

Page Title

Salisbury State University Policy on Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty

Introduction

Salisbury State University will use the following policies and procedures to implement the University of Maryland System's Policy on Comprehensive Review of tenured Faculty. Consistent with this policy SSU's policies are intended to complement the "faculty development program" and "to enhance the professional abilities of the faculty as teachers and scholars and members of the academic community." The policies are written to fulfill the requirements of the USM policy by providing guidelines that give departments flexibility over specific arrangements and procedures for the reviews.

Policies and Procedures

Five Year Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty Members

Every tenured faculty member at SSU shall undergo a comprehensive review of his or her performance every five years with approximately one-fifth of the tenured faculty undergoing a comprehensive evaluation each academic year. This review will examine the faculty member's performance for the previous five year period. Given their thorough review character and rigor reviews for tenure and promotion can be substituted for this comprehensive review. A comprehensive review can also be triggered prior to the five year period only if the department chair the dean and the provost find a faculty member "materially deficient" in complying with quantitative workload expectations ⁽¹⁾ in two consecutive workload-related annual reviews that are done regularly by the chair. ⁽²⁾

Departmental Role Peer Review and Criteria for Evaluation

Each academic department at SSU may employ the same review procedures and criteria for evaluation presently used in each department for the annual evaluations of tenured faculty at SSU. These procedures make use of an examination and evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the areas of instruction research and scholarship and service to the university and community. The kinds of activities and sources of information for a faculty member's performance can include but are not limited to the following:

Performance Category	Potential Information Sources
----------------------	-------------------------------

Teaching and Advising - - - - -	Course Syllabi Student Evaluations Instructional Planning Conferences Program Planning Department Meetings Classroom Observation Posted Advising Schedules Review of Advising Folders Incidents of Advisee Confusion Observation of Advising Conferences Involvement in student clubs and organizations
Professional Development - -	Participation in Campus Professional Development Activities Writing/Research Efforts and Creative Pedagogical Innovations Attendance at Conferences and Institutes Yearly Self-Evaluations
Service to the University and Community - -	Participation on Department Service and Campus Committees Support to Registration and Orientation Retention Activities Service to Schools businesses Service Agencies Artistic Contributions to Campus Community Involvement in Student Social Activities

An additional performance indicator that may be used in the five year evaluation is the workload review that is overseen by the department chair on an annual basis.

For the five year review provision must be made at the department level for some degree of peer review. The structure and size of such a peer review mechanism should be established by the department and agreed upon by the faculty member under review.

The faculty member under review will be the principle provider of the information for the comprehensive review. This need not exceed the submission of the annual self-evaluations of the previous five years. He or she will provide the reviewer(s) with the necessary information by February 1 of the year in which the review is to take place and the reviewer(s) shall provide a report to the faculty member by the same deadline as the annual review. As in the annual reviews the five year comprehensive review must be based on multiple sources of information.

Departmental policies must be filed with and approved by the dean of their respective schools and the provost of the University.

Uses and Consequences of the Comprehensive Review

As with the annual reviews the reviewer(s) shall submit the results of the comprehensive review to the faculty member the department chair and the dean. **Upon receipt of the review the faculty member should have ready access to the documents and reports that contributed to his or her review. The faculty member should also have a minimum of ten working days to respond formally to the review if he or she so desires. This could involve a written response or a formal hearing with the reviewers and the chair of the department.**

A faculty member may choose to use a favorable five year review for consideration in decisions on promotion merit pay or other awards such as SSU's annual Distinguished Faculty Award. The Administration shall review the rank and salary of each faculty member who undergoes the five year review and shall make upward adjustments and recommendations as necessary and as funds allow.

However if the peer evaluation concludes that the faculty member's performance fails to meet expectations then a specific faculty development plan must be worked out between the faculty member under review the peer reviewer(s) the department chair and the dean of the school. At his or her discretion the faculty member under review may choose a faculty colleague to participate in the development of this plan. The plan should address those elements of the review that were considered to be deficient in meeting expectations and make use of SSU's available resources both scholarly and financial for faculty development.

Given that the intention of this plan is to aid in the improvement of the faculty member's performance priority should be placed on fashioning a plan that facilitates the faculty member's growth and is amenable to the faculty member's preferences. Such a plan should be written and revised if necessary until mutual agreement between the reviewer(s) and the faculty member has been achieved. In the event an agreement cannot be reached the Faculty Development Committee will mediate a consensus.

The plan must also include "a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals." This procedure will include progress reports to the reviewer(s) at intervals of no less than one year unless a shorter interval is requested by the faculty member. Departments may wish to use SSU's annual evaluations as the benchmarks for the "fixed intervals" as required by the Regents' policy.

A faculty member under review who is dissatisfied with a plan that has emerged from this process retains the option of pursuing a grievance with the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty does not replace other SSU reviews of faculty performance.

Finally neither the Comprehensive Review process nor its results can be substituted for the existing USM policies regarding tenure and its termination. In this regard this review carries with it no greater weight than any other evaluation presently employed at Salisbury State University.⁽³⁾

Initial Implementation of Comprehensive Reviews

This plan will go into effect during the 1997-98 academic year with the first evaluations being conducted during the spring semester of 1998. Given that only one fifth of the faculty are to be evaluated in any given academic year evaluation of eligible tenured faculty will be conducted in phases until all tenured faculty who have not undergone a comprehensive evaluation tenure review or a promotions review within the last five years are evaluated. Faculty members who wish to undergo a comprehensive evaluation prior to the five year trigger can request and receive an earlier review.

The criterion for determining the sequence of evaluations will be seniority defined in this context as years passed since the granting of tenure or since one's last review for promotion. Those tenured faculty with the most years passed since either being granted tenure or since their last promotions review will be the first to undergo the comprehensive evaluation as outlined in this policy.

Implementation of this policy assumes that a faculty member deserves to know the evaluation criteria prior to the academic year during which those criteria are to be applied. Therefore for the purposes of the comprehensive review in which the last five academic years (1991-92 up through 1996-97) are relevant a faculty member must be evaluated only on the basis of the criteria that were in force during those academic years. New criteria post 1996-97 may be not applied retroactively to the most recent five year period.

Finally given that faculty members are primarily responsible for providing the bulk of the information for the evaluation they should be granted flexibility in the provision of information on their activities from the most recent five academic years. They must provide adequate information but cannot be required to supply information above and beyond that which was required to satisfy evaluation criteria applied in previous years.

1. This refers exclusively to the workload expectations as identified in section IV. Standard Workload Expectations of the BOR Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II.1.25) which addresses the ratio of time spent among the three areas of faculty responsibilities: teaching scholarship and community service.
2. This measure is referred to in the USM policy document as an "annual review." However this should not be confused with the SSU annual review that presently exists and is more comprehensive in scope.

3. As with other reviews this review can only contribute to a case for the termination of tenure of a faculty member if the reviewer(s) concluded that the tenured faculty member was found to have exhibited "...moral turpitude professional or scholarly misconduct incompetency or willful neglect of duty..." (**Salisbury State University Policy on Appointment Rank and Tenure of Faculty** Appointment of Faculty (3)(g) page 57 in the Faculty Handbook Salisbury State University 1994 Even then in itself this review would be wholly insufficient to lead to termination of a tenured faculty member.

Comments and questions about this page can be directed to the [Senate Webmaster](#).