

*University of Maryland
2011-2012 Guidelines for
Appointment, Promotion
and Tenure*



2011-2012 UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES MANUAL

The formal Policy and this manual are posted on the home page of the Office of Faculty Affairs at <http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies>. Please share the manual with faculty members of all ranks. Candidates for promotion may find it helpful in anticipating their own tenure reviews because it contains input from previous University APT Committees, the Provost, and President. Questions regarding APT guidelines and policies may be directed to the Office of Faculty Affairs (email: faculty@umd.edu or phone: 301.405.6803).

Section I of the manual lays out the structure of the APT process and offers useful definitions. Section II provides general instructions for assembling a dossier and carrying out reviews. Section III deals with specific types of dossiers, such as joint appointments. Section IV addresses final decisions, concerns, and appeals. Section V holds Appendices with tables, forms, sample letters and the University APT Policy.

This manual does not cover instructional, library, or research faculty, who follow other appointment and promotion processes, nor does it cover the search process for faculty positions.

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE APT PROCESS

This section includes instructions on:

- A. Sources of Information
- B. The Structure of Reviews
- C. Useful Definitions

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE APT PROCESS

A. Sources of Information

This manual contains three sources of information. **Discussion of the APT Policy (Appendix E), marked in bold, will be cited by line (e.g., APT Policy 453-459).**

Mandatory procedures for dossier preparation will be in default font. *Useful suggestions for the content of the dossier and review process will be printed in italics.*

B. The Structure of Reviews

Faculty members have their tenure homes in Departments, and Departments are combined into Colleges. Actions at both levels are governed by campus-wide policies, the most general level of organization; in keeping with the campus commitment to shared governance, advice about promotion and tenure at each of these three levels is provided by a faculty APT Committee and by an administrator. Hence, there are ordinarily six sets of recommendations to the President. The order of review is from the most specific level, the Department APT Committee and Chair, through the College APT Committee and Dean, to the Campus APT Committee and Provost. Then the final decision is made by the President. When a College is not departmentalized, the first level of review begins at the College (in which case four sets of recommendations go to the President).

C. Useful Definitions

APT Committee

Group of voting faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate who deliberate and vote whether to award appointment, promotion, or tenure. There are three possible levels of APT Committees – Department, College, and Campus.

Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as Initial Review Committee, or IRC)

Optional subgroup of voting-eligible faculty who gather information for the review, and who may author the APT Committee Evaluative Report, which they sign.

Joint Appointment

When a faculty member holds simultaneous appointments (of any percentage) in more than one Department or other Unit (e.g., Center or Institute). Tenure is sought in the primary Department, or tenure home of the candidate.

Quorum

Amount of eligible voting members needed to conduct a valid vote whether to award appointment, promotion, or tenure based on codified Department methods of operation.

Votes possible for deciding to award appointment, promotion or tenure based on criteria:

Yes

No

Abstention (two types) – these actions count toward quorum

Mandatory – a faculty member who has a conflict of interest (e.g., a family member or partner of the candidate), or who has already voted at a lower level

Voluntary – a faculty member who chooses not to vote (this should be explained in summaries and letters)

Absent – not present in person or via teleconference (if allowed by Department or College plan of organization); this lowers the quorum

II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSEMBLING A DOSSIER AND PREPARING THE CANDIDATE'S CASE

This section includes instructions on:

- A. Information about how to submit a dossier
- B. Preparing an electronic dossier
- C. The elements in a dossier (variations appear in Section III)
 - See Table 1, Appendix A: Transmittal Form (including required dossier sections)
 - See Table 2, Appendix A: Letter Log
- D. Division of responsibilities in dossier preparation and the review

II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSEMBLING A DOSSIER AND PREPARING THE CANDIDATE'S CASE

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. Soon after the candidate's arrival, the APT Policy calls for **the administrator of the academic unit that will become the faculty member's tenure home to (a) meet with the candidate and provide a written copy of the approved promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated (APT Policy 355-359; 637-642) and (b) appoint one or more senior faculty mentors. (APT Policy 767-779; see also the Senate Task Force Report available at www.faculty.umd.edu/mentoring)** The list of new tenure-track faculty and their mentors is due in the Office of the Associate Provost by February 1, 2012.

The review for tenure and promotion is the University's primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university. **Faculty members are expected to demonstrate accomplishment in three areas: (1) research, scholarship, and creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service. (APT Policy 360-403, 667-677)** Colleges and Departments must have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these areas. These criteria should be included in the dossier after the letter written by the Department Chair.

The candidate's dossier forms the basis for review at all levels. Therefore, it must be well prepared and include all relevant information in a form that will be clear to reviewers both within and outside the Department.

This section contains the general guidelines for preparing all dossiers. Tables 1 and 4 in Appendix A list the components of a dossier. Non-departmentalized Colleges will obviously omit the material that requires departmental input (Chair's Letter and Department APT report). Specific varieties of dossiers are described in Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix A.

A. Submission Guidelines: The dossier, consisting of a single bookmarked PDF file, is to be uploaded on a secure Faculty Affairs website: www.faculty.umd.edu/apt. These dossiers may be uploaded at any time prior to their due date.

B. The Electronic Dossier

PDFs are best created via a word processing program or OCR. These methods are easier to search and enable "cut and pasting." If necessary, PDFs may be created by scanning.

Whichever method is used to create the PDF document, it must have these characteristics:

- A resolution of 300 dpi. A finer resolution uses too much space; less is unreadable.
- Vertical flow of pages (avoid side by side presentations of pages).
- Bookmarked sections, as specified on the Transmittal Form in Table 2, will serve as a readily accessible table of contents. Note that External Letters must be sub-bookmarked for each separate letter with a designation of their source (candidate-C or Unit-U), e.g., U-Smith.

C. Elements in a Dossier

An overview: Every dossier will be submitted in electronic form. Optionally, representative pieces of scholarship may be submitted. Inclusion of a teaching dossier is also optional. These additions may be specified in the form of a URL (preferred for very large documents) or they may be uploaded to the area on the APT website for supplemental

materials. In unusual cases (e.g., for large, non-electronic pieces of scholarship) a hard copy may be forwarded as a supplement under separate cover. Colleges are responsible for returning all supplemental materials to candidates after the Campus APT Committee has finished its deliberations. Dossiers failing to conform to these guidelines will be returned to the College for corrective action before they are submitted for evaluation to the Campus APT Committee.

- #1. Transmittal Form: (See Table 1, Appendix A) The first page of the dossier is the transmittal form, which is available on the web at www.faculty.umd.edu/policies. Information from the transmittal form is entered into both the ARS database and the personnel database in the Office of Faculty Affairs. Accuracy of information on the transmittal form, especially the record of votes, the dates of meetings, and the type of appointment (e.g., 9-mo., 12-mo., etc.) must be carefully checked. For new appointments, a separate letter with the proposed salary and start dates must accompany the dossier. (See Table 5, Appendix A) Units must inform the Office of Faculty Affairs about the acceptance of each appointment.

Candidate's Name: Give the candidate's full legal name.

UID No: Avoid disclosing Social Security Numbers by listing University ID number.

Citizenship: Tenure is granted to non-U.S. citizen candidates contingent on their possession of a visa status that permits continued employment by the University.

Summary of Votes: Record the number of: (1) positive votes, (2) negative votes, (3) mandatory abstentions, (4) voluntary abstentions, (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc., and (6) the total number of faculty eligible to vote. The sum of the numbers in categories 1-5 should equal the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body. The numbers recorded on the transmittal form must match the numbers reported in APT Committee Reports.

Mandatory abstentions often arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice, e.g., at the College and Department levels. In these cases, **the faculty member is permitted to vote only at the lower level. If a faculty member is eligible to vote within two Departments (because both the candidate and the voter have similar joint appointments), the voting faculty member may only vote in their tenure home and must abstain from voting in the second unit. (APT Policy 597-601; 877-880; 933-935)** A mandatory abstention may arise for other reasons, such as when a faculty member is the candidate's partner.

Only tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is to be promoted or appointed may vote on that candidate's case. (APT Policy 686-690)

Secondary Unit: If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in a secondary unit, the chair or director of the secondary unit provides a written recommendation to the chair of the primary unit. If a candidate has a permanent joint appointment in a secondary unit with eligible voters, the secondary unit records the votes of the secondary unit (if this is required by the secondary unit's plan of organization) and provides a written recommendation to the chair of the primary unit.

- #2. a. **Dean's Letter: This letter should state the Dean's personal assessment of the reasons the candidate merits or does not merit promotion. (APT Policy 909-911)**

The letter should contain an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of the Department APT Committee, College APT Committee, or the Department Chair, the reasons underlying the dissent should be explained. Negative votes or abstentions at the College level ought to be explained. The Dean can provide a context for evaluating the candidate through characterizing the strengths of the Department, its role in the College and the role of the candidate in enhancing the excellence of the department. The letter should also discuss the expectations of the College and Department for promotion.

b. When either the College APT Committee or the Dean make a negative recommendation, the Dean should: **(1) write a brief letter to the candidate summarizing the nature of the considerations on which the negative decision was based, (2) allow the Chair of the College APT Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information in the summary letter, and (3) include this letter in the dossier directly following the Dean's letter. (APT Policy 989-1004)** Members of the College APT Committee may see the Dean's letter. A summary is not necessary if both College-level recommendations are positive.

- #3. College APT Committee Report: This report must include the date of the meeting and the names of Committee members. **The report should include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation. (APT Policy 906-911)** It should address the same areas as the Department APT report described in #5. *When the vote is not unanimous, the report should try to explain the reasons for the negative votes or the abstentions. If the assessment differs from the department vote, an explanation should be provided. Minority reports are permissible but not required.*

- #4. a. Department Chair's Letter: **The letter should contain the Chair's independent evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service, and should make a clear recommendation supported by the reasons for it. (APT Policy 724-725; 817-819)** *An explanation should be provided for negative votes and voluntary abstentions. For joint appointments, the head of the secondary unit should also provide a letter that is inserted in the same section as, and immediately following, the Department Chair's letter.*

The Chair's letter is most useful when it places the performance of the candidate in the context of the Department or discipline, and it comments on the APT Committee's report. It is particularly useful for informing the Committee about the criteria used to evaluate the candidate and the Chair's assessment of the candidate with respect to those criteria. These criteria should be appended to the Chair's letter. While the letter may summarize the basic information about the case, APT Committees expect the Chair's interpretation of the information about the candidate: an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of a Department APT Committee, it is helpful to explain the reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative faculty votes and abstentions when they are known.

b. The Department's APT criteria should be included after the Chair's letter. (The Chair's letter appears as 4a, and the promotion criteria appear as 4b.) For promotion cases, a candidate notification letter should also be included (as 4c).

c. The notification letter must be sent to promotion candidates within two weeks of the submission of the dossier to the next level. The Chair should: (a) write a brief letter summarizing the vote and the general nature of the considerations on which the department and chair's decision was based, (b) allow the Chair of the Department APT Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information before the letter is sent to the candidate, (c) send the summary assessment to the candidate, and (d) include the letter in the dossier which will be forwarded to the next level of review. (See Table 6, Appendix A) Voting members of the faculty may see the chair's letter. (APT Policy 982-1004) The notification letter should never refer to the content of confidential assessments from external evaluators.

#5. Report of the Department APT Committee: (APT Policy 846-855) This report has two clearly separate parts (5a and 5b), neither of which is shown to the candidate. In addition, the Department APT Committee may include an optional Minority Report (5c) in cases of major disagreement. Both (or all three) reports above are incorporated into the dossier sent by the Chair to higher levels of review. (APT Policy 856-859)

#5a. The Department APT Committee Meeting Report describes the decision meeting and is ordinarily written by the chair of the APT Committee or a designee. The discussions and the exact vote should be presented, as well as any departmental rules about the number of votes required for a positive recommendation. The report should contain the meeting date and be signed by its author.

#5b. The Department Evaluative Report: The Department may form an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as an Initial Review Committee, or IRC), whose members should be identified, to complete this report. (APT Policy 712-716) The evaluative report evaluates the candidate's research or creativity, service, mentoring and teaching contributions in light of the standards of the Department and the discipline.

It is helpful to address the following questions when preparing the Evaluative Report:

- *What are the standards and expectations of the Department or the discipline with respect to the candidate as expressed in the departmental criteria, and how are they measured?*
- *What are the candidate's major contributions? Why are these contributions important in the candidate's field?*
- *Has the candidate met or surpassed the Department's standards and expectations?*
- *What evidence supports the Review Committee's evaluation?*

This information is particularly helpful in areas with distinctive expectations for promotion. It is important to consider the audience to whom this report will be addressed, which includes faculty and administrators outside the unit.

The following are suggestions for summarizing and evaluating faculty performance:

a. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the work (as summarized in 6, below) should be provided in 5b above, including a description of the influence of the work in the field. The bases for the evaluation should be made explicit.

Where the primary activities of the faculty member consist of performance or practice, the Department should develop methods and procedures to obtain outside evaluation of the faculty member. Submission of published reviews of books and performances, samples of extension publications, etc. are strongly recommended. For journal publications, where appropriate, the citation rates and other quantitative factors should be included. Similarly, for extension agents whose scholarship is directed toward producers or consumers, a thorough evaluation of the quality, quantity and impact of these publications is essential.

When a faculty member works in collaborative teams, ascertaining his or her role in those teams and the intellectual leader of the project is important.

b. Teaching, Advising and Mentoring

Dossiers should contain data from the campus-wide standardized course evaluations, normally for the last five years. An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching, advising and mentoring (as summarized in 6 below) should be provided in 5b above. Detailed data analyses and student comments should be deferred until Section 14a.

Candidates may facilitate the process of teaching evaluation by providing a teaching portfolio. Judgments of teaching could include an assessment of: instructional materials, the rigor and scope of examinations, incorporation of instructional aids, etc. Also to be considered is the development of techniques or modes of instruction and the substantial revision of or development of courses. Feedback of colleagues and students include: 1) surveys of student opinions, 2) awards, 3) colleagues' opinions if based on systematic class visitations and 4) evidence of effective learning by the candidate's students, such as may be shown by student performance on learning outcome assessments.

Demonstrations of effective mentoring/advising include: 1) number and caliber of students guided in research and their placement in academic positions, postdoctoral labs, graduate programs, etc.; 2) development of or participation in bridge or summer programs; 3) service on awards and mentoring committees, or as an advisor for student groups or clubs, or as a mentor for other faculty; 4) organization of professional seminars for students on article or grant submission, etc.

c. Service

Service contributions (summarized in section 6 below) should be evaluated in section 5b above, particularly in those areas where service is a major component of a faculty member's activities, such as extension appointments. The report should do more than list committees or activities; it should, to the extent possible, evaluate the performance of these activities. Evaluation may be sought from supervisors or clients in organizations for which the faculty member has rendered service. Service awards help to document and evaluate service activities. Disciplinary service to editorial boards, national and international organizations, etc., is evidence of good citizenship and stature in the profession.

#5c. **Optional Minority APT Report:** Members of the Department APT Committee who do not think that the APT Committee Report adequately represents their views may write a signed minority APT report that will become part of the dossier. (APT Policy 852-855) A minority APT report is intended to be employed for major disagreements, not for presenting minor variations in wording.

#6. **Summary Statement of Professional Achievements:** This summary report is often written by an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as an Initial Review Committee, or IRC)—whose members should be identified—or its representative. The purpose of the summary is to ensure that committees have correct and complete information about the candidate on which to base their evaluation and their explanations of the candidate's credentials. The summary is a factual statement of the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of: research, scholarship, or creative activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; and service. The summary statement is an internal statement not to be mailed to external reviewers. **It should place the candidate's accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the broader discipline and the candidate's professional achievements in service and teaching in the context of the responsibilities of the Department, the College, the University and the greater community. It should be a neutral description; no evaluation of the candidate's work should be included. The candidate must be shown the Summary Statement at least two weeks before the Department deliberates about the candidate's case. Candidates must certify in writing that they have seen the document (which may be achieved by signing the document), and must be allowed to draft a rejoinder before it is used by the Department APT Committee as the basis for its discussion and vote. Thus the date on this report (and any rebuttal by the candidate) should predate the meeting on which the case is decided. If there is a rejoinder, the summary must acknowledge receipt and consideration of the rejoinder. (APT Policy 826-845)** *To facilitate production and "certification" of the report, Departments may wish to inform candidates in advance of the deadlines for reviewing the Summary Statement and for return of the signed Statement with any rejoinder.*

#7. **Curriculum Vitae:** The candidate's *curriculum vitae* must be signed and dated by the candidate to certify that it is accurate and current. (APT Policy 648-650, 653-658) The CV should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and should be included in each request for external evaluation. The CV that is sent to external evaluators is the official CV for the candidate. If there are subsequent changes in the candidate's credentials (e.g., additional funding, new external recognition), the Chair should forward a memo containing these changes to higher levels of review and this document should be appended to the candidate's CV in the electronic dossier. Memos may be added to the dossier up until the point when the dossier is signed by the President of the University. However, candidates should avoid multiple requests for such additions, especially for minor changes (e.g., reviewing activities, paid consulting).

