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Introduction

KINDS OF INFORMATION

This manual contains three kinds of information. Discussion of the APT Policy (Appendix D), marked in bold, will be cited by paragraph number and page (e.g., APT Policy Section III.B.1, page 18). References within the document are hyperlinked for convenience. Mandatory procedures for dossier preparation are in this default font. Useful suggestions for the content of the dossier and review process are printed in italics. When there is a link to other information, it will be live if you're viewing the manual electronically.

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 levels is provided by a faculty APT Review 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 Review Committee and Chair, through the College APT Review Committee and Dean, to the Campus APT Review Committee and Provost. The final decision is made by the President. When a College is not departmentalized, the first review begins at the College (in which case four sets of recommendations go to the President).

USEFUL DEFINITIONS

APT Review Committee

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

Advisory Subcommittee

Optional subgroup of voting-eligible faculty who gather information for the review, and who may author the APT Review 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 on 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.
# Timeline for the APT Process

This schedule is just a recommendation, and it does not include every detail of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term</td>
<td>Prepare / update CV. Prepare personal statement. Develop list of external evaluators. Choose materials that will be sent to external evaluators.</td>
<td>Begin developing list of faculty who will be reviewed in the fall. Double-check for joint appointments and for non-mandatory reviews. Review and update promotion criteria.</td>
<td>Gather preliminary materials (e.g., promotion criteria, reputation of publication outlets) for next year’s dossiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Prepare / update supplemental dossier materials, such as syllabi, assessments, and selected publications.</td>
<td>Choose and prepare materials to be sent to external evaluators. Request external evaluations.</td>
<td>For each candidate, set up transmittal form. Prepare letter log. Prepare student teaching evaluation summary tables. Prepare citation counts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule committee meetings. Follow up with external evaluators as needed.</td>
<td>Begin dossier for each candidate. Update letter log; add external evaluator letters as they are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Create CV addenda as needed.</td>
<td>Committee members prepare summary statement of professional activities for candidate’s review/signature. Department and college-level review committee meetings held. Notify candidates. Chairs/deans write evaluative letters.</td>
<td>Update transmittal forms with meeting dates, votes. Add committee reports and chairs’, deans’ letters to dossier as they become available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information for the Candidate

Your preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when you enter the University. Soon after you arrive, APT policy calls for your administrator:

- a) to provide you with a written copy of the promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which you will be evaluated (APT Policy Section II, page 56; Section IV, page 63) and
- b) to appoint one or more senior faculty mentors (APT Policy Section IV.A.3, page 67; see also the Senate Task Force Report available at www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/mnt_ndx.html).

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, or creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service (APT Policy Section II, page 56; Section IV, page 63). Colleges and Departments must have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these dimensions of the process.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

Three-Year Review
There will be a formal, intermediate review of your progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion in the third year of your appointment (APT Policy Section IV.A.3, page 67). This review will be structured like the review for tenure and/or promotion, but will generally not involve external evaluators.

Review for Tenure and/or Promotion
As a candidate for promotion and tenure, you will be reviewed at the department level by the Department APT Committee, and your case will be voted on by all department faculty members who are at or above the rank you are seeking. If you hold a joint appointment, your dossier may be reviewed by the APT Committee of your secondary unit as well. Following the committee review, your department chair (or chairs, in a joint appointment) will evaluate your dossier. Next, the dossier is reviewed by the College level APT Committee, by the Dean of the College, and finally, it is sent to the Campus level APT Committee, which makes a recommendation about your tenure and promotion to the President, through the Provost. These reviews usually take place during the sixth year of your appointment. Some faculty may seek a non-mandatory (i.e., early) tenure review, and others may receive one or more delays of their mandatory tenure review. From start to finish, the APT review process takes about a year, though you should be looking ahead to tenure review from the day you begin at the university.

Because your tenure dossier will be reviewed by so many people who may or may not be familiar with you or your work, the information in the dossier that you provide should be well-prepared and in a form that is as clear as you can make it. Your mentor can help with advice about preparation of those materials. The information in the dossier must remain the same as the dossier moves from one review level to the next, other than any necessary addenda to your CV.
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 Section IV.A.5, page 68). 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 Section IV.F.4, page 74).**

Denial

If either the Department APT Review Committee or the Chair supports the case, it goes forward (APT Policy Section IV.A.5, page 68).

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 Section IV.A.5, page 68).

THE CURRICULUM VITAE

The University has a recommended format for your CV, in which information is organized according to the three areas on which you will be evaluated:

1) Research, scholarship, or creative activity
2) Teaching, advising, and mentoring
3) Service

Your CV should present an accurate portrait of your accomplishments in **as concise a manner as possible.** There is a [template](#) available on the Faculty Affairs website. Your CV must be signed and dated when you give it to the department staff member who will create your tenure dossier. This indicates that it is up to date and accurate (**APT Policy Section IV, page 63**)Your CV will be included in each request for external evaluation.

