Each constituent unit shall also develop specific criteria and expectations to assess faculty performance over time.
- C. All school/college and unit policies shall be filed with and approved by the dean and provost as required in section 3 of the BOR policy's Guiding Principles/Criteria.