The CV should present an accurate portrait of the candidate's accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible. Please refer to Appendix C for a guide on CV format.

#8. **Reputation of Publication Outlets:** The Department should provide an appraisal of the reputations of the journals, presses and other outlets (e.g., theaters, exhibits, etc.) for the

candidate's scholarship/creative activity. Indicate whether peer review is required for each publication outlet. Departments should develop a standard, stable, credible method of rating journals and should present these ratings and, when possible, the rate of acceptance to the journal or other medium. The following fictional table suggests how the information should be provided. It contains just those outlets where the candidate's work appears and it uses objective indices. Acceptance rate and impact are used here, but there may be other more appropriate indices.

Reputation of Publication Sources

Journal	No. Of Articles	Impact Factor	Acceptance Rate
Psychological Review	5	4.3	15%
Cognition	10	2.3	20%
Child Development	15	1.9	22%

In addition, citation counts should be included. *Departments may prefer to put these in the Summary Statement (#6), so candidates can verify the counts.*

#9. Candidate's Personal Statement: This statement provides candidates with the opportunity to make a case for their promotion based on a demonstrated record of achievement. The statement ordinarily describes the questions addressed by the candidate and indicates their importance to the candidate's field, progress made in addressing these questions and directions of future creative work. (APT Policy 650-653) These statements should be relatively short, 3-4 pages, and directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate's field. The personal statement should be signed and dated. The statement should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and must be included in each request for external evaluation. **The document may not be changed before submission to the APT process. (APT Policy 654-658)**

#10. Log of Evaluation Letters: The Committee shall solicit letters of evaluation from at least six widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that shall include individuals nominated by the candidate. Among the letters requested, at least three and at most one-half must be from persons nominated by the candidate. (APT Policy 762-766) *APT Committees at all levels question the credibility of letters from the candidate's mentors and collaborators, and heed closely the comments of evaluators from highly ranked institutions and, where appropriate, evaluators holding the rank of professor. The committee will also heed closely the comments of evaluators who are documented as among the outstanding leaders in the field. It is suggested that, at a minimum, six of the letters be selected from evaluators who are not the candidate's mentors and collaborators. Up to two additional letters (for a total of at least eight) may be from a mentor or collaborator as long as sufficient explanation is provided by the Chair of the APT Committee and/or Department Chair. An allowable exception is the case where an appropriately small number of the six letter writers have had a one-time or temporally distant collaboration.*

The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal should be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted, and any prejudicial discussion regarding declines or non-answers is discouraged. In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review). Table 2 in Appendix A provides the appropriate format for the letter log. The order of letters in the dossier should correspond to the order of letters in the log, and the letters should be grouped by requestor (candidate or review unit). Within each group the letters should be alphabetized. Because all APT committees should have access to the same external letters, late arriving letters should not be included in the dossier, nor be used for evaluative purposes during deliberations. Unsolicited letters do not belong in the dossier and should not be relied on for evaluative purposes during deliberations.

The letter log should indicate which evaluators are collaborators with, or mentors of, the candidate, and in the credentials section justify their inclusion as an evaluator.

- #11. Credentials of External Evaluators: The credentials of each external evaluator should be provided in a paragraph, though not CVs of evaluators. The order of the credentials paragraphs should mirror the order of entries in the log and the order of inclusion of letters in the dossier.

It is important for the Department APT Committee to justify the choices of evaluators and to indicate the type and quality of the institution or program with which the evaluator is associated.

- #12. Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations: *(See Appendix C) The letter used to solicit external evaluations is usually sent by the Chair of the Department APT Committee. The letter should be neutral, asking for an honest evaluation rather than for support for the faculty member's promotion. It should ask if the reviewer is a co-author or collaborator. The letter should ask the evaluator to comment on:*

- *the nature of the evaluator's professional interactions with the candidate;*
- *the candidate's ranking among his or her professional peers (or cohort);*
- *the candidate's chances for promotion and, where appropriate, tenure in the evaluator's own institution, noting expressly that information on this point is an important consideration;*
- *the impact of the candidate's work on the field;*
- *clarification of the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in his/her field;*
- *the quality of the candidate's teaching, if known.*

Departments have the option of sending teaching dossiers including syllabi, examinations and other instructional material to external reviewers for their evaluation. Reviewers may be asked to comment on the scope and currency of the instructional materials and their appropriateness to the discipline and to the level of the course. Attachments to the letter should include the criteria for promotion, the candidate's CV and Personal Statement and a list of scholarly and teaching materials being sent, or made available, to the evaluator. The attachments should be listed within the sample letter.

#13. Responses of External Evaluators: The Chair of the Department review Committee should receive suggestions of potential external evaluators from the candidate. The Committee should select evaluators from the candidate's list and must also choose evaluators from their own list.

The most reliable way to get external evaluators to engage in a review is for the Committee to solicit letters well in advance of their deadline.

An excessive number of letters (e.g., 10 or more) should be avoided. Should an insufficient number of letters be timely received, the case may still go forward. However, Units should be aware that the absence of the requisite number of letters may weaken the case for the candidate. Although the contents of the letters are to be shared with eligible voters at each level of review, these letters are highly confidential and should not be shared with the candidate or others who will not be voting on or evaluating the candidate for promotion. Candidates may not contact evaluators to determine their willingness to provide information, or to enquire about the contents of the evaluation.

The following guidelines should be followed in presenting letters:

- All letters received in response to solicitation must be included in their entirety if the letters arrive for timely consideration by the Department APT Committee.
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation.
- Each letter should clearly indicate whether the evaluator was selected by the candidate, or by the committee.
- Dossier preparation and evaluation is facilitated if letters from external evaluators are sent as searchable electronic attachments.

Committees and candidates should take into account the following issues in selecting their evaluators.

- *An evaluator who is the candidate's dissertation advisor, former teacher, co-author, or student should be avoided.*
- *When a candidate is re-reviewed, as in the case of someone coming up for Professor shortly after being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor, new evaluators should be chosen unless there are strong justifications for repeated selection.*
- *Evaluators should ordinarily hold the rank of Professor or its equivalent.*
- *Because evaluators are asked whether the candidate would be promoted at their institutions, the prestige of the evaluators' institutional affiliations and their accomplishments should be taken into account in selecting them.*
- *Candidates should be informed of the University's perspective on appropriate evaluators and the right of the Department to select from the candidate's nominations those evaluators that the APT Committee deems appropriate. Candidates should also be informed about University rules of confidentiality.*

#14a. Student Evaluations of Teaching: Data on teaching evaluations must be analyzed and summarized. (For a sample, see Appendix D) Actual electronic evaluations (or other such data) should be uploaded in the separate area on the APT website for supplemental materials. These documents can also be presented in the form of a teaching portfolio, to be included in the supplemental website. Sometimes departments include a summary in their APT report.

If so, the page where the summary can be found should be indicated in this section. Materials should not be doubly included in personal statements. For clarity:

- An explanation of the rating system should be included, as well as a comparison with the norms of the Department and/or college.
- An explanation of the level and student composition of the courses should be provided, and a sample questionnaire. If a particular instructor's teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses, or if there was a particularly significant event in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known.

#14b. Peer Evaluations of Teaching: Many Departments engage in systematic peer review of teaching based on classroom visits by colleagues. *Peer evaluation should include evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, and other instructional material by members of the Department or external evaluators, and discussions of curriculum development, introduction of innovative uses of technology, special contributions to the teaching mission of the department or to special programs and teaching awards received by the candidate.* Departments may require a teaching portfolio including syllabi, examinations and other instructional material. These portfolios should be uploaded to the supplemental materials area of the APT website. *Reports provided only months ahead of the APT review (as opposed to those based on systematic visitation) tend not to be given much credence by higher levels of review.*

#14c. Mentorship, Advising, Research Supervision: A list of past and current undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has served as principal advisor should be provided in the CV in separate sections. *These should include evaluative discussion of undergraduate and graduate advising, supervision of theses and dissertations and mentoring of students and colleagues.*

Appendices to the Dossier, such as teaching dossiers, are encouraged and may be uploaded to the supplemental materials of the APT website. These can also include direct links to teaching evaluations and up to two candidate-selected samples of scholarship.

The Candidate Is Responsible For:

- Providing the *Curriculum Vitae* in the approved format, signed and dated. This Document should be submitted before external letters are solicited.
- **Signing and dating the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements. (APT Policy 826-833)**
- **Providing a signed and dated Personal Statement. (APT Policy 650-653)** This document should be prepared before external letters are solicited.
- **Suggesting the names of qualified external evaluators. (APT Policy 762-766)**
- Providing documentation on teaching (e.g., syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, teaching evaluations in a teaching portfolio).
- Providing publications or other forms of scholarship to the Department Committee.
- Selecting samples of scholarship for reviews by higher-level review Committees and working with the APT Committee to select materials for external reviewers.
- Providing any other relevant information requested by the Department Review Committee (e.g., of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of awards).

The Department APT Committee Is Responsible For:

- Gathering information and documents listed in the preceding section from the candidate.
- **Drafting the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and presenting it to the candidate for approval two weeks prior to the time it will be distributed to the faculty and ensuring its prompt return. (APT Policy 826-834)**
- **Requesting at least six external evaluations (with at least three names selected from the candidate's list), using the candidate's input to select the sample of material for evaluators to evaluate, and providing a brief summary of the qualifications of the evaluators. (APT Policy 762-766)**
- Obtaining documentation on teaching and mentorship from students and colleagues.
- Obtaining available documentation on service.
- Evaluating journals and other outlets in which candidate's scholarship is disseminated.
- **Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service (APT Policy 663-674), based on the candidate's CV, personal statements, external letters, scholarly and teaching materials and internal reports.**
- **Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion. (APT Policy 682-693)**
- **Writing reports on: (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and a justification for it and the date of the meeting; and (b) a separate evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions. (APT Policy 846-850)** *This latter report is often prepared by an advisory committee and is usually available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.*
- **Reviewing the Chair's summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy. (APT Policy 990-997)** *(Usually done by APT Chair)*
- **Representing the Department APT Committee's perspective to higher levels of review, if the need emerges. (APT Policy 896-905)**

The Department Chair is Responsible for:

- Ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted, and that the appropriate material is available to eligible voting faculty.
- **Writing a letter to the administrator at the next higher level making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case, and including the Department's promotion criteria. (APT Policy 856-859)**
- **Notifying candidates in writing, summarizing both the Chair's and Department APT Committee's decisions and reasoning within two weeks of the Committee's decision meeting (APT Policy 982-1004; see Appendix A, Table 6). A copy of this summary letter should be available for faculty who participated in the deliberations who wish to see it, and it should be included in the dossier. If both the Department APT Committee and Chair vote to deny tenure and/or promotion, the letter must be sent by certified mail. (APT Policy 1069-1070)**
- Inspecting dossiers for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- For new appointments, including the length of appointment year, start date, and projected salary in a separate memo (see Table 5, Appendix A) accompanying the appointment request. If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- **Sending the dossier to the next level of review, and if the candidate does not pass the initial review, providing sufficient information for the administrator at that**

- level (Dean or Provost) to determine that the review was conducted appropriately. (APT Policy 817-819)
- **Answering questions putatively posed by upper-level review committees. (APT Policy 896-905; 950-960)**
- **If candidates withdraw from the process, forwarding a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. (APT Policy 823-825)**
- Reviewing the Department's Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the conduct of reviews, and that the review conforms to the guidelines.
- Being aware of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and disseminating these changes to the faculty. The Office of Faculty Affairs web page should be consulted for updates: www.faculty.umd.edu/policies.
- **Meeting with new tenured and tenure-track faculty to provide APT information, such as Department and University policies, this Manual, and Department promotion criteria. Subsequently, administrators should notify faculty in writing of changes to the criteria. (APT Policy 355-359,637-642)**

Upper-level APT Committees Are Responsible For:

- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.
- **Meeting with lower level APT representatives when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing should be provided in advance. (APT Policy 896-905; 950-960)**
- **Writing a report that includes an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and the justification for it, the membership of the Committee, and the date of the decision meeting. (APT Policy 906-909; 961-963)**
- For the College Review Committee, when either the Dean or the Committee makes a negative recommendation, ensuring that the Dean's summary letter notifying the candidate of the negative recommendation accurately reflects Committee deliberations.

The Dean of a College is Responsible for:

- Reviewing the College's Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the appointment of a College Review Committee and the role of the Dean with respect to the Committee.
- Ensuring that the review conforms to those guidelines.
- Reviewing and approving College and Department promotion criteria.
- **Recommending appointees to the Campus APT and Campus Appeals Committee. (APT Policy 929-931; 1154-1156)**
- Informing Chairs of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and discussing with Chairs their evaluation of the preceding year's APT process and outcomes.
- Preparing a schedule for submission of dossiers to the Departments in the College and informing them of that schedule in a timely manner.
- **When candidates are denied tenure and/or promotion at a lower level of review, certifying the procedural appropriateness of the review, and writing a letter sent by certified mail to the candidate within two weeks of the decision that informs the candidate of the outcome, the procedural appropriateness of the review, and**

the consequences of this denial. (APT Policy 817-823) Copies should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained. (A summary letter is not necessary if at least one Department-level recommendation is positive.)

- **Appointing members of the College APT Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization. (APT Policy 871-873)**
- Providing staffing for the College APT Committee and ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted.
- **Reviewing the recommendations of the prior level of review and the College APT Committee, and writing a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case. (APT Policy 892-895; 909-911)**
- **When either the Dean or the College APT Committee make(s) a negative APT decision, writing a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Committee summarizing the outcome of the College APT's and Dean's deliberations, and the rationale behind it. (APT Policy 989-991; see Table 6, Appendix A) This summary letter should be available to members of the College APT Committee who can decide to amend it, and the letter should be included in the dossier. (APT Policy 906-911)**
- Inspecting the dossier for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Forwarding an electronic file and a hard copy of the original material plus another hard copy to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- **Meeting with the University APT Committee to address questions they may raise. (APT Policy 950-958)**
- For new appointments, including in a separate memo accompanying the dossiers, the terms of appointment, start date and projected salary in appointment requests. (See Table 5, Appendix A) If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.

III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

This section contains instructions on:

- A. Promotion Review for Faculty with Appointments in One Unit
- B. New Appointments of Associate and Full Professors, Senior Agents and Principal Agents
- C. Appointment and Promotion Review for Joint (Split) Appointments
A Road Map to the Joint Appointment/ Review Process
- D. Professor of the Practice
- E. Emerita/Emeritus Status
- F. College Park Professor

III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

Table 3 in Appendix A charts the approval routes for faculty with appointments in a single unit. (Also see the roadmap included in this section for the review of faculty with joint appointments.) Table 4 in Appendix A summarizes the differences in the contents of dossiers for diverse appointments. The ensuing section notes special considerations for each kind of appointment.

A. Promotion Review for Faculty with Appointments in One Unit

1. Nomination of Candidates:

Reviews are mandatory for:

- **All Assistant Professors and Agents in their sixth year of appointment at this rank; (APT Policy 463-464)**
- **All Associate Professors and Senior Agents appointed without tenure and currently in their third year of appointment; (APT Policy 486-487)**
- Candidates who were previously denied tenure or promotion, and whose cases were returned by the Appeals Committee to the level of review at which the error was found.

Non-mandatory reviews may be initiated for untenured faculty.

- By Department nomination.
- By self-nomination. **Faculty may request to be reviewed any year that is consistent with a Department's plan of organization (APT Policy 811-812) and may appeal to the Dean (or Provost, if a non-departmentalized college) in writing within 30 days if the candidate's request for a review is denied. If the request for review is denied at that level, within 30 days the candidate may appeal in writing to the Provost (or President, if a non-departmentalized college). (APT Policy 1315-1330)**

A candidate appointed as an Assistant Professor or Agent begins a six-year probationary period. Ordinarily, candidates for tenure serve the full probationary period. However, some candidates arrive with prior academic service and have accumulated years of research and teaching experience before their mandatory review year at this University. In other cases, a candidate is reviewed for tenure before having served six years on the faculty of any college or university. In such exceptional instances of non-mandatory tenure, letters from the Chair and the Dean should address why the promotion is merited now, and why there is convincing evidence of a sustained academic trajectory.

2. Withdrawal from consideration:

Candidates for promotion may voluntarily withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the President's decision by writing a letter to the Department Chair. (APT Policy 823-825) Copies of the letter of withdrawal should be forwarded to the Dean and Office of Faculty Affairs. When an untenured faculty member withdraws at the time of mandatory review, the faculty member is entitled to an additional one-year contract at the individual's current rank. (APT Policy 1058-1062)

3. Steps beyond the first level of review:

If either the Department APT Committee or the Chair supports the case, it goes forward (APT Policy 813-817).