To aid review committees, the CV should include the following information, in the order shown:

**Personal Information**

 List name, Department (joint appointments indicating percentage of each), 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).

**Research, Scholarly or 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. All of the works listed in this section should be numbered. **Pieces in preparation that are not completed and not**
accepted for publication should not appear on a CV. You should distinguish between authored and edited works and refereed vs. 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, you may list the first three, the last three, and yourself (including your 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 placing that name in bold, and identifying 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.

1. Books
   3. Chapters in books.
2. Articles in Refereed Journals. Full citation, inclusive of all authors in the order of publication and page numbers. Review articles and invited articles should be so identified.
4. Book Reviews, Other Articles, Notes.
   1. Invited talks, etc.
   2. Refereed conference proceedings.
   3. Unrefereed conference proceedings.
6. Films, CDs, Photographs, Web Pages, etc.
7. Exhibits, Performances, Demonstrations and Other Creative Activities.
9. Contracts and Grants. List source, title, amount awarded, time period and role (e.g., principal investigator) in reverse chronological order. List co-investigators, if any.
10. Fellowships, Prizes and Awards.
12. Other (specify type)

Teaching, Mentoring and Advising

1. Courses taught in the last five years. Indicate enrollments and unusual formats.
2. Course or Curriculum Development.
3. Textbooks, Manuals, Notes, Software, Web Pages and Other Contributions to Teaching.
4. Teaching Awards and Other Special Recognition.
5. Advising (other than research direction): Indicate numbers of students per year.
   1. Undergraduate
   2. Graduate

---

1 The one exception is working papers, customary in certain fields such as economics and mathematics. These should be listed under "Monographs, Reports and Extension Publications."

2 Specify whether a manuscript has been accepted without the need for further revisions.
3. Other advising and mentoring activities (advising student groups, special assignments, recruiting, faculty membership, etc.).

6. Advising: Research Direction. This refers to students whose projects the candidate has directed as chair. The name of the student and academic year(s) involved should be indicated, as well as placement of the student(s), if the project is completed.
   1. Undergraduate
   2. Master's
   3. Doctoral

7. Extension Activities. Major programs established, workshops, presentations, media activities, awards, honors, etc.

**Service**

1. Professional.
   1. Offices / memberships held in professional organizations (include dates).
   2. Reviewing activities for agencies.
   3. Other unpaid services to local, state and federal agencies.
   4. Other non-University committees, commissions, panels, etc.
   5. International activities not listed above.

2. Campus.
   1. Departmental.
   2. College.
   4. Special administrative assignments.
   5. Other.

3. Community, State, National.

4. Service Awards and Honors.

**Addenda to the CV**

If there are subsequent changes to your credentials, such as additional funding or new publications, they may be recorded as an addendum to your CV, which can then be included in the dossier. The addendum must also be signed and dated.

**THE 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 Section IV, page 63). 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 must be signed and dated. The statement must be included in each request for external evaluation. The document may not be changed after it is submitted to the APT Review Committee representative for letter writers to evaluate (APT Policy Section IV, page 63).
SUPPLEMENTAL DOSSIER

In addition to the tenure dossier, you may wish to prepare an optional supplemental dossier, which might include syllabi from your courses, examples of assessment, and evaluations of your teaching. This dossier may also include representative pieces of scholarship.

THE CANDIDATE’S RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Providing your Curriculum Vitae in the approved format. The document must be signed and dated to indicate that it is a complete and accurate record of your accomplishments.
- Providing a Personal Statement which makes a case for your tenure and/or promotion based on the facts in your curriculum vitae, on your department’s criteria for Promotion and Tenure, and on your perspective of your achievements in the context of your discipline.
- Suggesting the names of three or more qualified external evaluators (APT Policy Section IV.A.2, page 67). These should be widely recognized authorities in your field. You may not contact evaluators to determine their willingness to provide information, or to inquire about the contents of the evaluation. The evaluators you nominate should be familiar with your work, but not collaborators of yours. It is a good idea to nominate more than three, in case one of your nominees is not available to serve as an external evaluator.
- 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 Review 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).
### Information for Faculty Administrators

#### STEPS IN THE REVIEW OF FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion or New Appt. Assoc. &amp; Full Prof, Sr. &amp; Principal Agents w/ or w/o Tenure; Coll. Park Pros</th>
<th>Dept. APT Review Committee</th>
<th>Dept. Chair</th>
<th>College APT Review Committee</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Campus APT Review Committee</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Emerita/us | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

| 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 Campus APT Review Committee (where appropriate) and then the Provost and President.

#### DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The Department APT Review Committee has the key responsibility of preparing and soliciting review materials that will be the foundation of the candidate’s dossier:

- Choosing external evaluators and requesting their evaluations
- Evaluating the candidate’s publications and preparing a report on the reputation of publication outlets
- Gathering reports of peer evaluation of the candidate’s teaching and summarizing them
- Creating the Statement of Professional Activities
- Evaluating the candidate according to the Department Promotion Criteria

**External Evaluators**

The Review 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 Section IV.A.2, page 67). The Chair of the Department APT 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. If the candidate has a joint appointment, the secondary department or unit must be consulted on the choice of external evaluators. See Information about Joint Appointments, page 17.

*APT Review 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 Review 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 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.

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 must 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). A template for the letter log is available on the Faculty Affairs website (copied in Appendix A) providing the appropriate format. Because all APT review 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. A justification of their inclusion should be provided in the credentials document. Once the list of external evaluators is finalized, summarize their credentials with a paragraph for each evaluator. Do not include CVs of the evaluators. It is helpful if the order of the credentials paragraphs mirrors the order of letters in the dossier. It is important for the Department APT Review 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.

An excessive number of letters (e.g., 10 or more) should be avoided. Should an insufficient number of letters be received in a timely fashion, the case may still go forward. However, Units should be aware that the absence of the requisite number of letters weakens 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 must 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 in time for consideration by the Department APT Review 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, unless special circumstances are explained by administrators.
• 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.
• If 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 that the APT Review Committee deems appropriate. Candidates should also be informed about University rules of confidentiality.

Sample Letter to External Evaluators

(See Appendix B, page 43) The letter used to solicit external evaluations is usually sent by the Chair of the Department APT Review Committee, or from the chairs of both committees if the candidate has a joint appointment. 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 here 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.

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. In addition, citation counts should be included. Departments may also put these in the Summary Statement of Professional Activity, so candidates can verify the counts.

Peer Evaluation of the Candidate’s Teaching

Departments should 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.

Statement of Professional Activities

This summary report is often written by an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly called 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. It is a factual statement of the candidate’s accomplishments in: research, scholarship, or creative activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; and service. The summary statement is not to be sent to external reviewers. It should place the candidate’s accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the 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 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 Review Committee as a basis for its discussion and vote. The date on this report (and any rebuttal by the candidate) must 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 Section IV.A.6, page 68). To facilitate production and “certification” of the report, Departments should inform candidates in advance of deadlines for reviewing the Summary Statement and for return of the signed Statement with any rejoinder.

Report of the Department APT Review Committee

(APT Policy Section IV.A.7, page 69) This report has two clearly separate parts, neither of which is shown to the candidate. In addition, the Department APT Review Committee may include an optional Minority Report in cases of major disagreement. All parts of the report are incorporated into the dossier sent by the Chair to higher levels of review.
The first part is the Department APT Review Committee Meeting Report, describing the decision meeting. This report is ordinarily written by the chair of the APT Review 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.

The second part is the Evaluative Report. The Department may form an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly called Initial Review Committee, or IRC), whose members should be identified, to complete this part of the report (APT Policy Section IV.A.1, page 65). The evaluative report evaluates the candidate’s research or creativity, service, mentoring and teaching contributions in light of the departmental standards. Some of the elements of the report will be based on data provided in greater detail in other sections of the dossier. In this instance, bear in mind that the purpose of this report is evaluative, and try to avoid repeating information.

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

- What are the standards and expectations of the Department or discipline with respect to the candidate, as expressed in 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 crucial 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:

**Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities**

An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the work should be provided, 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. Submissions 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 is important.
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 should be provided. Detailed data analyses and student comments should be included in the dossier in the Student Evaluation Data section. 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.

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.

Service

Service contributions should be evaluated, 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.

The Report of the Department APT Review Committee may also include a minority report. Members of the Department APT Review Committee who do not think that the APT Review Committee Report adequately represents their views may write a signed minority APT report that will become part of the dossier (APT Policy Section IV.A.7, page 69). A minority APT report is intended to be employed for major disagreements, not for presenting minor variations in wording.

Voting at the Department Level

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 his or her tenure home and must abstain from voting in the second unit (APT Policy Section III.D.4, page 63; Section IV.B.1, page 69; Section IV.C.1, page 70). A mandatory abstention may arise for other reasons, such as when a faculty member is the candidate’s partner.

As a general matter, voluntary abstentions are to be discouraged. Higher-level APT review committees depend on the reasoning and expertise of the lower level committees; voluntary abstentions result in an absence of crucial input on a candidate’s dossier. Abstentions of 50% or more of the relevant faculty mean that the decision (negative or positive) does not represent a majority opinion, and could give rise to grounds for an appeal.

