

# Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance Checklist

Per the University of Maryland Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance ([II-1.20\(A\)](#)), the Plan of Organization of each department and non-departmentalized College/School must include a plan to periodically review tenured faculty. The process involves peer review, and is intended to recognize long-term meritorious performance; improve quality of faculty efforts in teaching, scholarship, and service; increase opportunities for professional development; and uncover impediments to faculty productivity. The policy applies to tenured faculty members, as well as instructors and lecturers with job security.

**At the end of each item, please list the relevant section of the Plan that satisfies the requirement. If the requirement is not fully met, please indicate which elements are missing.**

## Required Elements

1. The Plan must require that each faculty member receive periodic reviews. These reviews:
  - a. May take the form of reviews associated with promotions or merit pay, contract renewals, or reviews of faculty administrators (in all of these cases, the policies associated with each type of review will take precedence).
  - b. Should have a major influence on the faculty member's future and rewards.
  - c. Must occur at regular intervals specified in the Plan.

**Section(s) addressing periodic reviews:**

**Section(s) describing the review interval:**

2. The Plan must require that the faculty member under review submit a written report addressing teaching, advising, and other educational activities; research, scholarly, or creative activities; and documented service activities.

**Section(s) describing the written report:**

3. The Plan must establish a review committee composed of the faculty member's peers. The committee is responsible for preparing a written appraisal of the faculty member's report. The composition of the faculty committee conducting the review should be set forth in the unit's Plan.

**Section(s) establishing review committee composition, duties:**

4. The Plan must ensure that the faculty member is given the review committee's appraisal and allowed to submit a written response. The response should be provided within 14 calendar days of the faculty member's receipt of the appraisal (or by an alternate deadline acceptable to the review committee). The unit should determine and define the criteria for satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance.

**Section(s) establishing appraisal, ability to provide a written response:**

**Section(s) describing how performance criteria are determined/defined:**

5. The Plan must describe the review portfolio, which shall at minimum include the faculty member's report, the review committee's appraisal, and the faculty member's response to the appraisal (if applicable). The review portfolio must be submitted to the unit administrator. The Plan should establish a deadline by which this submission must occur.

**Section(s) describing review portfolio, required elements, submission deadline:**

6. The administrator and faculty member must create a written development plan and timetable designed to improve the faculty member's performance.

**Section(s) describing development plan, timetable:**

7. The Plan must indicate that two consecutive periodic reviews that find a faculty member is materially deficient in meeting expectations necessitates an immediate comprehensive review.

**Section(s) describing mandated comprehensive review:**

8. Each faculty member must undergo a comprehensive review at least every 5 years. The procedures should also state how leaves (e.g., sabbatical, leave without pay, other), assignments (i.e., administrative), or other factors may impact the schedule.

**Section(s) establishing timeline for comprehensive reviews:**