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation by both the Chair and the Department APT Committee, the review will not proceed further and the candidate must be notified of the situation. The Chair must also inform the administrator at the next level (e.g., the Dean) who needs to certify that the procedures to evaluate the candidate conformed to the regulations in the APT Policy (APT Policy 817-823). To “close out” the case, copies of the letter informing the candidate of the negative outcome of the review, the candidate’s dossier, and the Dean’s certification letter must be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

B. New Appointments of Associate and Full Professors, Senior Agents and Principal Agents

New appointments at the rank of Professor and Associate Professor and Principal and Senior Agent (regardless of tenure status) must be reviewed by faculty committees and administrators at all levels. No offer of appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent or Principal Agent is valid without presidential approval. New Assistant Professor and Agent appointments are not handled by the University APT process.

New appointments may be submitted at any time. All requests for new appointments must be accompanied by a separate memo that provides the information in Table 5, Appendix A that is required for presidential approval of the appointment.

Dossiers for new appointments look slightly different from the dossiers of candidates being promoted from within. They lack a Summary of Personal Achievements and a Personal Statement. They should, however, contain as much information as possible on the candidate’s performance or potential performance as a teacher, mentor and advisor, as well as on the candidate’s scholarship. External letters of evaluation should be solicited from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from reviewers suggested by the Department. For tenure cases, it is essential that the question of tenure be addressed, both in the departmental APT report and in the external letters. Letters soliciting recommendations for a new tenured appointment should pose the question of whether the candidate merits a tenured appointment.

C. Appointment and Promotion Review for Joint (Split) Appointments

New joint appointments should include a copy of the memorandum of understanding (M.O.U.) between the two participating units. This M.O.U. should also be sent to the faculty member. Ordinarily, the memo specifies:

- the tenure home;
- division of responsibility for the line and, where appropriate, arrangements for allocation of DRIF money, lab and office space;
- rights and obligations of the secondary unit(s) and the conditions under which line responsibility might be renegotiated (e.g., if the units disagree about promotion and/or tenure); and arrangements for reviewing renewal of contract and promotion (if appropriate).

Review of newly hired joint appointments as well as promotions for candidates with joint appointments: In joint appointments, the tenure home department is referenced here as primary, usually the Department with the greatest fraction of the appointment line. It is the prerogative of the primary Department to grant tenure. However, because the rank held by an individual must be consistent across departments, the primary Department needs to consider advisory input from the secondary Department or Unit (e.g., an Institute) as part of the APT review. The following scenarios reflect three different kinds of joint appointment.

1. Appointment split between two independent tenure granting departments and schools

To be eligible to vote within the Department the faculty member:

- (a) **must hold a tenured appointment in the University,**
- (b) **must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion,**
- (c) **must hold a regular appointment in the unit (with a given percentage of time attached),**
- (d) **may only vote in a single unit providing the plan of organization permits it, and at only one level of review,**
- (e) **must vote at the Department level of review and in the tenure home, when there is the opportunity to vote more than once.¹ (APT Policy 682-761)**

Step 1. *At the inception of the review, the Chair (or Directors) of the primary and secondary Departments or units are encouraged to coordinate the timing of the review process to obtain timely input from the secondary department. They are also encouraged to draw up a mutual letter that solicits evaluation of the candidate. Ordinarily, this letter should be signed by both APT Chairs. The two units may wish to form a joint review committee consisting of members of both units, who would then deliver their reports to the respective units for consideration and voting.*

Step 2. The secondary unit should conduct a complete review and make its recommendation before the case is considered by the primary unit. The secondary unit's recommendation is for promotion to a higher rank, not tenure, because the secondary unit is not the individual's tenure home. The APT report of the secondary unit's review committee and its votes, as well as the recommendation of the administrator in the secondary unit, should be forwarded to the primary unit for consideration in its APT process. Thus, the secondary unit's review becomes part of the promotion dossier.

Step 3. The primary unit votes based on its own review and the material furnished by the secondary unit. If the recommendations of the two units disagree, the Chair of the primary unit's APT Committee should provide a written list of questions to the administrator of the secondary unit and the spokesperson for the secondary unit's APT Review Committee, and invite them to meet with the primary unit to discuss the case.

¹ Chairs and Deans cannot vote as faculty in their Departments. When there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty in a Unit, Deans may appoint faculty from related units as voting faculty, to ensure the APT Committee contains at least three persons. However, these faculty also may not vote on the candidate more than once.

The primary unit incorporates its input (from the faculty and the unit administrator) into the dossier, which the unit then forwards to higher levels of review. The dossier is then forwarded to the Dean.

Step 4. The APT Committee for the College wherein the primary unit resides evaluates the entire Dossier that includes material from the primary and secondary units' reviews. This College APT Committee votes and writes a report, the Dean writes a letter, and the Dossier is submitted for evaluation by the Campus APT Committee. When disagreements arise between voting units, the Committee should follow the standard practice of informing and inviting the APT chairs and administrators to discuss the case.

A Road Map to the Joint Appointment/ Review Process

1. Two Departments or Units meet to decide on external referees.
Letters are sent under joint signature of APT Chairs;
A joint advisory subcommittee or separate advisory subcommittee may be appointed.
2. Secondary unit performs review.
Secondary unit APT Committee votes and writes a report;
Secondary unit administrator writes a letter;
Material is forwarded to Primary unit.
3. Primary unit completes review.
The APT Committee considers its own material and the material supplied by the Secondary unit committee;
Primary unit votes and writes a report;
Primary unit administrator writes a letter;
4. Primary College review.
Primary College evaluates Dossier containing Primary and Secondary Units' reviews;
College APT Committee votes and writes report;
Dean writes letter;
Material is submitted for evaluation by the University APT Committee.

2. Appointment split between tenure home and a "permanent" appointment in a secondary unit.
If a candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither a secondary department nor a non-departmentalized school, the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from the faculty in the unit who are above the rank which the candidate currently holds. The format of the advice will be determined by the unit's plan of organization. If the input is in the form of a vote, the vote may not include input from those eligible to vote on the candidate at the Department level elsewhere. The director's advisory letter should be available to faculty in the primary unit before they vote.
3. Appointment split between tenure home and a temporary appointment in a secondary unit.
The Chair or Director of the secondary unit writes an evaluative letter to the Chair of the primary unit which is available to the primary unit faculty before they vote. The faculty in the temporary unit do not vote on the candidate.

D. Professor of the Practice (**see APT Policy 290-301**)

1. Appointment: The material needed for Professor of the Practice is the same as for any new appointment, except that teaching evaluations may not be available. Letters from the Chair and Dean must address the professional credentials of the candidate and the candidate's role in fulfilling the mission of the Department. Appointments may be for as long as 5 years and contracts are renewable (see below).

The approval route starts with review by the Department APT Committee including input from the Chair, and then requires evaluations by the Dean (but not the College APT Committee), a committee composed of five Associate Provosts representing the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, Academic Planning and Programs, Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs, and then the Provost and the President.

2. Reappointment: Requires presidential approval based on letters of endorsement from the Chair, Dean and committee of the five Associate Provosts in the preceding paragraph. No department vote or solicitation of outside letters is required. These recommendations and supporting material, such as CV and teaching evaluations, should be forwarded (in abbreviated dossier format with material assembled in the order listed in Table 4) through the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for approval by the Provost and President. As with other contracts, the renewal review should be conducted in the year before the year the contract expires.

E. Emerita/Emeritus Status (**APT Policy 267-275**)

Associate/Full Professors and Principal/Senior Agents who have been faculty members for at least ten years are eligible for nomination to Emerita/Emeritus status. The review is ordinarily conducted during the candidate's last semester of employment. (APT Policy 1087-1090) Recommendations for emeriti status will only be considered after the faculty member has filed for retirement and the materials submitted for an Emerita/Emeritus appointment should include proof of retirement. Faculty at or above the candidate's pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/Emeritus status. (APT Policy 1096-1100) Candidates for Emeriti status are not reviewed by faculty committees beyond the Department APT Committee. Reviews beyond the Department are conducted by the Dean, Provost, and President. (APT Policy 1121-1128)

Dossiers for Emerita/Emeritus candidates may be submitted at any time, and the date on which Emerita/Emeritus status is to become effective must be specified.

F. College Park Professor (**APT Policy 302-312**)

This title is conferred on nationally distinguished scholars, creative or performing artists or researchers who would normally qualify for appointment as a professor within the University, but who typically hold full time positions elsewhere. Initial appointment (for a period of three years) must follow the procedures for any appointment for new tenured professor (see B above). Annual appointment renewal is based on recommendations by the Chair and Dean to the Provost in the form of brief evaluative communications, forwarded through the Office of Faculty Affairs.

IV. FINAL DECISIONS, CONCERNS THAT ARISE AND APPEALS

This section includes instructions on:

- A. Denial at the Department Review
- B. Moving through Higher Levels of Review
- C. Awarding or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion
See Table 6, Appendix A: Candidate Notification of APT Decisions
- D. When Issues Arise during the Review Process
- E. Appeals Process for Denial of Promotion

IV. FINAL DECISIONS, CONCERNS THAT ARISE AND APPEALS

A. Denial at the Department Review

If both the Department APT Committee's and the Chair's recommendation are negative, the Chair must inform the candidate by certified mail within two weeks of the date of the decision. The letter should state the faculty decision and the administrator's decision and summarize briefly in general terms the reason for the denial. This letter should include the APT vote. (APT Policy 982-989; see Appendix C for examples)

The Department forwards the case only to the Dean. The Dean will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If not, the Dean will remand the case to the Department to reconsider. If no error has occurred, the dean must write a letter (a) stating that the case has been reviewed to ascertain that there was no violation of substantive or procedural due process, and (b) where appropriate, specifying the date of termination of employment. (APT Policy 817-823) The letter should be sent by certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. The Office of Faculty Affairs is available for consultation or advice in matters pertaining to this process. For examples of possible wording for notification letters, see Appendix C.

A copy of these letters and the dossier should be sent to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The Dean should retain the dossier in case there is an appeal.

B. Moving Through Higher Levels of Review

As long as there is one positive recommendation at the Department level (from either the APT Committee or the Chair) the case will proceed to all subsequent levels for review. (APT Policy 813-817) That is, the case will proceed through the College and University faculty committees and administrator reviews.

During higher levels of review, questions may arise regarding a recommendation from a lower level of review. In such cases, the College or University APT Committee shall meet with the APT Committee Chair(s) and Administrator(s) from the lower levels. A written list of questions will be provided to the lower level representatives in advance to serve as a basis for discussion. (APT Policy 896-905; 950-958)

Whenever either or both faculty and administrator recommendations are negative at higher levels of review, a letter must be sent to the candidate summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which those decisions were based. (APT Policy 989-991) The College-level notification letter should be included in the dossier file appended to the Dean's letter and should be sent by certified mail.

C. Awarding or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion

Final authority for any appointment that confers tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent, or Principal Agent resides solely with the President. (APT Policy 961-971) The President will inform the candidate of the final disposition of the

case. If the decision is negative, the President will inform the candidate by certified mail. (APT Policy 1069-1072)

D. When Issues Arise During the Review Process

Administrators and faculty committees are responsible for ensuring that all candidates receive fair and impartial treatment. They should deal with perceived problems either within their committee or through the administrative structure as soon as the issue arises. It is recommended that the Chair of the APT Committee inform the voting faculty about these responsibilities whenever cases are reviewed. (University Senate Review of Appeals No. 99-00-13).

The faculty member who believes that a violation has occurred during the review process is responsible for objecting at that time and asking for a resolution of the problem. Individuals in that position must inform the Department Chair, the Dean, or the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs of the perceived difficulty. (University Senate Review of Appeals No. 99-00-13)

E. Appeals Process for Denial of Promotion (APT Policy 1144-1313)

1. Grounds for Appeals (APT Policy 1188-1216)

The two bases for appeal are: violation of substantive due process or violation of procedural due process. Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected First Amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials. (APT Policy 1208-1216)

Violation of procedural due process arises when the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the APT review: (1) to take a procedural step or (2) to fulfill a procedural requirement established in APT Policy or review procedures of a department or college. Violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal. (APT Policy 1198-1207)

2. The Appeals Process (APT Policy 1166-1306)

A request for an appeal must be made in writing to the President within 60 calendar days of notification of the decision not to grant tenure, promotion, reappointment, or emeriti status. (APT Policy 1169-1175) The request must detail the basis for the appeal and evidence to support the claims. The grounds for the appeal must be within the purview of those identified in the University APT Policy. (APT Policy 1188-1216) Faculty members with questions regarding this process should contact the Office of Faculty Affairs. The President will determine whether to grant the request for an appeal based on the criteria stated above.

If an appeal request is granted, **an Appeals Committee is formed. (APT Policy 1145-1162)** The appellant has an additional 60 days in which to submit materials related to the case to the Office of Faculty Affairs. **The appellant should be aware that these materials will be shared with the Appeals Committee, and with parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee. (APT Policy 1179-1187)**

The Committee will meet with the Appellant, and other parties, and investigate the case, as it deems appropriate. (APT Policy 1224-1237) The Committee may not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review.

The Committee makes a recommendation to the President who makes the final decision. (APT Policy 1238-1250) When the President supports the grounds for an appeal, the Provost has the responsibility for oversight of the implementation of the corrective action the president requires to be taken. **(APT Policy 1256-1259)**

V. APPENDICES

This section includes reference materials and examples for:

- A. Tables and Forms
- B. CV Format
- C. Sample Letters
- D. Sample Teaching Evaluation Chart
- E. University of Maryland APT Policy

Appendix A: Tables and Forms

Table #1. Transmittal Form 2011-2012

Candidate's Name _____ U ID. No. _____
 Primary Unit _____ Secondary Unit _____
 College _____
 Present Rank _____ Date to Rank _____
 Proposed Rank _____
 Mandatory Review?: YES ___ NO ___ Citizenship/Visa Status _____
 Type of Appointment: 9-Mo ___ 9.5-Mo ___ 10-Mo ___ 12-Mo ___
 Is this a new appointment? YES ___ NO ___

Primary Unit (Tenure Home)	Meeting Date	Summary of Votes		Abstentions		Absent	Sum
		Positive	Negative	Voluntary	Mandatory		
Department APT Committee							
Department Chair							
College APT Committee							
Dean							

Secondary Unit (If Joint Appointment)	Meeting Date	Summary of Votes		Abstentions		Absent	Sum
		Positive	Negative	Voluntary	Mandatory		
Department APT Committee							
Department Chair							
College APT Committee							
Dean							

CONTACTS		
Type Name	Phone No. & Email	Office Address
Dean:		
College APT Spokesperson:		
Department Chair:		
Dept. APT Spokesperson:		

ORDER OF ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ELECTRONIC DOSSIER

1. Transmittal Form
- 2a. Dean's Letter
- 2b. Candidate Notification Letter (if necessary)
3. College APT Committee Report
- 4a. Department Chair's Letter (and secondary unit head's letter, if applicable)
- 4b. Promotion Criteria
- 4c. Candidate Notification Letter
- 5a. Dept. APT Committee Meeting Report
- 5b. Dept. Evaluative Report
- 5c. Optional Minority APT Report
6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (signed & dated by candidate)
7. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated)
8. Reputation of Publication Outlets
9. Candidate's Personal Statement (signed & dated)
10. Log of Letters of Evaluation
11. Credentials of External Evaluators
12. Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations
13. Responses of External Evaluators (6 or more, 3 chosen by candidate)
- 14a. Student Evaluations of Teaching
- 14b. Peer Evaluations of Teaching
- 14c. Mentorship, Advising, Research Supervision

Table #2. Letter Log

Evaluator	Affiliation	Initial Contact	Date Materials Sent	Date Response Received
Candidate's Choice				
Jane Doe	Stanford	9-1-11		9-10-11/Declined
James Smith	Brown	9-1-11	9-10-11	9-15-11
Unit's Choice				
John Brown	Harvard	9-1-11	9-10-11	9-28-11

Table #3. Steps in the Review of Faculty

	Dept. APT Committee →	Dept. Chair →	College APT Committee →	Dean →	Campus APT Committee →	Provost →	President
Promotion or New Appt. Assoc. & Full Prof, Sr. & Principal Agents w/ or w/o Tenure Coll. Park Profs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Emeritus/a	*	*		*		*	*
Reappointment College Park Professor		*		*		*	*
New Appt. Prof. of the Practice	*	*		*	Assoc. Provosts	*	*
Reappointment Prof. of the Practice		*		*	Assoc. Provosts	*	*

Note: In non-departmentalized colleges the review originates with the eligible voting faculty and the Dean of the College, and then proceeds to the University APT Committee (where appropriate) and then the Provost and President.

Table # 4. What's in a Dossier for Different Cases?