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 Section IV.A.1, page 65).

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.

**INFORMATION ABOUT JOINT 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.
Appointment split between two independent tenure granting departments and schools

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

- must hold a tenured appointment in the University,
- must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion,
- must hold a regular appointment in the unit (with a given percentage of time attached),
- may only vote in a single unit providing the plan of organization permits it, and at only one level of review,
- must vote at the Department level of review and in the tenure home, when there is the opportunity to vote more than once.³ (APT Policy Section IV.A.1, page 65)

**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, which then delivers the report to the respective units for a decision.

**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.

The primary unit incorporates its input (from faculty and unit administrator) into the dossier, to forward it to higher levels of review. The dossier moves on 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.

---

³ 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. These faculty may not vote on the candidate more than once.
When disagreements arise between voting units, the Committee should inform and invite the APT Review Committee chairs and administrators to discuss the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTLINE OF THE JOINT APPOINTMENT / REVIEW PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Departments or Units meet to decide on external referees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters are sent under joint signature of APT Review Committee Chairs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A joint advisory subcommittee or separate advisory subcommittee may be appointed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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;

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 Campus APT Review Committee.

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 relevant (at rank) faculty in the unit. 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.

Appointment split between tenure home and a temporary appointment in a secondary unit.

The secondary unit Chair/ Director writes an evaluative letter to the primary unit Chair, which is available to the primary unit faculty before they vote. Faculty in the temporary unit do not vote.

THE DEPARTMENT APT COMMITTEE’S RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Gathering information and documents 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 Section IV.A.6, page 68)
• 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 Section IV.A.2, page 67).

• 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 Section IV, page 63), 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 IV.A.1, page 65).

• Writing reports on: (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the Committee’s recommendation and its justification, and the date of the meeting; and (b) a separate evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential for future contributions (APT Policy Section IV.A.7, page 69). This latter report is often prepared by an advisory committee and is available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.

• Reviewing the Chair’s summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy (APT Policy Section IV.D, page 72). (Usually done by APT Chair)

• Representing the Department APT Review Committee’s perspective to higher levels of review, if the need emerges (APT Policy Section IV.B.4, page 70).

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. 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 Section II, page 56; Section IV, page 63) and (b) appoint one or more senior faculty mentors. (APT Policy Section IV.A.3, page 67; see also the Senate Task Force Report available at [http://www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/mntndx.html](http://www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/mntndx.html)). The list of new tenure-track faculty and their mentors is due in the Office of the Associate Provost by February 1.

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, or creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service (APT Policy Section II, page 56; Section IV, page 63). Colleges and Departments must have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these areas. These criteria must be included in requests for external evaluations and in the dossier after the letter written by the Department Chair. Upper-level APT review committees and administrators rely on the criteria to assess fitness for appointment or promotion equitably. Reviewers at all levels must keep these criteria in mind as they review individual cases.
Peer Evaluation of Teaching

In the Unit’s implementation of peer teaching evaluation, it is the Chair’s responsibility to assign other faculty to observe a candidate’s classes. It is recommended that peer evaluations of the candidate’s teaching be conducted at least once annually. Evaluations done only in the months preceding review tend not to be given much credence by higher levels in the review process.

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 Section IV.A.1, page 65). 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 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 Review 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 Review 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 Review Committee, it is crucial to provide reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative faculty votes and abstentions when they are known.

Denial at the Department Review

If both the Department APT Review 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 IV.D, page 72; see Appendix B, page 44, 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 Section IV.A.5, page 68). The letter must 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 B, page 44.

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.
THE CHAIR’S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 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 Section IV.A.8, page 69).
- Notifying candidates in writing, summarizing the Chair’s and Department APT Review Committee’s decisions and reasoning within two weeks of the Committee’s decision meeting (APT Policy Section IV.D, page 72; Appendix A, page 39). 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 Review Committee and Chair vote to deny tenure and/or promotion, the letter must be sent by certified mail (APT Policy Section IV.F.6, page 74).
- Inspecting dossiers for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- For new appointments (other than Assistant Professor), including the appointment type (9-month or 12-month), start date, and projected salary in a separate memo (see Appendix A, page 38) accompanying the appointment request. If the appointment is accepted, 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 IV.A.5, page 68).
- Answering questions putatively posed by upper-level review committees (APT Policy Section IV.B.4, page 70; Section IV.C.2, page 71).
- 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 Section IV.A.5, page 68).
- 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 Section II, page 56; Section IV, page 63).

COLLEGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The College APT Review Committee 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 Section IV.B.5, page 70).** It should address the same areas as the Department APT report described above (see page 14). **When the vote is not unanimous, the**
report should 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.

