INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

The Table Steps in the Review of Faculty 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.) The Table What’s in a Dossier 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 497-498)
- All Associate Professors and Senior Agents appointed without tenure and currently in their third year of appointment; (APT Policy 517-521)
- 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 845-846) 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 1349-1364)

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 857-859) 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 1092-1094)
3. Steps beyond the first level of review:
   If either the Department APT Review Committee or the Chair supports the case, it goes forward (APT Policy 847-851).

   When a candidate receives a negative recommendation by both Chair and Department APT Review 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., Dean) who must certify that the procedures to evaluate the candidate conformed to the regulations in the APT Policy (APT Policy 851-856). 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 faculty appointments to the ranks of Professor and Principal Agent carry tenure and must be reviewed under the University APT process. New faculty appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor and Senior Agent may be with or without tenure. New appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor and Senior Agent with tenure require review under the University APT process. New appointments to these ranks without tenure may proceed for review and approval by the President based on a recommendation from the Provost, unless questions arise, in which case the President may direct that the proposed appointment undergo an unofficial “tenurability” review by University APT committees prior to presidential consideration. No offer of appointment to the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent or Principal Agent (regardless of tenure status) is valid in the absence of presidential approval. New faculty appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor and Agent are not handled under 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 required for presidential approval of the appointment. (See New Faculty Appointment Information form)

Dossiers for new appointments differ slightly from dossiers of candidates being promoted from within. They lack a Summary of Personal Achievements and 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 APT reports and in external letters. Letters soliciting recommendations for a new tenured appointment should pose the question of whether the candidate merits tenure.

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 conditions under which line responsibility might be renegotiated (e.g., if 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 716-742)

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 Review 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 Review 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 Review Committee votes and writes a report, the Dean writes a letter, and the Dossier is submitted for evaluation by the Campus APT Review Committee. When disagreements arise between voting units, the Committee should follow the standard practice of informing and inviting the APT Review Committee 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 Review Committee Chairs;
   A joint advisory subcommittee or separate advisory subcommittee may be appointed.
2. **Secondary unit performs review.**
   Secondary unit APT Review 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 Review 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 Review Committee votes and writes report;
   Dean writes letter;
   Material is submitted for evaluation by the University APT Review 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 tenure granting 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 322-335)

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 Review Committee including input from the Chair, and then requires evaluations by the Dean (but not the College APT Review 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 assembled in the order listed in What’s in a Dossier) through the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for approval by 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 301-309)

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. Recommendations for Emerita/Emeritus status will only be considered after the faculty member has submitted a letter of resignation and retirement or an approved retirement agreement, as well as a copy of a memo from the Benefits Office confirming that the faculty member has met with them. (Refer to http://faculty.umd.edu/Retirement/index.html for more information.) The review is ordinarily conducted during the candidate’s last semester of employment. (APT Policy 1121-1124) Faculty at or above the candidate’s pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/Emeritus status. (APT Policy 1130-1134) Candidates for Emerita/Emeritus status are not reviewed by faculty committees beyond the Department APT Review Committee. Reviews beyond the Department are conducted by the Dean, Provost, and President. (APT Policy 1155-1160) Materials submitted for emeriti appointments should include a copy of the above referenced documents. (See Table What’s in a Dossier)

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 336-346)

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.