	Promotions (A)	Emeriti (E)	Appointments & Renewals of Professors of the Practice	Appointments of New Tenured Professors (B) & College Park Professors (F) ****	Joint Appointments*** (C)
1. Transmittal Form	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2a. Dean's Letter	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2b. Candidate Notification Letter (for non-departmentalized college)	✓				
3. College APT Committee Report	✓		✓	✓	✓
4a. Department Chair's Letter (and secondary unit head's letter, if applicable)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4b. Promotion Criteria	✓		✓	✓	✓
4c. Candidate Notification Letter	✓				
5a. Dept. APT Committee Meeting Report	✓	✓	✓*	✓	✓
5b. Dept. Evaluative Report	✓		✓*	✓	✓
6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (signed & dated by candidate)	✓				✓
7. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Reputation of Publication Outlets	✓			✓	✓
9. Candidate's Personal Statement (signed & dated)	✓				✓
10. Log of Letters of Evaluation	✓		✓*	✓	✓
11. Credentials of External Evaluators	✓		✓*	✓	✓
12. Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations	✓		✓*	✓	✓
13. Responses of External Evaluators (6 or more, 3 chosen by candidate)	✓		✓*	✓	✓
14a. Student Evaluations of Teaching	✓		✓	✓**	✓
14b. Peer Evaluations of Teaching	✓				✓
14c. Mentoring, Advising, Research Supervision	✓		✓*	✓**	✓
Appendices	✓			✓	✓
Submit: Electronic copy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

* Not needed for renewal ** Not necessary for College Park Professors

*** See section on Joint Appointments for interweaving input from multiple sources at each level

**** Also for Appointments of Associate Professors without Tenure

NOTE: With College Park Professors of extreme stature (e.g., Nobel Laureates), letters may be bypassed.

Table #5. New Faculty Appointment Information

Provide the following information for the Candidate:		
Candidate's Name:		
Mailing Address:		
Type of Appointment:	9 month appointment	<input type="checkbox"/>
	12 month appointment	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Unless otherwise indicated, the following start dates should be inserted:</i>		
<i>For 9-month Appointments August 23</i>		
<i>For 12-month Appointments July 1</i>		
Expected Start Date:		
Salary	\$	(State Supported)
	\$	(External Funding)
If joint appointment, breakdown of salary (by percentage or dollar amount):		
Primary Department		
Secondary Department		

Table #6. CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION OF APT DECISION

Type of Case	Letters Written By	Contents of Letters	Placement in Dossier	Deadlines/Delivery Methods	Who May Review Letters
Department					
Possibility A <i>Both Chair & Committee vote negatively</i>	Dept. Chair & Dean	Dept. Chair: Votes, decision & rationale of Committee & Dept. Chair Dean: Confirm review conducted appropriately & promotion denied	Front of dossier. Send entire dossier to Fac Affairs	Chair's Letter: Required within 2 weeks of decision, certified mail Dean's: Suggested within 1 month, certified mail	Chair's Letter: <i>Required: Comm. Chair</i> <i>Optional: Comm. Members</i> Dean's: No one
----- Possibility B <i>Either/both vote(s) positively</i>	Dept. Chair	----- Votes, decision & rationale of Dept. Committee & Chair	----- After Dept. Chair's letter	----- Required within 2 weeks of decision	----- N/A
College					
Possibility A <i>Either/both vote(s) negatively</i>	Dean	Decision & rationale of Committee & Dean	After Dean's letter	Suggest within 2 weeks of decision	<i>Required: Comm. Chair</i> <i>Optional: Comm. Members</i>
----- Possibility B <i>Both are positive</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Campus					
In all cases	Assoc. Provost	Decision (If vote is negative, rationale)	Before Pres's letter	Following decision of the President	
President					
Possibility A Pres.'s decision is <i>negative</i>	President	Decision (If mandatory case, termination date) ----- Decision and effective date of promotion	Front of dossier [Dossier placed in candidate's Personnel File]	Suggested within 2 weeks of decision, certified mail ----- Suggested within 2 weeks of decision	N/A
----- Possibility B Pres.'s decision is <i>positive</i>					

Appendix B: CV Format

The *CV* should present a portrait of the candidate's accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible. To aid the review committees, it should include, in the order shown, the following information:²

1. Personal Information.

List the candidate's name, Department (joint appointments should indicate percentage of each appointment), current rank, year of University appointment to current rank, educational background (including institutions, dates and degrees), and employment background (in chronological order or its inverse).

2. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities.

In each category, published works should be listed first, in either chronological order or its inverse, followed (or preceded) by works not yet published but accepted for publication. Pieces in preparation that are not completed and not accepted for publication should not appear on a *CV*.³ The candidate should distinguish between authored and edited works and between refereed and unrefereed outlets and should clarify the status of unpublished works (e.g. accepted, in press). All authors should be listed in the order they appear on the publication. In exceptional cases, e.g., when the work is a product of a large group (more than 10 authors), not all authors need be listed. As an example, the candidate may list the first three, the last three, and the candidate him/herself (including his/her place in the total author list). That is, if a candidate named "Candidate" is the 97th author, the citation may be listed as: *Smith, Jones, Curley...Candidate (97th)...Moe, Larry, Shemp (total of 189 authors)*. Candidates should designate the identity of the author with intellectual leadership on jointly authored papers (if this designation can be appropriately ascertained) by using * or by placing that name in bold, and also identify which co-authors they mentored as undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, faculty research assistants, and junior faculty. When the research is published in a foreign language, the translation of the title should be included.

a. Books⁴

- i. Books authored. Specify original or revised edition.
- ii. Books edited.
- iii. Chapters in books.

b. Articles in Referred Journals.

Full citation, inclusive of all authors in the order of publication and page numbers.
Review articles and invited articles should be so identified.

c. Monographs, Reports and Extension Publications.

d. Book Reviews, Other Articles, Notes.

e. Talks, Abstracts and Other Professional Papers Presented.

² Tenured professorial appointment candidates are not required to adhere to this format.

³ The one exception is working papers, customary in certain field such as economics and mathematics. These should be listed under "Section 2 l. Other."

⁴ Specify whether a manuscript has been accepted without the need for further revisions.

- i. Invited talks, etc.
 - ii. Refereed conference proceedings.
 - iii. Unrefereed conference proceedings.
 - f. Films, CDs, Photographs, Webpages, etc.
 - g. Exhibits, Performances, Demonstrations and Other Creative Activities.
 - h. Original Designs, Plans, Inventions, Software and/or Patents.
 - i. Contracts and Grants.
 - List source, title, amount awarded, time period and role (e.g., principal investigator) in reverse chronological order. If there are co-investigators, please list these.
 - j. Fellowships, Prizes and Awards.
 - k. Editorships, Editorial Boards and Reviewing Activities for Journals and Other Learned Publications.
 - l. Other (specify type).
3. Teaching, Mentoring and Advising.
- a. Courses taught in the last five years. Indicate approximate enrollments and any unusual formats.
 - b. Course or Curriculum Development.
 - c. Textbooks, Manuals, Notes, Software, Web pages and Other Contributions to Teaching.
 - d. Teaching Awards and Other Special Recognition.
 - e. Advising (other than research direction): Indicate approximate numbers of students per year.
 - i. Undergraduate.
 - ii. Graduate.
 - iii. Other advising and mentoring activities (advising student groups, special assignments, recruiting, faculty mentorship, etc.).
 - f. Advising: Research Direction. This refers to students whose projects the candidate has directed as chair. The name of student and academic year(s) involved should be indicated, as well as placement of the student(s), if the project is completed. List completed work first.
 - i. Undergraduate.
 - ii. Master's.
 - iii. Doctoral.
 - g. Extension Activities. Major programs established, workshops, presentations, media activities, awards, honors, etc.
4. Service.
- a. Professional.
 - i. Offices and committee memberships held in professional organizations (include dates).
 - ii. Reviewing activities for agencies.
 - iii. Other unpaid services to local, state and federal agencies.
 - iv. Other non-University committees, commissions, panels, etc.
 - v. International activities not listed above.

- vi. Paid consultancies (optional).
- b. Campus.
 - i. Departmental.
 - ii. College.
 - iii. University.
 - iv. Special administrative assignments.
 - v. Other.
- c. Community, State, National.
- d. Service Awards and Honors.

END OF *CV* FORMAT

Appendix C: Sample Letters

Sample Letter to External Evaluator

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

Dr. XXXX XXX is due to be reviewed for Associate Professor in academic year YYYY-YYYY. I am writing to request your confidential evaluation of the qualifications of Dr. XXX for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of XXXX with Tenure.

In accordance with Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy and Guidelines adopted by the University of Maryland, College of XXXX and Department of XXXX at College Park, I am required to indicate the criteria for promotion and request your evaluation of the following:

- the quality of the publications of the candidate,
- the impact of the candidate's research,
- the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published,
- the potential for future contributions,
- the candidate's service to the profession,
- the candidate's teaching abilities and performance,
- how the candidate compares to others in the field at a comparable stage in their careers and whether or not you would recommend promotion/tenure at your institution (this is an important component in your considerations),
- the nature of your professional interaction with the candidate, if applicable,
- potential clarification of the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in his/her field.

To assist in your evaluation, I am enclosing the following information: Dr. XXX's latest curriculum vitae and personal statement, copies of the three papers listed below selected by Dr. XXX, and a brief summary of the promotion criteria.

I realize that this information is rather extensive and will require considerable effort on your part to review. However, your assistance in helping evaluate Dr. XXX's credentials will be greatly appreciated and will constitute an important element in the overall evaluation. I would be very grateful if you could respond to us in writing no later than..... If possible, would you send your reply electronically toumd.edu as an attachment?

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX
Chair, APT Committee
Department of XXX

enclosures: *CV*, personal statement, publications (please list), Department promotion criteria

Sample Language for Letters in Cases of Denial of Promotion

The eligible voting members of the department met on October 25, 2008 to consider your case for promotion. The vote to endorse your promotion was X yes and Y no with Z mandatory abstentions. This vote, to deny your promotion, reflected concerns about your low scholarly productivity and failure to obtain external funding. Regrettably, I concur with the decision. I am forwarding your dossier to the Dean for review of the evaluative procedures.

Sample Language for Letters of Review for Adherence to Due Process

Dear.....:

As you know, the faculty and Chair of the Department of ... have recommended against promoting you to the rank of ... The University APT Policy requires me, as Dean of the College of ..., to “review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process.” I have carefully examined your case and find no evidence of procedural or substantive due process errors during the review.

For letters to Associate Professors:

I, therefore, accept the judgment of the Department APT Committee and the Chair that you not be promoted to the rank of Professor at this time. I hope and trust that your continued efforts in teaching, research, mentoring, and service will warrant promotion at a later date.

For letters to Assistant Professors and untenured Associate Professors undergoing mandatory review:

I, therefore, accept the judgment of the Department APT Committee and the Department Chair that you not be (promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and) granted tenure. You will be granted an additional one-year contract and your appointment will terminate on _____.

Please accept my best wishes in your future endeavors.

*Sincerely,
Dean*

APPENDIX D: Sample Teaching Evaluation Chart

Course UNIV100	N	Mean F07	College Mean*	N	Mean S08	College Mean *
The instructor treated students with respect.	19	3.05	3.26	39	3.08	3.29
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	19	3.05	3.27	39	3.09	3.47
The course was intellectually challenging.	19	3.00	3.00	39	3	3
I learned a lot from this course.	19	3.21	2.88	39	3.27	2.78
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	19	3.26	2.82	39	3.29	2.82
Average		3.11	3.15		3.14	2.91

*Average rating for all similarly leveled course sections (e.g., all 100-level courses sections) in that college in that semester.

Scaled 0-4: Strongly Disagree=0; Strongly Agree=4. N/A is not in the average.

The standards the instructor set for students were...			
	Too Low	Appropriate	Too High
F 07	0%	89%	11%
S 08	5%	85%	10%
How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?			
	CORE Requirement	Major/Certificate/Minor/Program Requirement	Elective
F07	32%	58%	11%
S08	29%	61%	10%

APPENDIX E: University APT Policy

II-1.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON APPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF FACULTY

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT, FEBRUARY 16, 1993; APPROVED BY THE CHANCELLOR, MARCH 26, 1993; TEXT ON DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR APPROVED BY THE CHANCELLOR ON APRIL 15, 1994; TEXT ON EMERITUS STATUS ADDED 1995; TEXT ON MANDATORY RETIREMENT AT AGE 70 REMOVED MARCH, 1996; TEXT ON TERM OF SERVICE FOR APT COMMITTEE MEMBERS AMENDED FEBRUARY 1998; TEXT ON PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE AMENDED 1998; TEXT ON SENIOR LECTURER ADDED NOVEMBER 2002; TEXT ON APPEALS PROCESS AMENDED AUGUST 2003; TEXT ON FIELD FACULTY ADDED OCTOBER 2003; TEXT ON LIBRARIANS ADDED APRIL, 2004, APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE CHANCELLOR DECEMBER 2004, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 23, 2005; TEXT ON COLLEGE PARK PROFESSOR ADDED JUNE 2005, CONTINUING THROUGH MAY 2012. TEXT ON LIBRARIAN EMERITA /EMERITUS STATUS ADDED APRIL 2006; TEXT ON FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS ON APT COMMITTEES ADDED APRIL 2006; TEXT ON FACULTY EXTENSION AGENT AND ASSOCIATE AGENT AMENDED DECEMBER 15, 2006; TEXT ON COMPOSITION OF THIRD OR CAMPUS-LEVEL REVIEW COMMITTEE AMENDED NOVEMBER 23, 2010.

1 This policy complements the University of Maryland System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and
2 Tenure of Faculty, adapting that policy in accordance with the institutional mission of the
3 University of Maryland at College Park. Within the framework of the System Policy, it specifies
4 the criteria and procedures related to faculty personnel actions which shall apply to the
5 University of Maryland at College Park.

6 Subject to the provisions of paragraphs I.C.15 and I.C.17 of the University of Maryland System
7 Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty (1989), the provisions of paragraph III.C of
8 this University of Maryland at College Park Policy on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of
9 Faculty shall be published in the Faculty Handbook and shall constitute part of the contractually
10 binding agreement between the university and the faculty member. Any proposed changes to
11 this University of Maryland at College Park Policy on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of
12 Faculty shall be submitted for initial review and endorsement by the College Park Campus
13 Senate.

14 Terminological Note

15 The procedures spelled out in this document for tenure and promotion review specify three levels
16 of review below the President's office. For most faculty members these are the department, the
17 college, and the campus levels. However, some faculty members are appointed in colleges and
18 schools that are not departmentalized and that conduct the initial review at the college or school
19 level. For uniform terminology the initial review, whether conducted by a department or a non-
20 departmentalized school or college, is referred to as a “first-level review,” and “department” is
21 usually replaced by “first-level unit.” First-level units thus comprise departments, non-

22 departmentalized schools, and non-departmentalized colleges. Higher levels of review are
23 referred to as “second-level” and “third-level.”

24 For the purpose of this policy, the term "university" and the term "institution" shall be
25 synonymous and shall mean the University of Maryland at College Park. For the purpose of this
26 policy, the word "days" shall refer to calendar days.

27 Purpose of this Policy

28 The University of Maryland is dedicated to the discovery and the transmission of knowledge and
29 to the achievement of excellence in its academic disciplines. Each faculty member has a
30 personal responsibility for contributing to the achievement of excellence in his or her own
31 academic discipline and for exercising the best judgment in advancing the department, the
32 college, and the University. Those faculty members holding the rank of Professor have the
33 greatest responsibility for establishing and maintaining the highest standards of academic
34 performance within the University. This Policy on the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of
35 Faculty exists to set the standards for appointment and promotion to the various faculty ranks
36 and to recognize and to encourage the achievement of excellence on the part of the faculty
37 members through the awarding of tenure and through promotion within the faculty ranks.
38 Through this process the University builds and enhances its educational programs and services
39 and it advances the state of knowledge which supports the growth and development of our
40 society.

41 I. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO THE 42 ACADEMIC AND ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE RANKS

43 The only faculty ranks which may involve a tenure commitment are: Professor,
44 Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Principal Agent, Senior Agent, and Agent, and
45 such other ranks as the Board of Regents may approve. Effective April 5, 1989,
46 appointments to all other ranks, including any qualified rank, other than an honorific
47 qualification, in which an additional adjective is introduced, are for a definite term and do
48 not involve a tenure commitment. Those granted tenure in such a rank before April 5,
49 1989, shall continue to hold tenure in that rank.

50 The following shall be the minimum qualifications for appointment or promotion to the
51 academic ranks in use by the University of Maryland at College Park.

52 A. Faculty with Duties in Teaching and Research

53 1. Instructor 6

54 An appointee to the rank of Instructor ordinarily shall hold the highest earned
55 degree in his or her field of specialization. There shall be evidence also of
56 potential for excellence in teaching and for a successful academic career. The

6 As of November 14, 1995, this title may NOT be used for new appointments.

57 rank does not carry tenure.

58 2. Assistant Professor

59 The appointee shall have qualities suggesting a high level of teaching ability in
60 the relevant academic field, and shall provide evidence of potential for superior
61 research, scholarship, or artistic creativity in the field. Because this is a tenure-
62 track position, the appointee shall at the time of appointment show promise of
63 having, at such time as he or she is to be reviewed for tenure and promotion in
64 accordance with paragraph I.C.4 of the University of Maryland System Policy
65 and paragraph III.C.3 of this policy, the qualities described under "Associate
66 Professor" below. In most fields the doctorate shall be a requirement for
67 appointment to an assistant professorship. Although the rank normally leads
68 to review for tenure and promotion, persons appointed to the rank of Assistant
69 Professor after the effective date of this policy shall not be granted tenure in this
70 rank.