THE COLLEGE COMMITTEE’S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 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 Section Section IV.B.4, page 70; Section IV.C.2, page 71).
- Writing a report with an evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee’s recommendation and its justification, the membership of the Committee, and the date of the decision meeting (APT Policy Section IV.B.5, page 70; Section IV.C.3, page 72).
- 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.

DEAN

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 Section IV.B.5, page 70).

The letter should start with a specific description of the candidate’s area of expertise. It 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 Review Committee, College APT Review Committee, or the Department Chair, the reasons underlying the dissent must be explained. Negative votes or abstentions at the College level must 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.

Dean’s Notification to Candidate

When either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean make a negative recommendation, the Dean must: (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 Review 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 Section IV.D, page 72). Members of the College APT Review Committee may see the Dean’s letter. A summary is not necessary if both College-level recommendations are positive.
THE DEAN’S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 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 Section IV.C.1, page 70; Section V.A.1, page 76).**
- 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 Section IV.A.5, page 68).** Copies should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained.
- **Appointing members of the College APT Review Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization (APT Policy Section IV.B.1, page 69).**
- Providing staffing for the College APT Review Committee and ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted.
- **Reviewing recommendations of the prior level of review and the College APT Review Committee, and writing a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case (APT Policy Section IV.B.3, page 70; Section IV.B.5, page 70).**
- **When either the Dean or the College APT Review Committee make(s) a negative APT decision, writing a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Review Committee summarizing the outcome of the College APT Review Committee’s and Dean’s deliberations, and the rationale behind it. (APT Policy Section IV.D, Page 72; see Table 6, page Error! Bookmark not defined.)** This summary letter should be available to members of the College APT Review Committee who can decide to amend it, and the letter should be included in the dossier (APT Policy Section IV.D, Page 72).
- Inspecting the dossier for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Forwarding an electronic file to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- **Meeting with the University APT Review Committee to address questions they may raise (APT Policy Section IV.C.2, Page 71).**
- For new appointments, including in a separate memo accompanying the dossiers, the terms of appointment, start date and projected salary in appointment requests (See Appendix A, page 38). If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.
**Other Types of Cases**

**NEW APPOINTMENTS OF ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSORS, SENIOR AGENTS AND PRINCIPAL AGENTS, AND UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROFESSORS**

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 in Appendix A, page 38, that is required for presidential approval of the appointment.

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.

As there is generally no campus level committee review for a new appointment to Associate Professor or Senior Agent without tenure, this type of dossier includes only letters from the dean, the department chair, and external evaluators, along with the candidate’s CV and other supporting documents, if they exist. Based on these documents, the Provost will make a recommendation to the President regarding the appointment.

**PROFESSOR OF THE PRACTICE**

*(SEE APT POLICY SECTION I.F.9, PAGE 54)* **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.

**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, page 42) 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.

**EMERITA/EMERITUS STATUS**

*(SEE APT POLICY SECTION I.F.7, PAGE 54)* Associate/Full Professors and Principal/Senior Agents who have been faculty members for 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, plus a memo from the Benefits Office confirming that the faculty member has met with them. (Refer to [http://www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/retire.html](http://www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/retire.html) for more information.) The review is ordinarily conducted during the candidate’s last semester of employment (APT Policy Section IV.G.3, page 75). Faculty at or above the candidate’s pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/ Emeritus status (APT Policy Section IV.G.4, page 75). 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 Section IV.G.8, page 75).** Materials submitted for emeriti appointments should include a copy of the above referenced documents (See Table 4, page 42).

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.

**COLLEGE PARK PROFESSOR**

*(SEE APT POLICY, SECTION I.F.10, PAGE 55)* 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 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.

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROFESSOR**

*(SEE APT POLICY, SECTION I.F.11, PAGE 55)* This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative or performing artists, or researchers who have qualified for full-time
appointments at the University of Maryland, Baltimore at the level of professor, who are active in MPowering the State programs, and who also qualify for full-time appointment at the University of Maryland, College Park at the level of professor. Holders of this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal investigators, and participate in departmental and shared governance. Initial appointments are for three years and are renewable annually upon recommendation to the Provost by the unit head and dean. This is a non-paid, non-tenure track title but initial appointments must follow the procedures for appointment as a new tenured Professor.
Final Decisions, Concerns That Arise and Appeals

DENIAL AT THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW

If both the Department APT Review 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 IV.D, page 72; see Appendix C, page 43, 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 Section IV.A.5, page 68). 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, page 43.

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.

MOVING THROUGH HIGHER LEVELS OF REVIEW

As long as there is one positive recommendation at the Department level (from either the APT Review Committee or the Chair) the case will proceed to all subsequent levels for review (APT Policy Section IV.A.5, page 68). 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 Review Committee shall meet with the APT Review 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 Section IV.B.4, page 70; Section IV.C.2, page 71).

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 Section IV.D, page 72). 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.

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 Section IV.E, page 73). 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 Section IV.F.6, page 74).

**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 Review 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).

**APPEALS PROCESS FOR DENIAL OF PROMOTION**

**Grounds for Appeals**

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 Section V.B.1.b, page 77).

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 Section V.B.1.b, page 77).

**The Appeals Process**

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 Section V.B.1.a, page 77). 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 Section V.B.1.b, page 77). 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 Section V.A, page 76). 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 Section V.B.1.a, page 77).

The Committee will meet with the Appellant, and other parties, and investigate the case, as it deems appropriate (APT Policy Section V.B.1.d.3, page 78). 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 Section V.B.1.d.4, page 78). 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 Section V.B.1.e.1, page 79).
Information for Staff

OVERVIEW

Staff members make an essential contribution to the promotion and tenure process through their careful preparation of the materials in a candidate's dossier. Often, the last person to see the dossier before the university level review is a staff member. Through the efforts of the staff, the dossiers are clearly laid out and easy to evaluate.

Representative pieces of scholarship may be submitted in addition to the dossier. Inclusion of a teaching dossier is also optional. These additions may be specified in the form of a URL (preferred for 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 Review 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 Review Committee.

It is crucial for APT documents to be searchable. Non-searchable documents will be returned to the units where they originated.

GATHERING MATERIALS FOR THE DOSSIER

While dossier materials will vary according to the nature of the case, there are some elements that will be found in every dossier:

1. Transmittal Form. The transmittal form, besides providing the information used to record the candidate’s new or changed appointment, serves as a summary of the first and second level meeting dates and votes, along with the evaluations of the dean and department chair. The transmittal form has recently been revised as a PDF form, so you can open it from the Faculty Affairs website, enter the appropriate information, and then save it to your own computer for when you come back to add information to it. More information about completing the transmittal form is available in the Elements of the Dossier section below.

2. Promotion Criteria. The promotion criteria included must be that which was current when the candidate was appointed.

3. Letter Log. The letter log constitutes a summary of the requests for external evaluation. Letters from external evaluators make up an important part of the dossier, so the log must show clearly who has been contacted, when, and what their response was.

4. Reputation of Publication Outlets. Though this information is likely to be prepared by members of the Advisory Subcommittee, it should be presented in a clear and consistent fashion, which may well mean it becomes the responsibility of a staff member.

5. Citation counts or similar such metrics.
CREATING THE DOSSIER

The electronic dossier must meet three essential criteria:

1. It must be bookmarked.
2. It must be password-protected.
3. It must be searchable.

Bookmarks

The bookmarks in the dossier form a table of contents for the included materials. The items which are to be bookmarked are listed at the bottom of the transmittal form, in the appropriate order. Note that the order has changed from recent years. Of course, not all of the listed materials will appear in every candidate’s dossier. If an item is not present in the dossier, there is no need to create a bookmark for it.

To create a bookmark: navigate to the page you wish to bookmark. If the bookmarks pane is open, click the new bookmark button and enter the appropriate label. Labels need not match what’s at the bottom of the transmittal form, though it is convenient if they do.

You can alter the text of the bookmark by right clicking the bookmark and choosing Rename from the menu. Another bookmark problem is that they sometimes go awry when pages are added or deleted. To edit the page a bookmark links to: right click the bookmark and then choose Properties. From the window that appears, choose the Actions tab, and then click in the Actions window to highlight “Go to a page in this document.” Click the Edit button, and change the page number to whatever it should be.

Password Protection

The dossier must be password-protected to ensure the confidentiality of the materials within. The Faculty Affairs Office will let you know what the password should be at the beginning of each APT cycle. To add a password to the dossier, choose Properties from the File menu. Click on the Security tab, and choose “Password Security” from the dropdown Security Method list. You will then see the Password Security – Settings window. Check the box labeled “Require a password to open the document” and type the appropriate password in the “Document Open Password” field. Click OK, and then retype the password in the confirmation dialogue box that appears. Click OK to return to the Document Properties window.

Next, click the Initial View tab. Change the Navigation tab dropdown to “Bookmarks Panel and Page.” Change the Magnification dropdown to “Fit Width.” Finally, click OK. This sets the default view of the dossier so that bookmarks are visible and the dossier pages are easy to read.