71 3. Associate Professor

72 In addition to having the qualifications of an Assistant Professor, the appointee
73 shall have a high level of competence in teaching and advisement in the relevant
74 academic field, shall have demonstrated significant research, scholarship, or
75 artistic creativity in the field and shall have shown promise of continued
76 productivity, shall be competent to direct work of major subdivisions of the
77 primary academic unit and to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate
78 research, and shall have served the campus, the profession, or the community in
79 some useful way in addition to teaching and research. Promotion to the rank from
80 within confers tenure; appointment to the rank from without may confer tenure.

81 4. Professor

82 In addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, the appointee
83 shall have established a national and, where appropriate, international reputation
84 for outstanding research, scholarship or artistic creativity, and a
85 distinguished record of teaching. There also must be a record of continuing
86 evidence of relevant and effective professional service. The rank carries
87 tenure.

88 B. Faculty with Duties Primarily in Research, Scholarship, or Artistic Creativity

89 All appointments in the following titles are renewable. Appointments with these
90 faculty titles do not carry tenure.

91 1. Faculty Research Assistant

92 The appointee shall be capable of assisting in research under the direction of the
93 head of a research project and shall have ability and training adequate to the
94 carrying out of the particular techniques required, the assembling of data, and the
95 use and care of any specialized apparatus. A baccalaureate degree shall be the
96 minimum requirement.

97 2. Research Associate

98 The appointee shall be trained in research procedures, shall be capable of carrying
99 out individual research or collaborating in group research at the advanced level,
100 and shall have had the experience and specialized training necessary for success
101 in such research projects as may be undertaken. An earned doctorate shall
102 normally be a minimum requirement.

103 3. Research Assistant Professor; Assistant Research Scientist; Assistant Research
104 Scholar; Assistant Research Engineer

105 These ranks are generally parallel to Assistant Professor. In addition to the
106 qualifications of a Research Associate, appointees to these ranks shall have
107 demonstrated superior research ability. Appointees should be qualified and
108 competent to direct the work of others (such as technicians, graduate students,
109 other senior research personnel). The doctoral degree will be a normal
110 requirement for appointment at these ranks. Appointment to these ranks may be
111 made for a period of up to three years.

112 4. Research Associate Professor; Associate Research Scientist; Associate Research
113 Scholar; Associate Research Engineer

114 These ranks are generally parallel to Associate Professor. In addition to the
115 qualifications required of the assistant ranks, appointees to these ranks should
116 have extensive successful experience in scholarly or creative endeavors, and the
117 ability to propose, develop, and manage major research projects. Appointment to
118 these ranks may be made for a period of up to three years.

119 5. Research Professor; Senior Research Scientist; Senior Research Scholar; Senior
120 Research Engineer

121 These ranks are generally parallel to Professor. In addition to the qualifications
122 required of the associate ranks, appointees to these ranks should have
123 demonstrated a degree of proficiency sufficient to establish an excellent
124 reputation among regional and national colleagues. Appointees should provide
125 tangible evidence of sound scholarly production in research, publications,
126 professional achievements or other distinguished and creative activity.
127 Appointment to these ranks may be made for a period of up to five years.

128 6. Assistant Artist-in-Residence; Associate Artist-in-Residence; Senior Artist-in-
129 Residence

130 These titles, parallel to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor,
131 respectively, are intended for those persons whose professional activities are of a
132 creative or performance nature, including but not limited to theatre, dance, music,
133 and art. In each case, the qualifications shall reflect demonstrated superior
134 proficiency and excellence and progressively higher national and international
135 reputation, as appropriate to the ranks involved. Appointment to the rank of
136 Senior Artist-in-Residence may be made for a period of up to five years;
137 appointment to the ranks of Assistant Artist-in-Residence and Associate Artist-in-
138 Residence may be made for a period of up to three years.

139 C. Field Faculty

140 1. Associate Agent

141 The appointee shall hold at least a bachelor's degree and shall show evidence of
142 ability to work with people. The appointee shall have an educational background
143 related to the specific position and should demonstrate evidence of creative ability
144 to plan and implement Cooperative Extension Service programs. This is a term
145 appointment and may be renewed annually.

146 2. Faculty Extension Assistant

147 The appointee shall be capable of assisting in Extension under the direction of the
148 head of an Extension project and have the specialized expertise, training and
149 ability to perform the duties required. An earned bachelor's degree and
150 experience in the specialized field is required.

151 3. Faculty Extension Associate

152 The appointee shall be capable of carrying out individual instruction or
153 collaborating in group discussions at the advanced level, should be trained in
154 Extension procedures, and should have had the experience and specialized
155 training necessary to develop and interpret data required for success in such
156 Extension projects as may be undertaken. An earned doctorate shall be the
157 minimum requirement.

158 4. Agent (parallel to the rank of Assistant Professor)

159 The appointee must hold a master's degree in an appropriate discipline and show
160 evidence of academic ability and leadership skills. The appointee shall have an
161 educational background related to the specific position.

- 162 5. Senior Agent (parallel to the rank of Associate Professor)
- 163 In addition to the qualifications of an Agent, the appointee must have
164 demonstrated achievement in program development and must have shown
165 originality and creative ability in designing new programs, teaching effectiveness,
166 and evidence of service to the community, institution, and profession.
167 Appointment to this rank may carry tenure.
- 168 6. Principal Agent (parallel to the rank of Professor)
- 169 In addition to the qualifications of a Senior Agent, the appointee must have
170 demonstrated leadership ability and evidence of service to the community,
171 institution, and profession. The appointee must also have received recognition for
172 contributions to the Cooperative Extension Service sufficient to establish a
173 reputation among State, regional and/or national colleagues, and should have
174 demonstrated evidence of distinguished achievement in creative program
175 development. Appointment to this rank carried tenure.
- 176 D. Faculty Engaged Exclusively or Primarily in Library Services
- 177 Library faculty hold the ranks of Librarian I-IV. Each rank requires a master's
178 degree from an American Library Association accredited program or a graduate
179 degree in another field where appropriate. The master's degree is considered the
180 terminal degree. Appointments to these ranks are for 12 months with leave and
181 other benefits provided to twelve-month tenured/tenure track faculty members
182 with the exception of terminal leave, sabbatical leave, and non-creditable sick
183 leave (collegially supported).
- 184 Permanent status is an institutional commitment to permanent and continuous
185 employment to be terminated only for adequate cause (for example, professional
186 or scholarly misconduct; incompetence; moral turpitude; or willful neglect of
187 duty) and only after due process in accordance with relevant USM and campus
188 policies. Librarians at the rank of Librarian I and Librarian II are not eligible for
189 permanent status. Permanent status is available for library faculty holding the
190 rank of Librarian III and Librarian IV. Those candidates without permanent
191 status applying for the rank of Librarian III and Librarian IV shall be considered
192 concurrently for permanent status.
- 193 1. Librarian I
- 194 This is an entry-level rank, assigned to librarians with little or no
195 professional library experience. This rank does not carry permanent
196 status.
- 197 2. Librarian II

198 Librarians at this rank have demonstrated professional development
199 evidenced by achievement of a specialization in a subject, service,
200 technical, administrative, or other area of value to the library. This rank
201 does not carry permanent status.

202 3. Librarian III

203 Librarians at this rank have a high level of competence in performing
204 professional duties requiring specialized knowledge or experience. They
205 shall have served the Libraries, the campus, or the community in some
206 significant way; have shown evidence of creative or scholarly
207 contribution; and have been involved in mentoring and providing
208 developmental opportunities for their colleagues. They shall have shown
209 promise of continued productivity in librarianship, service, and
210 scholarship or creativity. Promotion to this rank from within the Libraries
211 confers permanent status; appointment to this rank from outside the
212 Libraries may confer permanent status.

213 4. Librarian IV

214 Librarians at this rank show evidence of superior performance at the
215 highest levels of specialized work and professional responsibility. They
216 have shown evidence of and demonstrate promise for continued
217 contribution in valuable service and significant creative or scholarly
218 contribution. Such achievement must include leadership roles and have
219 resulted in the attainment of Libraries, campus, state, regional, national, or
220 international recognition. This rank carries permanent status.

221 E. Additional Faculty Ranks

222 1. Assistant Instructor

223 The appointee shall be competent to fill a specific position in an
224 acceptable manner, but he or she is not required to meet all the
225 requirements for an Instructor. He or she shall hold the appropriate
226 baccalaureate degree or possess equivalent experience.

227 2. Lecturer

228 The title Lecturer will ordinarily be used to designate appointments, at any
229 salary and experience level, of persons who are serving in a teaching
230 capacity for a limited time or part-time. This rank does not carry tenure.

231 3. Senior Lecturer

232 In addition to having the qualifications of a lecturer, the appointee
233 normally shall have established over the course of six years a record of
234 teaching excellence and service. Appointment to this rank requires the
235 approval of the departmental faculty. The appointment is made for a term
236 not to exceed five years and is renewable. This rank does not carry tenure.

237 4. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct
238 Professor

239 The appointee shall be associated with the faculty of a department or non-
240 departmentalized school or college, but shall not be essential to the
241 development of that unit's program. The titles do not carry tenure. The
242 appointee may be paid or unpaid. The appointee may be employed
243 outside the University, but shall not hold another paid appointment at the
244 University of Maryland at College Park. The appointee shall have such
245 expertise in his or her discipline and be so well regarded that his or her
246 appointment will have the endorsement of the majority of the members of
247 the professorial faculty of the academic unit. Any academic unit may
248 recommend to the administration persons of these ranks; normally, the
249 number of adjunct appointments shall comprise no more than a
250 small percentage of the faculty in an academic unit. Appointments to
251 these ranks shall not extend beyond the end of the fiscal year during
252 which the appointment becomes effective and may be renewed.

253 5. Affiliate Assistant Professor, Affiliate Associate Professor, Affiliate
254 Professor, Affiliate Librarian II, Affiliate Librarian III, and Affiliate
255 Librarian IV

256 These titles shall be used to recognize the affiliation of a faculty member
257 or other university employee with an academic unit other than that to
258 which his or her appointment and salary are formally linked. The nature
259 of the affiliation shall be specified in writing, and the appointment shall be
260 made upon the recommendation of the faculty of the department with
261 which the appointee is to be affiliated and with the consent of the faculty
262 of his or her primary department. The rank of affiliation shall be
263 commensurate with the appointee's qualifications.

264 6. Visiting Appointments

265 The prefix Visiting before an academic title, e.g., Visiting Professor, shall
266 be used to designate a short-term professorial appointment without tenure.

267 7. Emerita, Emeritus

268 The word emerita or emeritus after an academic title shall designate a
269 faculty member who has retired from full-time employment in the
270 University of Maryland at College Park after meritorious service to the
271 University in the areas of teaching, research, or service. Emerita or
272 emeritus status may be conferred on Associate Professors, Professors,
273 Distinguished University Professors, Research Associate Professors,
274 Research Professors, Senior Agents, Principal Agents, Librarians III, and
275 Librarians IV.

276 8. Distinguished University Professor

277 The title Distinguished University Professor will be conferred by the
278 President upon a limited number of members of the faculty of the
279 University of Maryland at College Park in recognition of distinguished
280 achievement in teaching; research or creative activities; and service to the
281 University, the profession, and the community. College Park faculty who,
282 at the time of approval of this title, carry the title of Distinguished
283 Professor, will be permitted to retain their present title or to change to the
284 title of Distinguished University Professor. Designation as Distinguished
285 University Professor shall include an annual allocation of funds to support
286 his or her professional activities, to be expended in accordance with
287 applicable University policies.

288 9. Professor of the Practice

289 This title may be used to appoint individuals who have demonstrated
290 excellence in the practice as well as leadership in specific fields. The
291 appointee shall have attained regional and national prominence and, when
292 appropriate, international recognition of outstanding achievement.
293 Additionally, the appointee shall have demonstrated superior teaching
294 ability appropriate to assigned responsibilities. As a minimum, the
295 appointee shall hold the terminal professional degree in the field or
296 equivalent stature by virtue of experience. Appointees will hold the rank
297 of Professor but, while having the stature, will not have rights that are
298 limited to tenured faculty. Initial appointment is for periods up to five
299 years, and reappointment is possible. This title does not carry tenure, nor
300 does time served as a Professor of the Practice count toward achieving
301 tenure in another title.

302 10. College Park Professor

303 This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative or
304 performing artists, or researchers who would qualify for appointment at
305 the University of Maryland at College Park at the level of professor but
306 who normally hold full-time positions outside the University. Holders of

307 this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal
308 investigators, and participate in departmental and college shared
309 governance. Initial appointment is for three years and is renewable
310 annually upon recommendation to the Provost by the unit head and dean.
311 Appointment as a College Park Professor does not carry tenure or
312 expectation of salary.

313 11 Other Titles

314 No new faculty titles or designations shall be created by the University of
315 Maryland at College Park for appointees to faculty status without
316 approval by the Campus Senate and the President.

317 II. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

318 The criteria for appointment, tenure, and promotion shall reflect the educational mission
319 of the University of Maryland at College Park: to provide an undergraduate education
320 ranked among the best in the nation; to provide a nationally and internationally renowned
321 program of graduate education and research, making significant contributions to the arts,
322 the humanities, the professions, and the sciences; and to provide public service to the
323 state and the nation embodying the best tradition of outstanding land-grant colleges and
324 universities.

325 In the case of both appointments and promotions every effort shall be made to fill
326 positions with persons of the highest qualifications. Search, appointment, and promotion
327 procedures shall comply with institutional policies, including affirmative action
328 guidelines, and be widely publicized and published in the Faculty Handbook.

329 It is the special responsibility of those in charge of recommending appointments to make
330 a thorough search of available talent before recommending appointees. At a minimum,
331 the search for full-time tenure-track or tenured faculty and academic administrators shall
332 include the advertisement of available positions in the appropriate media.

333 Decisions on tenure-track appointments must also take account of the academic needs of
334 the department, school, college, and institution at the time of appointment and the
335 projected needs at the time of consideration for tenure. This is both an element of sound
336 academic planning and an essential element of fairness to candidates for tenure-track
337 positions. Academic units shall select for initial appointment those candidates who, at
338 the time of consideration for tenure, are most likely to merit tenure and also whose areas
339 of expertise are most likely to be compatible with the unit's projected programmatic
340 needs. The same concern shall be shown in the renewal of tenure-track appointments.

341 Each college, school, and department shall develop brief, general, written Criteria for
342 Tenure and/or Promotion. The criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions
343 fall into three general categories: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of

344 students; (2) performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity; (3) performance
345 of professional service to the university, the profession, or the community. The relative
346 importance of these criteria may vary among different academic units, but each of the
347 categories shall be considered in every decision. The criteria for appointment to a faculty
348 rank or tenure shall be the same as for promotion to that rank (or for tenuring at the rank
349 of associate professor), whether or not the individual is being considered for an
350 administrative appointment. An academic unit's general Criteria for Tenure and/or
351 Promotion must receive the approval of the next level administrator. Any exceptional or
352 unusual arrangements relating to criteria for tenure and/or promotion shall be specified in
353 writing at the time of appointment and shall be approved by the faculty and administrator
354 of the first-level unit, by the dean of the school or college, and by the Provost.

355 Upon appointment, each new faculty member shall be given by his or her chair or dean a
356 copy of the unit's Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion and the chair or dean shall
357 discuss the Criteria with the faculty member. Each faculty member shall be notified
358 promptly in writing by his or her chair or dean of any changes in the unit's Criteria for
359 Tenure and/or Promotion.

360 Decisions on promotion of tenured faculty members shall be based on the academic merit
361 of the candidate as evaluated using the relevant Criteria. Decisions on the renewal of
362 untenured appointments and on promotion decisions involving the granting of tenure
363 shall be based on the academic merit of the candidate as evaluated using the relevant
364 Criteria and on the academic needs of the department, school, college, and institution.
365 Considerations relating to the present or future programmatic value of the candidate's
366 particular field of expertise, or other larger institutional objectives, may be legitimately
367 considered in the context of a tenure decision. In no case, however, may programmatic
368 considerations affecting a particular candidate be changed following the first renewal of
369 the faculty contract of that candidate. It is essential that academic units develop long-
370 range projections of programmatic needs in order that decisions on tenure and tenure-
371 track appointments and promotions to tenure ranks be made on a rational basis.

372 A. Teaching and Advisement

373 Superior teaching and academic advisement at all instructional levels (or
374 reasonable promise thereof in the case of initial appointments) are essential
375 criteria in appointment and promotion. Every effort shall be made to recognize
376 and emphasize excellence in teaching and advisement. The general test to be
377 applied is that the faculty member be engaged regularly and effectively in
378 teaching and advisement activities of high quality and significance.

379 The responsibility for the evaluation of teaching performance rests on the
380 academic unit of the faculty member. Each academic unit shall develop and
381 disseminate the criteria to be used in the evaluation of the teaching performance
382 of its members. The evaluation should normally include opinions of students and
383 colleagues.