Searchable Text

The text in the dossier must be searchable so that committee members can easily move around within the dossier and confirm various elements of the content. The easiest way to create
searchable text is to create the elements of the dossier straight from Word or from Excel (in the case of the student teaching evaluation summaries), using the “Save as PDF” function from the File Menu. However, you can also create searchable text from a traditionally-scanned page (if, for example, you receive an external evaluator’s letter through the mail), using the optical character recognition built into Adobe Acrobat Pro. To use this OCR function, click on Tools on the right side of the Acrobat menu. Click on “Recognize Text” and then click “In this file.” Acrobat will convert the scanned text into searchable text. It is a requirement that all dossiers be searchable. Contact the Faculty Affairs Office if you have concerns about this step. Non-searchable dossiers will be returned to the units that created them.

ELEMENTS OF THE DOSSIER

The items below are numbered, as they are in the reference list at the bottom of the transmittal form. However, you do not need to include the numbers in the bookmark text of the dossier file. The numbers are included simply as an aid to organizing these materials.

1. Transmittal Form

Check the accuracy of information on the transmittal form carefully, particularly the record of votes, the dates of meetings, and the type of appointment (e.g., nine month, twelve month, etc.). For new appointments, a separate letter with the proposed salary and start dates must be sent to the Faculty Affairs Office when the dossier is uploaded to the APT website (See New Faculty Appointment Form, page 38).

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, and (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc.. The sum of the numbers in categories 1-5, which will be automatically calculated on the transmittal form, should equal the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body. Numbers recorded on the transmittal form must match numbers reported in APT Review Committee Reports.

When filling out contact information, be sure to include the department for the college APT spokesperson.

2. Dean’s Letter

Make sure the date on the Dean’s letter agrees with the date on the transmittal form. Also, remember that the text of the Dean’s letter must be searchable.

3. Candidate Notification from Dean

If either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean has made a negative recommendation, the dossier must include a letter from the Dean to the candidate that explains the recommendation.
4. **College APT Report**
   This report must include the date of the meeting and the names of the Committee members. **The report should include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation (APT Policy Section IV.B.5, page 70).** Check to be sure the meeting date and votes match what is on the transmittal form. The text of the report must be searchable.

5. **Department Chair’s Letter**
   Make sure the date on the letter matches the date on the transmittal form. Remember that the text of the letter must be searchable.

6. **Promotion Criteria**
   The Department’s APT criteria should be included after the Chair’s letter. Remember that in cases where the criteria have changed, what appears in the dossier should be the criteria in force when the candidate was hired. The text of the promotion criteria must be searchable.

7. **Candidate Notification from Chair**
   The notification letter must be sent to promotion candidates within two weeks of the submission of the dossier to the next level.

8. **Department APT Report**
   The department APT report must include the date of the meeting and the exact vote. Make sure the report matches what is on the transmittal form. The text of the report must be searchable.

9. **Advisory Subcommittee Report**
   Technically, the information included in this report is a part of the Department APT Report. In some instances, this information will not be provided as a separate document.

9a. **Optional Minority APT Report**
   If such a report is included, it must be signed by its authors.

10. **Candidate’s Summary Statement**
    This statement of the candidate’s accomplishments is often written by the Advisory Subcommittee members or a representative. The statement must be reviewed by the candidate at least two weeks before the full Department APT meeting; the candidate must sign and date the report to indicate that he or she agrees with the contents. The candidate may wish to draft a rejoinder to the report, which would also be signed and dated, and would be included directly after the Summary Statement in the dossier.

11. **Letter Log of Evaluation Requests**
    This is a list of all external evaluators to whom a formal request for evaluation was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write a letter. Some evaluators are suggested by the candidate and others are identified by the department APT committee, and this must be indicated on the letter log. In addition, the letter log should indicate if an evaluator declined to write a letter, or did not respond to the request. There is a [letter log template](#) available on the Faculty Affairs website, or you can create your own, as long as all the requisite information is included.
12. **Declines from Evaluators**

If an evaluator declines to write, his or her message to that effect – whether it is an email or a letter – must be included in the dossier. You can easily make a searchable PDF from an email by choosing Print from the file menu, and then changing the printer to “Adobe PDF.” You will be prompted to enter a file name, and then depending on how Acrobat is installed on your computer, the file may open in Adobe, or you may have to open it yourself.

13. **Credentials of External Evaluators**

Credentials of the external evaluators should be briefly summarized in a single document under this bookmark. Each evaluator’s credentials should be provided in a paragraph. Remember that this document must be searchable.

14. **Sample Letter requesting Evaluation**

This sample letter should be dated.

15. **Responses of External Evaluators**

Organize the external evaluator responses according to the requestor. So, the letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate would come first, and those requested by the unit would come second. Give each letter a separate bookmark that includes a C for candidate or a U for unit (e.g., C – Smith; U – Jones). It is also helpful if the letters are included in alphabetical order by last name within each of these subcategories.