384 B. Research, Scholarship, and Artistic Creativity

385 Research, scholarship and artistic creativity are among the primary functions of
386 the university. A faculty member's contributions will vary from one academic or
387 professional field to another, but the general test to be applied is that the faculty
388 member be engaged continually and effectively in creative activities of
389 distinction. Each academic unit shall develop and disseminate the criteria for
390 evaluating scholarly and creative activity in that unit.

391 Research or other activity of a classified or proprietary nature shall not be
392 considered in weighing an individual's case for appointment or promotion.

393 C. Service

394 In addition to a demonstrated excellence in teaching and in research, scholarship
395 and artistic creativity, a candidate for promotion should have established a
396 commitment to the University and the profession through participation in service
397 activities. Such participation may take several different forms: service to the
398 university; to the profession and higher education; and to the community, school
399 systems, and governmental agencies. Service activity is expected of the faculty
400 member, but service shall not substitute for teaching and advisement or for
401 achievement in research, scholarship, or artistic creativity. Service activity shall
402 not be expected or required of junior faculty to the point that it interferes with the
403 development of their teaching and research.

404 III. APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY

405 A. Search Process

406 1. Recruitment of faculty shall be governed by written search procedures,
407 which shall anticipate and describe the manner in which new professorial
408 faculty members will be recruited, including arrangements for
409 interinstitutional appointments, interdepartmental appointments, and
410 appointments in new academic units.

411 2. Search procedures shall reflect the commitment of the University to equal
412 opportunity and affirmative action. Campus procedures shall be widely
413 disseminated and published in the Faculty Handbook.

414 3. Faculty review committees are an essential part of the review and
415 recommendation process for new full-time faculty appointments. The
416 procedures which lead to new faculty appointments should hold to
417 standards at least as rigorous as those that pertain to promotions to the

418 same rank.

419 B. Offers of Appointment

420 1. An offer of appointment can be made only with the approval of the
421 President or his or her designee. Full-time appointments to the rank of
422 Associate Professor or Professor require the written approval of the
423 President.

424 2. All faculty appointments are made to a designated rank effective on a
425 specific date. A standard letter of appointment shall be developed for each
426 rank and tenure status and shall be approved by the Office of the Attorney
427 General for form and legal sufficiency. The University shall publish in a
428 designated section of the Faculty Handbook all duly approved System and
429 University policies and procedures which set forth faculty rights and
430 responsibilities. Subject to the provisions of paragraphs I.C.15 and I.C.17
431 of the System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty and
432 paragraph III.C of this document, the terms described in the letter of
433 appointment, together with the policies reproduced in the designated
434 portions of the Faculty Handbook, shall constitute a contractually binding
435 agreement between the University and the appointee.

436 C. Provisions Related to Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

437 The following provisions are adapted from the System Policy on Appointments,
438 Rank, and Tenure to reflect the mission of the University of Maryland at College
439 Park and are to be furnished to all new faculty at the time of initial appointment.

440 1. Adjustments in salary or advancement in rank may be made under these
441 policies, and, except where a definite termination date is a condition of
442 appointment, the conditions pertaining to the rank as modified shall
443 become effective as of the date of the modification.

444 2. Subject to any special conditions specified in the letter of appointment,
445 full-time appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor shall be for an
446 initial term of one to three years. The first year of the initial appointment
447 shall be a probationary year, and the appointment may be terminated at the
448 end of that fiscal year if the appointee is so notified by March 1. In the
449 event that the initial appointment is for two years, the appointment may be
450 terminated if the appointee is so notified by December 15 of the second
451 year. After the second year of the initial appointment, the appointee shall
452 be given one full year's notice if it is the intention of the University not to
453 renew the appointment. If the appointee does not receive timely
454 notification of nonrenewal, the initial appointment shall be extended for
455 one additional year. An initial appointment may be renewed for an

456 additional one, two, or three years. Except as set forth in paragraph III.C.3
457 below, an appointment to any term beyond the initial appointment shall
458 terminate at the conclusion of that additional term unless the appointee is
459 notified in writing that it is to be renewed for another term allowable
460 under University System policies or the appointee is granted tenure. Such
461 appointments may be terminated at any time in accordance with
462 paragraphs III.C.5-11.

463 3. An Assistant Professor whose appointment is extended to a full six years
464 shall receive a formal review for tenure in the sixth year. (An assistant
465 professor may receive a formal review for tenure and be granted tenure
466 earlier (cf. IV.A.4.)). The appointee shall be notified in writing, by the
467 end of the appointment year in which the review was conducted, of the
468 decision to grant or deny tenure. Notwithstanding anything in paragraph
469 III.C.2 to the contrary, a full-time appointee who has completed six
470 consecutive years of service at the University as an Assistant Professor,
471 and who has been notified that tenure has been denied, shall be granted an
472 additional and terminal one year appointment in that rank, but, barring
473 exceptional circumstances, shall receive no further consideration for
474 tenure. In the event that an Assistant Professor in his or her sixth year of
475 service is not affirmatively awarded tenure by the President or otherwise
476 notified of a tenure decision, then he or she shall be granted a one-year
477 terminal appointment.

478 4. Full-time appointments or promotions to the rank of Associate Professor
479 or Professor require the written approval of the President. Promotions to
480 the rank of Associate Professor or Professor carry immediate tenure. New
481 full-time appointments to the rank of Professor carry immediate tenure.
482 New full-time appointments to the rank of Associate Professor may carry
483 tenure. If immediate tenure is not offered, such appointments shall be for
484 an initial period of up to four years and shall terminate at the end of that
485 period unless the appointee is notified in writing that he or she has been
486 granted tenure. An Associate Professor who is appointed without tenure
487 shall receive a formal review for tenure. No later than one year prior to
488 the expiration of the appointment, the formal review must be completed,
489 and written notice must be given that tenure has been granted or denied.
490 Appointments carrying tenure may be terminated at any time as described
491 under paragraphs III.C.5-11.

492 5. A term of service may be terminated by the appointee by resignation, but
493 it is expressly agreed that no resignation shall become effective
494 until the termination of the appointment period in which the resignation is
495 offered except by mutual agreement between the appointee and the
496 President or designee.

- 497 6. a. The President may terminate the appointment of a tenured or
498 tenure-track appointee for moral turpitude, professional or
499 scholarly misconduct, incompetence, or willful neglect of duty,
500 provided that the charges be stated in writing, that the appointee be
501 furnished a copy thereof, and that the appointee be given an
502 opportunity prior to such termination to request a hearing by an
503 impartial hearing officer appointed by the President or a duly
504 appointed faculty board of review. With the consent of the
505 President, the appointee may elect a hearing by the President rather
506 than by a hearing officer or a faculty board of review. Upon
507 receipt of notice of termination, the appointee shall have thirty (30)
508 calendar days to request a hearing. The hearing shall be held no
509 sooner than thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of such a
510 request. The date of the hearing shall be set by mutual agreement
511 of the appointee and the hearing officer or faculty board of
512 review. If a hearing officer or a faculty board of review is
513 appointed, the hearing officer or board shall make a
514 recommendation to the President for action to be taken. The
515 recommendation shall be based only on the evidence of record in
516 the proceeding. Either party to the hearing may request an
517 opportunity for oral argument before the President prior to action
518 on the recommendation. If the President does not accept the
519 recommendation of the hearing officer or board of review, the
520 reasons shall be communicated promptly in writing to the
521 appointee and the hearing officer or board. In the event that the
522 President elects to terminate the appointment, the appointee may
523 appeal to the Board of Regents, which shall render a final decision.
- 524 b. Under exceptional circumstances and following consultation with
525 the chair of the faculty board of review or appropriate faculty
526 committee, the President may direct that the appointee be relieved
527 of some or all of his or her University duties, without loss of
528 compensation and without prejudice, pending a final decision in
529 the termination proceedings. (In case of emergency involving
530 threat to life, the President may act to suspend temporarily prior to
531 consultation.)
- 532 c. The appointee may elect to be represented by counsel of his or her
533 choice throughout the termination proceedings.
- 534 7. If an appointment is terminated in the manner prescribed in paragraph
535 III.C.6, the President may, at his or her discretion, relieve the
536 appointee of assigned duties immediately or allow the appointee to
537 continue in the position for a specified period of time. The appointee's
538 compensation shall continue for a period of one year commencing on the

539 date on which the appointee receives notice of termination. A faculty
540 member whose appointment is terminated for cause involving moral
541 turpitude or professional or scholarly misconduct shall receive no notice or
542 further compensation beyond the date of final action by the President or
543 Board of Regents.

544 8. The University may terminate any appointment because of the
545 discontinuance of the department, program, school or unit in which the
546 appointment was made; or because of the lack of appropriations
547 or other funds with which to support the appointment. Such decisions
548 must be made in accordance with written University policies. The
549 President shall give a full-time appointee holding tenure notice of such
550 termination at least one year before the date on which the appointment is
551 terminated.

552 9. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, the appointment of any
553 untenured faculty member, fifty percent or more of whose compensation is
554 derived from research contracts, service contracts, gifts or grants, shall be
555 subject to termination upon expiration of the research funds, service
556 contract income, gifts or grants from which the compensation is payable.

557 10. Appointments shall terminate upon the death of the appointee. Upon
558 termination for this cause, the University shall pay to the estate of the
559 appointee all of the accumulated and unpaid earnings of the appointee plus
560 compensation for accumulated unused annual leave.

561 11. If, in the judgment of the appointee's department chair or supervisor, a
562 deficiency in the appointee's professional conduct or performance
563 exists that does not warrant dismissal or suspension, a moderate sanction
564 such as a formal warning or censure may be imposed, provided that
565 the appointee is first afforded an opportunity to contest the action through
566 the established faculty grievance procedure.

567 12. Unless the appointee agrees otherwise, any changes that are hereafter
568 made in paragraphs III.C.1-12 will be applied only to subsequent
569 appointments.

570 13. Compensation for appointments under these policies is subject to
571 modification in the event of reduction in State appropriations or in other
572 income from which compensation may be paid.

573 14. The appointee shall be subject to all applicable policies and procedures
574 duly adopted or amended from time to time by the University or the
575 University System, including, but not limited to, policies and procedures
576 regarding annual leave; sick leave; sabbatical leave; leave of absence;
577 outside employment; patents and copyrights; scholarly and professional

578 misconduct; retirement; reduction, consolidation or discontinuation of
579 programs; and criteria on teaching, scholarship, and service.

580 D. Provisions Relating to Formal Promotion and Tenure Reviews

581 1. Reviews for promotion and tenure shall be conducted according to the
582 duly adopted written policies and procedures of the University. These
583 procedures shall be published in the Faculty Handbook.

584 2. Faculty review committees are a part of the review process at each level.

585 3. Each review by a faculty committee and each review by the administrator
586 of an academic unit (chair or dean) shall be focused on the evaluation of
587 the candidate using the Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion of that unit.
588 Each review shall be based on materials that must include the candidate's
589 *CV*, the candidate's Personal Statement, the Summary Statement of
590 Professional Achievements, the Candidate's Response to the Summary
591 Statement of Professional Achievements (if one is written), the letters
592 from external evaluators, and the other prescribed elements in the
593 University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual. At
594 the second and third levels of review, these promotion materials include
595 the promotion committee reports and the letters from academic unit
596 administrators.

597 4. A faculty member eligible to vote on the promotion recommendation on a
598 candidate of an academic unit may not participate in a review of that
599 candidate or vote on that candidate at a higher level of review. Because
600 they provide an independent evaluation, department chairs, academic
601 deans, and the Provost are ineligible to vote at any level.

602 5. Candidates shall have the right to appeal negative promotion and tenure
603 decisions on grounds specified in the policies and procedures of paragraph
604 V.B.

605 IV. PROMOTION, TENURE, AND EMERITUS REVIEW

606 The Provost shall develop detailed written procedures, implementing the University and
607 the System policies on appointment, promotion, and tenure. This set of procedures shall
608 be known as the University's Implementation of the University Appointment, Promotion
609 and Tenure Policy and these procedures shall govern the University's decision-making.
610 The procedures developed shall be subject to review and approval by the University
611 Senate. The Provost shall also develop useful guidelines, suggestions, and advice for
612 candidates for tenure and/or promotion and for academic units responsible for carrying
613 out reviews of candidates. Each year the Provost shall publish the University

614 Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual. This manual shall contain the
615 entire text of the University's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy, the
616 University's implementation of this policy, and the guidelines, suggestions, and advice
617 for candidates and for academic units. The University's Implementation should contain
618 the University's required procedures clearly identified as such. All guidelines,
619 suggestions, and advice in the Manual must be so labeled and distinguished from the
620 required procedures.

621 Each college, school, and department shall develop detailed written procedures
622 implementing the University and System policies on appointment, promotion, and tenure
623 and the University's implementation of the University's Policy. The procedures of each
624 academic unit shall be subject to review and approval by the policy-setting faculty body
625 of the college or school for an academic unit in a departmentalized college or school, as
626 established in its plan of organization, by the dean, and by the University Senate.

627 The University's required procedures and the required procedures of each academic unit
628 to which a candidate belongs shall apply to promotion and tenure decisions for all full-
629 time faculty and for academic administrators who hold faculty rank, or who would hold
630 faculty rank if appointed.

631 The Provost has the responsibility for systematically monitoring the fair and timely
632 compliance of all academic units with the approved procedures of this Appointment,
633 Tenure and Promotion Policy and for the prompt remedying of any failure to fulfill a
634 provision of this Policy that occurs prior to the institution of a formal tenure and/or
635 promotion review. A violation of procedural due process during a formal review for
636 tenure and/or promotion is subject to the provisions of Section V, The Appeals Process.

637 At the time of appointment, each new faculty member shall be provided by the chair or
638 dean of the first-level unit with a copy of the University's Appointment, Promotion and
639 Tenure Procedures Manual and the procedures for the lower-level academic units to
640 which he or she belongs and the chair or dean shall discuss the procedures with the
641 faculty member. Faculty members should stay up to date on these procedures and
642 academic units should keep their faculty members informed of any changes.

643 Faculty review committees shall be an essential part of the review and recommendation
644 process for all full-time faculty. Review committees and administrators at all levels shall
645 impose the highest standards of quality, shall ensure that all candidates receive fair and
646 impartial treatment, and shall be responsible for maintaining the integrity and the
647 confidentiality of the review and recommendation process.

648 Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are responsible for providing their academic unit
649 with an accurate *curriculum vitae* detailing their academic and professional
650 achievements. Candidates holding faculty rank at the University shall also make a
651 written Personal Statement advocating their case for tenure and/or promotion based on
652 the facts in their *CV*, on the applicable Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion, and on their
653 perspective of those achievements in the context of their discipline. Both the *CV* and the

654 Personal Statement shall be presented in the form required by the University
655 Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual at the beginning of the
656 academic year in which a formal review for tenure and/or promotion will occur. These
657 two documents shall be included with each request for external evaluation and shall be
658 included in the promotion dossier reviewed at each level within the University. Within
659 the University review system, units and administrators may express their judgments on
660 the contents and on the significance of elements in either of the candidate's documents.
661 Units may only ask in neutral language for external evaluators to comment on elements
662 of these documents as part of their review but not suggest conclusions.

663 The burden of evaluating the qualifications and suitability of the candidate for tenure and
664 promotion is greatest at the first level of review. Great weight shall be given at the higher
665 levels of review to the judgments and recommendations of lower-level review
666 committees and to the principle of peer review.

667 The decision whether or not to award tenure or promotion shall be based primarily on the
668 candidate's record of accomplishment in each of the three areas of teaching and
669 advisement, research, and service, and the anticipated level of future achievements as
670 indicated by accomplishments to date. Considerations relating to the present or future
671 programmatic value of the candidate's particular field of expertise, or other larger
672 institutional objectives, may legitimately be considered in the context of a tenure
673 decision; but in no case shall the year of the tenure review be the first occasion on which
674 these considerations are raised. The faculty and the unit chair or dean are responsible for
675 advising untenured faculty on any and all programmatic considerations relative to the
676 tenure decision, conveying such information to the candidate at the earliest opportunity
677 during annual assessments of progress towards tenure.

678 When the President has completed his or her review of the tenure or promotion case and
679 informed the candidate of the decision, the list of members of the unit, college, and
680 campus committees shall be made public.

681 A. First-level Review

682 1. Eligible Voters: At the first-level unit of review, the review committee
683 shall consist of all members of the faculty of that unit who are eligible to
684 vote. To be eligible to vote within the first-level unit, the faculty member
685 must hold a tenured appointment in the university and must be at or above
686 the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion. Tenured
687 faculty voting on promotions cases at the first-level of review may only do
688 so in a single academic department or non-departmentalized school, and
689 may only vote in units in which they have a regular appointment and
690 where this is permitted by the unit's plan of organization. In those cases
691 where a faculty member has the opportunity to vote in more than one
692 department or non-departmentalized school, the faculty member votes in

693 that department/school in which the faculty member holds tenure.

694 In those cases where a faculty member has the opportunity to vote at more
695 than one level of review, the faculty member votes at the first level of
696 review at which the faculty member has the opportunity to vote. There are
697 two exceptions: (a) chairs or deans are excluded from voting as faculty in
698 their first level unit; (b) if there are fewer than three (3) eligible faculty
699 members in the first-level unit, the dean at his/her discretion shall appoint
700 one or more eligible faculty members from related units as voting
701 members of the first-level review committee, to ensure that the review
702 committee shall contain at least three (3) persons. Consequently, in
703 promotion and tenure cases of faculty with joint appointments, faculty
704 appointed by the dean to the first-level review committee of the primary
705 unit, who are also members of a secondary unit providing input on a
706 candidate, are permitted to vote on the candidate only in the primary unit
707 where they have been appointed as member of the review committee by
708 the Dean.

709 Although they do not have voting privileges, other faculty and the head of
710 the first-level unit may be invited to participate in discussion about the
711 candidate if the plan of organization and the bylaws of the unit permit.

712 Advisory Subcommittee: The first-level unit review committee may
713 establish an advisory subcommittee to gather material and make
714 recommendations, but the vote of the entire eligible faculty of the first-
715 level unit shall be considered the faculty recommendation of the first-level
716 unit.

717 Conduct of the Review: The first-level review committee shall appoint an
718 eligible member of the faculty from the first-level unit to serve as chair
719 and spokesperson for the candidate's review committee. The chair of the
720 review committee is responsible for writing the recommendation on the
721 candidate and recording the transactions at the review meeting. Under no
722 circumstances may the chair of the unit or dean serve as spokesperson for
723 the first-level unit review committee or write its report.

724 As the first-level administrator, the chair or dean shall submit a
725 recommendation separately; the recommendation of the chair or dean shall
726 be considered together with all other relevant materials by any reviewing
727 committee at a higher level. Requests for information from higher level
728 review units shall be transmitted to both the chair of the first-level unit
729 review committee and the first-level unit administrator.

730 Joint Appointments: Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a
731 primary appointment (in their tenure home) and one or more secondary
732 appointments (in the unit or units that are not their tenure home). When a

733 joint appointment candidate is reviewed for appointment, promotion
734 and/or tenure, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the
735 recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or
736 more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary
737 unit(s) will be as follows:

- 738 • If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary
739 unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary unit shall
740 consist solely of a written recommendation by the chair or director
741 of the secondary unit.
- 742 • If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit
743 that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized
744 school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by
745 advice from the faculty in the unit who are at or above the rank to
746 which the candidate aspires. That advice shall be in a format
747 consistent with the unit's plan of organization. If the plan of
748 organization includes a vote, the vote may not include those
749 eligible to vote elsewhere on the candidate.
- 750 • If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit
751 that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized
752 school, then there shall be both a vote of the faculty in the unit
753 who are at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires and a
754 written recommendation by the head of that unit. The restriction
755 on multiple faculty votes continues to apply in this instance.
756 The secondary unit's review of the candidate shall be provided to the
757 first-level unit review committee and the first-level administrator. If
758 the chair/director of the secondary unit is also a member of the
759 candidate's primary unit, the chair/director may participate in the
760 deliberations of the primary unit, but may not vote on the candidate's
761 promotion in that unit.

762 2. The committee shall solicit letters of evaluation from six or more widely
763 recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that shall include
764 individuals nominated by the candidate. At least three letters and at most
765 one-half of the requested letters shall be from persons nominated by the
766 candidate.

767 3. Each first-level unit shall provide for the mentoring of each assistant
768 professor and of each untenured associate professor by one or more
769 members of the senior faculty other than the chair or dean of the unit.
770 Mentors should encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and
771 be available for consultation on matters of professional development.
772 Mentors also need to be frank and honest about the progress toward
773 fulfilling the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Following appropriate

774 consultations with members of the unit's faculty, the chair or dean of the
775 unit shall independently provide each assistant professor and each
776 untenured associate professor annually with an informal assessment of his
777 or her progress. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments
778 by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not
779 guarantee a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

780 The first-level academic unit shall perform a formal intermediate review
781 of the progress towards meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion in
782 the third year of an assistant professor's appointment. The first-level
783 academic unit shall perform a formal intermediate review of the progress
784 towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the rank of professor in the
785 fifth year of a tenured associate professor's appointment and every five
786 years thereafter. An associate professor may request an intermediate
787 review earlier than the five years specified. The purposes of these
788 intermediate reviews are to assess the candidate's progress toward
789 promotion, to inform the reviewed faculty member of that assessment, to
790 inform the faculty members more senior to that faculty member who will
791 eventually consider him or her for promotion of that assessment, and to
792 advise the candidate and the first-level administrator of steps that should
793 be taken to improve prospects for promotion. These intermediate reviews
794 shall be structured in a similar fashion to reviews for tenure and/or
795 promotion according to the unit's plan of governance but normally will
796 not involve external evaluations of the faculty member. If it is deemed
797 necessary to obtain informal external evaluations, the academic unit must
798 adopt written procedures applying this requirement to all intermediate
799 reviews and these procedures must be approved by the academic
800 administrator (dean or provost) at the next level of review.

801 Any change in the nature of the institution's or the unit's programmatic
802 needs which may have a bearing on the candidate's prospects for tenure
803 should be brought to the attention of the candidate at the earliest possible
804 time. In addition, first-level units shall make the best possible effort to
805 advise tenure-track faculty of the prevailing standards of quality and of the
806 most effective ways to demonstrate that they meet the standards. The
807 advice and assessments provided to untenured candidates should avoid
808 simplistic quantitative guidelines and should not suggest or imply that
809 tenure decisions will be based on the quantity of effort or scholarly
810 activity, independently of its intellectual quality.

811 4. A tenure-track or tenured faculty member may request a formal review for
812 tenure or promotion.

813 5. The tenure or promotion case shall go forward to the next level of review
814 if fifty percent of the faculty vote cast is favorable (or such higher

815 percentage as may be established by procedures or guidelines of the first-
816 level unit) or if the recommendation of the administrator of the first-level
817 unit is favorable. If both faculty and unit administrator recommendations
818 are negative, the case shall be reviewed at the next level only by the dean
819 (or, in the case of a non-departmentalized school or college, the Provost).
820 The dean (or Provost) shall review the case to ensure that the candidate
821 has received procedural and substantive due process, as defined in
822 Section V.B.1.b. If the dean (or Provost) believes that the candidate has
823 not received due process, he or she shall direct the unit to reconsider. The
824 candidate may withdraw from his or her review at any time prior to the
825 President's decision.

826 6. The first-level review committee shall prepare a concise Summary
827 Statement of Professional Achievements on each candidate for tenure
828 and/or promotion. The Summary Statement shall place the professional
829 achievements of the candidate in scholarship, research, artistic
830 performance, and/or Extension in the context of the broader discipline. It
831 shall place the candidate's professional achievements in teaching and in
832 service in the context of the responsibilities of the unit, the college or
833 school, the University, and the greater community. The Summary
834 Statement shall be factual and objective, not evaluative. The Summary
835 Statement shall be reviewed by the candidate at least two weeks before the
836 meeting at which the academic unit begins consideration of its
837 recommendation on tenure and/or promotion. If the candidate and the
838 committee cannot agree on the Summary Statement, the candidate has the
839 right and the responsibility to submit a Response to the Summary
840 Statement of Professional Achievements for the consideration of the
841 voting members of the review committee and the academic unit must note
842 the existence of the Response in the unit's Summary Statement. The
843 purpose of the Summary Statement is to set the candidate's work in the
844 context of the field for each level of review within the University and it is
845 not to be sent to external evaluators or others outside the University.

846 7. The chair of the first-level review committee shall prepare a written report
847 stating the committee's vote and recommendation on whether or not to
848 grant tenure or promotion, and explaining the basis for the faculty's
849 recommendation insofar as that basis has been made known in the
850 discussions taking place among the members of the committee. This letter
851 will be provided to the chair or dean for his or her information and for
852 forwarding to higher levels of review. Faculty participating in the unit's
853 deliberation who wish to express a dissenting view are free to do so, and
854 any such written statement shall be included in the materials sent forward
855 to the next level of review.

856 8. The recommendation of the first-level administrator shall likewise be in

857 writing. The administrator's recommendation shall be transmitted to the
858 second-level review and shall be made available to all eligible members of
859 the first-level faculty.

860 9. If a faculty member must be given a formal review for tenure in
861 accordance with paragraph I.C.4 of the University of Maryland System
862 Policy and paragraph III.C.3 of this policy, and the chair or dean of the
863 first-level academic unit of which the appointee is a member fails to
864 transmit, by the date specified in paragraph IV.F.2 of this policy, a tenure
865 recommendation for the appointee, the Provost shall extend the deadline
866 for the transmittal of such recommendations and instruct the first-level
867 unit to forward recommendations and all supporting documents as
868 expeditiously as possible.

869 B. Second-level Review

870 1. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion and tenure from
871 departments shall be conducted within the appropriate college. The
872 second-level review committees shall be established in conformity with
873 the approved bylaws of the college. The dean may be a non-voting ex-
874 officio member but not a voting member of the committee. Each second-
875 level committee shall elect its own chair and an alternate chair; the latter
876 shall serve as chair when a candidate from the chair's own unit is under
877 discussion. A committee member who is entitled to vote in a lower-level
878 review of a candidate may be present for the discussion of that candidate
879 but shall not participate in the discussion in any way and shall not vote on
880 that candidate. The committee members must maintain absolute
881 confidentiality in their consideration of cases. Outside of the committee
882 meetings, members of the second-level review committee shall not discuss
883 specific cases with anyone who is not a member of the second-level
884 review committee. The membership of the committee shall be made
885 public at the time of the committee's appointment. Every member of the
886 campus community must respect the integrity of the appointment, tenure
887 and promotion process and must refrain from attempting to discuss cases
888 with committee members or to lobby them in any way.

889 2. Review of recommendations for promotion and tenure from non-
890 departmentalized schools and colleges shall be conducted by the third-
891 level review (see Section IV.C.1) committee.

892 3. Both the recommendation of the second-level committee and the
893 recommendation of the second-level administrator shall go forward to be
894 considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of
895 review.

896 4. When significant questions arise regarding the recommendations from the
897 first-level review or the contents of the dossier, the second-level review
898 committee shall provide an opportunity for the chair of the first-level
899 academic unit and the designated spokesperson of the first-level unit
900 review committee to meet with the second-level committee to discuss their
901 recommendations; the committee shall provide them with a written list of
902 the committee's general concerns about the candidate's case prior to the
903 meeting. The second-level review committee may also request additional
904 information from the first level of review by following the procedures
905 described in Section F1 below.

906 5. Whether its recommendation is favorable or unfavorable, the committee
907 shall, as soon as possible and no later than thirty (30) days after the
908 decision, transmit through the dean its decision, its vote, and a written
909 justification to the Provost. The dean of the college shall also promptly
910 transmit his or her recommendation with a written justification to the
911 Provost.

912 C. Third-level Review

913 1. A third- or campus-level review committee shall be established in the
914 following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members
915 holding the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges
916 (Agriculture and Natural Resources; Arts and Humanities; Behavioral
917 and Social Sciences; Business; Computer, Mathematical, and Natural
918 Sciences; Education; Engineering; School of Public Health) and one
919 from among the four small colleges (Architecture, Planning, and
920 Preservation; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy).
921 Since this committee shall make its recommendations on the basis of
922 whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion
923 have been met, members of this committee shall have a track record of
924 outstanding academic judgment along with sufficient intellectual breadth
925 and depth to be capable of comparing and judging candidates from varied
926 disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. No small
927 college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once
928 in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from
929 the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive
930 Committee, and from the faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time
931 administrative position may serve as a voting member of the committee.
932 The Provost shall be a non-voting ex-officio member. A committee
933 member who is entitled to vote in a lower-level review of a candidate shall
934 not be present for the discussion of that candidate and shall not vote on
935 that candidate. Appointments to the third-level review committee from
936 the eight large colleges shall be for three years while the appointment from
937 one of the five small colleges shall be for two years, with the terms

938 staggered so that approximately one-third of the committee is replaced
939 each year. No one may serve two consecutive terms. The third-level
940 review committee shall elect its own chair and alternate chair. The
941 committee members must maintain absolute confidentiality in their
942 consideration of cases. Outside of the committee meetings, members of
943 the third-level review committee shall not discuss specific cases with
944 anyone who is not a member of the third-level review committee. The
945 membership of the committee shall be made public at the time of the
946 committee's appointment. Every member of the campus community must
947 respect the integrity of the appointment, tenure and promotion process and
948 must refrain from attempting to discuss cases with committee members or
949 to lobby them in any way.

950 2. When questions arise regarding the recommendations from either the first-
951 or second-level reviews or the contents of the dossier, the third-level
952 committee shall provide the opportunity for the first-level unit
953 administrator, the spokesperson for the first-level faculty review
954 committee, the dean of the college, and the chair of the second-level
955 review committee to meet with the third-level committee to discuss their
956 recommendations; the committee shall provide them with a written list of
957 the committee's general concerns about the candidate's case prior to the
958 meeting. The third-level review committee may also request additional
959 information from the first and second levels of review by following the
960 procedures prescribed in Section F1 below.

961 3. The committee shall promptly transmit its recommendation and a written
962 justification through the Provost to the President, along with all materials
963 provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost and the President
964 shall confer about the case, and the Provost shall transmit his or her
965 recommendation and a written justification to the President. If the
966 Provost's recommendation differs from that of the third-level committee
967 or from that of the Dean, the Provost will meet with the committee and/or
968 the dean to discuss the review. After the President has made a decision, a
969 report on the decisions reached at the third level of review shall be
970 provided to the second-level administrator and faculty committee chair,
971 the first-level administrator and faculty chair, and to the candidate.

972 4. The Third-level Review Committee and the Provost shall conduct an end-
973 of-the-year review of appointment, promotion, and tenure. The
974 Committee shall write a public Annual report, the purpose of which
975 includes improving the understanding of faculty members and of academic
976 units about appointments, promotion, and tenure. The report should
977 include any recommendations for improvements in policy, procedures, or
978 the carrying out of reviews of candidates. The Provost shall write a public
979 report annually giving statistical information on the appointment,

980 promotion, and tenure cases considered during the academic year.

981 D. Notification to Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

982 Upon completion of the first-level review, the unit administrator at the first level
983 shall within two weeks of the date of the decision: (1) inform the candidate
984 whether the recommendations made by the faculty committee and the unit
985 administrator were positive or negative (including specific information on the
986 number of faculty who voted for tenure and/or promotion, the number who voted
987 against, and the number of abstentions), and (2) prepare for the candidate a
988 letter summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which
989 those decisions were based. At higher levels of review, summaries shall be
990 provided to the candidate whenever either or both faculty and administrator
991 recommendations are negative. The chair of the faculty committee shall review
992 the summary letter prepared by the unit administrator in order to ensure that it
993 accurately summarizes the considerations regarded as relevant by the faculty
994 committee at that level. The chair of the faculty committee at each level shall be
995 provided access to the unit administrator's letters to the candidate and to the next
996 level of review in order to ensure that the summary accurately reflects the
997 recommendation and rationale provided to higher levels of review. In addition,
998 both letters shall be made available for review in the office of the chair (dean or
999 Provost) by any member of the faculty committee at that level. In the event that
1000 the chair of the faculty committee and the unit administrator are unable to agree
1001 on the appropriate language and contents of the summary letter, each shall write a
1002 summary letter to the candidate. A copy of all materials provided to the candidate
1003 shall be added to the tenure or promotion file as the case proceeds through higher
1004 levels of review.

1005 E. Presidential Review

1006 Full-time appointments or promotions to the ranks of Associate Professor or
1007 Professor require the written approval of the President, in whom resides final
1008 authority for promotion and granting of tenure to faculty. Final authority for any
1009 appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor cannot
1010 be delegated by the President.

1011 F. General Procedures Governing Promotion and Tenure

1012 1. With the exception of the third-level review committee, in their reviews of
1013 tenure and promotion recommendations from lower levels, upper-level
1014 administrators or review committees may not seek or use additional
1015 information from outside sources concerning a candidate's merits unless:
1016 (1) the materials forwarded from lower levels indicate the presence of a
1017 significant dissenting vote or divided recommendations from a lower
1018 level; (2) representatives from the first-level unit participate in the
1019 selection of additional persons to be consulted; and (3) the assessments

1020 received from these external sources are shared with and considered by the
1021 first-level review committee and by the unit's chair or dean; and (4) the
1022 review committee and the unit's academic administrator have the
1023 opportunity to reconsider their recommendations in the light of the
1024 augmented promotion dossier. The third-level review committee may
1025 seek additional information on any candidate as it chooses, although it
1026 must follow (2), (3) and (4) as described above. In doing so, the
1027 committee should ask the Provost to obtain the additional information
1028 from the Dean, who would then consult with the Department Chair to
1029 obtain faculty input. The evidential basis for upper-level committees and
1030 administrators should be restricted to the materials as assembled and
1031 evaluated by the first-level unit, with the exception of information
1032 obtained in compliance with the procedures just described. Candidates for
1033 tenure or promotion, however, are permitted to bring to the attention of the
1034 university administration any changes in their circumstances which might
1035 have a significant bearing on the tenure or promotion question. In the
1036 event that candidates for tenure or promotion bring information of this sort
1037 to the attention of upper-level committees or administrators after the first-
1038 level review has been concluded, these committees or administrators may
1039 take these changes into account in reaching their decisions and may elect
1040 to send the case back to the first-level for reconsideration.

1041 2. The candidate's application and supporting materials, and the reports and
1042 recommendations of the first-level committee and administrator, shall
1043 be transmitted to the appropriate levels of secondary review no later than a
1044 date set annually by the Provost.

1045 3. If an untenured faculty member requests leave without pay for a year or
1046 more, the dean of the college in which the faculty member will be
1047 considered for tenure shall recommend whether or not the faculty
1048 member's mandatory tenure review will be delayed. A positive
1049 recommendation from the dean to stop the tenure clock shall require
1050 evidence: (1) that the leave of absence will be in the interest of the
1051 University, and (2) that the faculty member's capacity to engage in
1052 continued professional activity will be significantly impaired during the
1053 period of the leave. The dean's recommendation shall be included in the
1054 proposal for leave submitted to the Provost. Delay of the mandatory
1055 tenure review requires the written approval of the Provost.

1056 4. A faculty member who would otherwise receive a formal review for
1057 tenure may waive the review by requesting in writing that he or she not be
1058 considered for tenure. A faculty member who has waived a tenure review
1059 shall receive whatever terminal appointments he or she would have
1060 received if tenure had been denied. A faculty member at any rank who has

1061 been denied tenure and who is ineligible for further consideration shall
1062 receive an additional and terminal one-year appointment in that rank.

1063 5. All recommendations for the appointment of faculty below the rank of
1064 Associate Professor shall be transmitted for approval through the various
1065 levels of review to the President or designee. Final authority for any
1066 appointment that confers tenure or for any appointment or promotion to
1067 the rank of Associate Professor or Professor cannot be delegated by the
1068 President.

1069 6. After a negative decision by the President, candidates for promotion or
1070 tenure shall be notified by certified mail. Determination of the
1071 time limits for the period during which an appeal may be made shall be
1072 based on the date of the candidate's receipt of the President's letter.

1073 G. Procedures Governing the Granting of Emerita/Emeritus Status

1074 1. Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors,
1075 Research Associate Professors, Research Professors, Senior Agents,
1076 Principal Agents, Librarians III, and Librarians IV who have been
1077 members of the faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park for
1078 ten or more years, and who give to their chair or dean proper written
1079 notice of their intention to retire, are eligible for nomination to
1080 emerita/emeritus status (see I.E.7 Emerita, Emeritus). Only in exceptional
1081 circumstances may Professors with fewer than ten years of service to the
1082 institution be recommended for emerita/emeritus status..

1083 2. The decision whether or not to award emeritus standing shall be based
1084 primarily on the candidate's record of significant accomplishment in any
1085 of the three areas of (1) teaching and advisement, (2) research,
1086 scholarship, and creative activity, and (3) service.

1087 3. If a faculty member gives notice of intention to retire before March 15, the
1088 first-level tenured faculty shall vote on emeritus standing within 45 days
1089 of the notice. If notice is given after March 15, the vote shall be taken no
1090 later than the 45th day of the following semester. The result of the vote
1091 shall be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to the administrator of
1092 the unit no later than ten days after the vote is taken. A faculty member
1093 who has not been informed of the decision concerning his or her emeritus
1094 standing within the time limits specified, shall be entitled to appeal the
1095 action as a negative decision in accordance with V.B.2.

1096 4. The review committee of the first-level unit shall consist of all eligible
1097 members of the faculty. Eligible members of the faculty are all full-time
1098 tenured associate and full professors, as appropriate, excluding the chair or

1099 dean. The vote of the entire eligible faculty shall be considered the
1100 recommendation of the faculty. The chair or dean shall submit a
1101 recommendation separately; the recommendation of the chair or dean shall
1102 be considered together with all relevant materials by administrators at
1103 higher levels.

1104 5. An emeritus case shall go forward to the next level of review if the
1105 department chair's recommendation is positive or the faculty vote is at
1106 least fifty percent favorable.

1107 6. The chair of the first-level committee shall prepare a written report, stating
1108 the committee's vote and recommendation on whether or not to award
1109 emeritus standing and explaining the basis for the faculty's
1110 recommendation insofar as that basis has been made known in the
1111 discussions taken place among the members of the committee. This letter
1112 will be forwarded to the chair or dean for his or her information and for
1113 forwarding to higher levels of review. Faculty participating in the unit's
1114 deliberations who wish to express a dissenting view are free to do so, and
1115 any such written statement shall be included in the materials sent forward
1116 to the next level of review.

1117 7. The recommendation of the first-level administrator shall also be in
1118 writing. The administrator's recommendation shall be transmitted to the
1119 second-level of review and a copy shall be made available for review by
1120 any member of the faculty participating in the unit's review deliberations.

1121 8. Second-level review of recommendations of emeritus standing shall be
1122 conducted by the appropriate dean. Second-level reviews of
1123 recommendations from non-departmentalized schools and colleges shall
1124 be conducted by the Provost. The second-level recommendation of the
1125 dean or the Provost, together with all other relevant materials, shall be
1126 transmitted to the President.

1127 9. The President shall make the final decision on the award of emeritus
1128 standing.

1129 10. Faculty members with ten or more years of service to the University who
1130 retired prior to the effective date of this policy and who have not been
1131 granted emeritus standing may apply to their departments for
1132 consideration as in Section IV.G.1.

1133 H. Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause

1134 If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member whose appointment the campus
1135 administration seeks to terminate for cause requests a hearing by a hearing officer,

1136 the hearing officer shall be appointed by the President from a college or school
1137 other than that of the appointee, with the advice and consent of the faculty
1138 members of the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate. If the appointee
1139 requests a hearing by a faculty board of review, members of the board of review
1140 shall be appointed by the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the
1141 Campus Senate from among tenured Professors not involved in administrative
1142 duties.

1143 V. THE APPEALS PROCESS

1144 A. Appeals Committees

1145 1. The President shall appoint an appeals committee. This committee shall
1146 consist of nine faculty members holding the rank of Professor, one from
1147 each from the eight large colleges (Agriculture and Natural Resources;
1148 Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Business;
1149 Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Education; Engineering;
1150 Chemical and Life Sciences) and one from among the five small colleges
1151 (Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Health and Human
1152 Performance; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy). No small
1153 college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once
1154 in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from
1155 the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive
1156 Committee, and from the faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time
1157 administrative position and no one who has participated in the promotion
1158 and tenure review process of the appellant shall serve on the campus
1159 appeals committee. Appointment to the campus appeals committee shall
1160 be for one year, and no one may serve two consecutive terms. Appeals
1161 committees shall elect their own chairs. The committee members must
1162 maintain absolute confidentiality in their consideration of cases.

1163 2. Special appeals committees at the college, school or campus level shall be
1164 appointed by the dean, Provost or President in a manner consistent with
1165 the policies, bylaws, or practice of the respective unit.

1166 B. Guidelines and Procedures for Appeals

1167 1. Negative Promotion and/or Tenure Decisions

1168 a. Mandatory and Non-Mandatory Reviews

1169 When a candidate for promotion and/or tenure receives notification
1170 from the President, dean or chair that promotion or tenure was
1171 not awarded, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting

1172 that the President submit the matter to the Campus Appeals
1173 Committee for consideration. The request shall be in writing and
1174 be made within sixty (60) days of notification of the negative
1175 decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support
1176 of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not
1177 later than one hundred and twenty (120) days after notification
1178 unless otherwise extended by the President because of
1179 circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In
1180 writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that
1181 these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the
1182 validity of the appeal and that, should the President accept the
1183 request and refer the appeal to the Campus Appeals Committee,
1184 these letters shall be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee
1185 with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other
1186 persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of
1187 the issues.

1188 b. Grounds for Appeal

1189 The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion and tenure
1190 decision shall be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process,
1191 and/or (2) violation of substantive due process.

1192 A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different
1193 review committee, department chair, dean or Provost exercising
1194 sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a
1195 different conclusion. An appeals committee will not substitute its
1196 academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review
1197 process.

1198 Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was
1199 negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for
1200 tenure and/or promotion by those in the review process to take a
1201 procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in
1202 relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department,
1203 school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations
1204 occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal
1205 and are dealt with under the provisions of paragraph 4 of the
1206 introduction to Section IV, Promotion, Tenure, and Emeritus
1207 Review.

1208 Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision
1209 was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible
1210 consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age,
1211 nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's
1212 exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of

1213 speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was
1214 based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of
1215 information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the
1216 supporting materials.

1217 c. Standard of Proof

1218 An appeal shall not be granted unless the alleged grounds for
1219 appeal are demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence.

1220 d. Responsibilities and Powers of the Appeals Committee

1221 1. The appeals committee shall notify the relevant
1222 administrators and APT chairs in writing of the grounds for
1223 the appeal and meet with them to discuss the issues.

1224 2. The appeals committee shall meet with the appellant to
1225 discuss and clarify the issues raised in the appeal.

1226 3. The appeals committee has investigative powers. The
1227 appeals committee may interview persons in the review
1228 process whom it believes to have information relevant to
1229 the appeal. Additionally, the Appeals Committee shall
1230 examine all documents related to the appellant's promotion
1231 or tenure review and may have access to such other
1232 departmental and college materials as it deems relevant to
1233 the case. Whenever the committee believes that a meeting
1234 could lead to a better understanding of the issues in the
1235 appeal, it shall meet with the appropriate party (with the
1236 appellant or with the relevant academic administrator and
1237 APT chair).

1238 4. The Appeals Committee shall prepare a written report for
1239 the President. The report shall be based upon the weight of
1240 evidence before it. It shall include findings with respect to
1241 the grounds alleged on appeal, and, where appropriate,
1242 recommendations for corrective action. Such remedy may
1243 include the return of the matter back to the stage of the
1244 review process at which the error was made and action to
1245 eliminate any harmful effects it may have had on the full
1246 and fair consideration of the case. No recommended
1247 remedy, however, may abrogate the principle of peer
1248 review.

1249 5. The President shall attach great weight to the findings and

1250 recommendations of the committee. The decision of the
1251 President shall be final. The decision and the rationale
1252 shall be transmitted to the appellant, the department chair,
1253 dean, chair(s) of the relevant APT committee(s) and
1254 Provost in writing.

1255 e. Implementation of the President's Decision

1256 1. When the President supports the grounds for an appeal, the
1257 Provost has the responsibility for oversight of the
1258 implementation of the corrective actions the President
1259 requires to be taken. Within 30 days of receipt of the
1260 President's letter, the Provost shall request the
1261 administrator involved to formulate a plan and a timeline
1262 for implementing and monitoring the corrective actions.
1263 Within 30 days after receipt of this letter, the administrator
1264 must supply a written reply. The Provost may require
1265 modification of the plan before approving it.

1266 2. The Provost shall appoint a Provost's Representative to
1267 participate in all stages of the implementation of the
1268 corrective actions specified in the approved plan for the re-
1269 review, including participation in the meeting or meetings
1270 at which the academic unit discusses, reviews, or votes on
1271 its recommendation for tenure and/or promotion for the
1272 appellant. The Provost's Representative shall participate in
1273 these activities but does not have a vote. After the
1274 academic unit completes its review, the Provost's
1275 Representative shall prepare a report on all of the elements
1276 of corrective action specified in the approved plan and this
1277 report will be included with the complete dossier to be
1278 reviewed at higher levels within the University. The
1279 Provost's Representative shall be a senior member of the
1280 faculty with no previous or potential involvement at any
1281 level of review or appeal pertaining to the consideration of
1282 the appellant for tenure and/or promotion except for the
1283 participation as Provost's Representative as defined in this
1284 paragraph.

1285 3. The Provost's request and the administrator's approved
1286 plan of implementation must be included in the dossier
1287 from the inception of the review. Re-reviews begin at the
1288 level of review at which the violation(s) of due process
1289 occurred and evaluate the person's record at the time the
1290 initial review occurred unless otherwise specified by the

1291 President. The administrator at the level at which the errors
1292 occurred, in addition to evaluating the candidate for
1293 promotion, must certify that each of the corrective actions
1294 has been taken and describe how the actions have been
1295 implemented. Re-reviews must proceed through all levels
1296 of evaluation including Presidential review. The Provost's
1297 review of the dossier will include an evaluation of
1298 compliance with the requirements imposed in the
1299 President's decision to grant the appeal. If the Provost
1300 discovers a serious failure by the unit to comply with the
1301 corrective actions required, the Provost shall formulate and
1302 implement a new plan for corrective action with respect to
1303 the appellant. In addition, the Provost shall inform (in
1304 writing) the administrator of the unit where the failure
1305 arose and the Provost shall take appropriate disciplinary
1306 action.

1307 f. Extension of Contract

1308 In the event that the appellant's contract of employment will have
1309 terminated before reconsideration can be completed, the
1310 appellant may request the President to extend the contract for one
1311 additional year beyond the date of its normal termination, with the
1312 understanding that the extension does not in itself produce a claim
1313 to tenure through length of service.

1314 2. Decision Not to Review

1315 If a faculty member requests his or her first level academic unit to
1316 undertake a review for his or her promotion or early recommendation for
1317 tenure, and the academic unit decides not to undertake the review or fails
1318 to transmit a recommendation by the date announced for transmittals, as
1319 specified in IV.F.2, above, the faculty member may appeal to the dean (if
1320 in a department) or to the Provost (if in a non-departmentalized school or
1321 college) requesting the formation of a special appeals committee to
1322 consider the matter. The request shall be made in writing. It shall be
1323 made promptly, and in no case later than thirty (30) days following written
1324 notification of the decision of the first-level academic unit.

1325 If the dean or Provost determines not to form a special appeals committee,
1326 the faculty member may appeal to the Provost (if the decision was the
1327 dean's) or to the President (if the decision was the Provost's) requesting
1328 formation of the special appeals committee. Request shall be made in
1329 writing. It shall be made promptly, and in no case no later than thirty (30)
1330 days following written notification of the decision of the dean or Provost.

1331 The grounds for appeal and the burden of proof shall, in all instances, be
1332 the same as set forth in V.B.1.b and c, above. A committee shall not
1333 substitute its academic judgment for that of the first-level unit. The
1334 responsibility of a special appeals committee shall be to prepare findings
1335 and recommendations. The committee may, for example, recommend that
1336 the dean or Provost extend the deadline for transmitting a recommendation
1337 and instruct the first-level unit to forward supporting documents as
1338 expeditiously as possible. A decision by a dean or the Provost, upon
1339 receiving the findings and recommendations of a special appeals
1340 committee, shall be final. A decision by the President shall be final.

1341 3. Decision Not to Renew

1342 When, prior to the mandatory promotion and tenure decision, an untenured
1343 tenure-track faculty member receives notification that his or her
1344 appointment will not be renewed by the first-level unit, he or she may
1345 appeal the decision in the manner described in V.B.1.a above.

1346 4. Emeritus Standing

1348 An unsuccessful candidate for emeritus standing may appeal the decision
1349 in the manner described in V.B.1. above.

INDEX

Advisory Subcommittee.....	5, 7, 53
Appeals	15, 21-22, 64-66
Assistant Professor.....	15, 35-37, 46-47, 55
Associate Professor.....	16, 35-36, 46-47, 61
Associate Professor without Tenure	15, 47, 55
Campus APT Committee	3, 14, 18, 58
Candidate's Role	11, 52
Chair's Role.....	12, 51, 57-58, 60
Citizenship	3
College APT Committee.....	4, 13-14, 18, 57-58
College Park Professor.....	19, 42
<i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	7, 10-11, 28-30, 50, 52
Dean's Role	14, 58-60, 62
Dossier (Required Elements)	2-11, 50
Emerita/Emeritus Status.....	19, 41, 62-63
External Evaluators.....	5, 7, 9-10, 31, 50, 52
Full Professor.....	16, 36
Joint Appointment.....	3, 4, 16-18, 53-54
Letters/Reports	
Candidate Notification Letter	5, 20, 60
Chair's Letter	4, 57
College APT Committee Report.....	4
Dean's Letter	4
Department APT Committee Report	5
Letter to Solicit External Evaluation	9, 31, 52, 54
Letters from External Evaluators.....	8, 10
Minority APT Report.....	7
Mandatory Tenure Review	15, 65
Negative Recommendation.....	4, 13, 16, 20-21, 56, 60, 65
Non-mandatory Tenure or Promotion Review	15, 65
Personal Statement of Candidate	8, 10, 12, 50, 52
Professor of the Practice	19, 42
Publications.....	6, 8, 28
Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities	2, 6, 44-45
Service.....	2, 6, 44-45
Summary Statement of Professional Achievements	7, 12, 50, 56
Teaching Portfolio	6, 11-12
Teaching, Advising and Mentoring	2, 6, 43-44
Transmittal Form	3, 23
Votes	3, 12-13, 17-20, 50, 52,-54, 56-59, 61, 63
Withdrawal from Review Process	13, 15, 56