16. **Curriculum Vitae**

The candidate’s CV should be in the format recommended by the University. A template is available on the Faculty Affairs website. The CV must be signed and dated by the candidate to indicate that it is complete and current; this signed and dated copy will be sent to external evaluators. If there are subsequent changes to the candidate’s credentials, such as additional funding or new publications, they may be recorded as an addendum to the CV, which can then be included in the dossier. The addendum must also be signed and dated. The entire CV, including addenda, must be searchable.

17. **Reputation of Publication Outlets**

The information contained in this document will vary according to discipline. However, the document is most useful when it refers only to the outlets where the candidate’s work appears and uses objective metrics to assess publication impact. A tabular format is preferred for presenting this information. If appropriate, citation counts should be included below the table, as well as a calculation of the candidate’s h-index or other field-accepted metric. See the example below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>No. Of Articles</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Personal Statement
The candidate’s personal statement should be relatively short (3-4 pages), and directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate’s field. Like the other materials provided by the candidate, it must be signed and dated.

19. Student Evaluation Data
These evaluation scores are an important indicator of teaching ability. They must be clearly presented so that they can be easily evaluated at all levels of review. An Excel spreadsheet template is available from the Faculty Affairs website, or you may wish to create your own. However, there are some elements that are essential:

   a) Course numbers and terms when the course was taught must be clearly marked.
   b) Include the number of students completing the evaluation.
   c) Include the college mean for courses at the same level as the course being summarized.
   d) Include a calculation of the average for the candidate and for the college, for each course, and for each semester the course was taught. The spreadsheet template will calculate these averages automatically.
   e) Do not include the output from the Course Evaluation website in this dossier. If the candidate wishes to include it, it may be added to the supplemental teaching dossier.

If your college does not use the university standard course evaluation system, there should also be an explanation of the rating system that is used, as well as a sample questionnaire.

20. Peer Evaluation Data
Include the reports of peer evaluations of teaching. If peer evaluation does not take place in your department, include a memo from the chair to that effect.

21. Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision
This bookmark may jump to the appropriate page in the candidate’s CV, unless there is additional information about these activities not appropriate to the CV. If you are bookmarking to a page in the CV, set the bookmark to the exact page, rather than to the beginning of the CV. There is no need to include a separate page here which merely refers to the CV. If there is a document with information here, it should also include the entire CV section on mentoring, advising, etc.

UPLOADING THE DOSSIER
To upload a dossier to the Faculty Affairs website, go to http://faculty.umd.edu/apt and login with your university login. You will see a list of the candidates from your college; choose upload dossier for the appropriate candidate and follow the on-screen instructions. There is no need to notify the Faculty Affairs office when you upload a dossier; we receive an automatic notification.

CREATING THE SUPPLEMENTAL DOSSIER
The supplemental dossier might include additional pieces of scholarship and / or information about the candidate’s teaching. The contents of the supplemental dossier should be bookmarked to show what they are. The supplemental dossier must also have a password, and be set to open with the bookmarks panel visible and the page zoomed to the full width of the screen.
### LETTER LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT'S CHOICE</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATE'S CHOICE</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATOR</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>INITIAL CONTACT</td>
<td>MATERIALS SENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATOR</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>INITIAL CONTACT</td>
<td>MATERIALS SENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATOR</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>INITIAL CONTACT</td>
<td>MATERIALS SENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please indicate declines with an asterisk next to the date reply received, and bookmark and include the letters or emails of decline directly after the letter log in the dossier.
**NEW FACULTY APPOINTMENT INFORMATION**

(Use this form for new tenured or tenure-track appointments *other than* Assistant Professor.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide the following information for the Candidate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate's Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 month ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 month ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unless otherwise indicated, the following start dates should be inserted:**

For 9-month appointments, August 23  
For 12-month appointments, July 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>(State Supported)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>(External Funding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If joint appointment, provide a breakdown of salary (by percentage or dollar amount):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION OF APT DECISION**

### Department Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Case</th>
<th>Letters From</th>
<th>Contents of Letters</th>
<th>Placement in Dossier</th>
<th>Deadline / Delivery Method</th>
<th>Who May Review the Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Chair &amp; Committee vote negatively</td>
<td>Dept. Chair &amp; Dean</td>
<td>Dept. Chair: Votes, decision, rationale of Committee &amp; Chair</td>
<td>Front of Dossier. Send entire dossier to Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Chair’s: Required within 2 weeks of decision, certified mail</td>
<td>Chair’s: Required / Chair’s: Required: Comm. Chair Optional: Comm. Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean: Confirm review was conducted appropriately; promotion denied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean’s: Suggested within 1 month, certified mail</td>
<td>Dean’s: No one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either / both vote(s) positively</td>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
<td>Dept. Chair: Votes, decision, rationale of Committee &amp; Chair</td>
<td>After Dept. Chair’s Letter</td>
<td>Required within 2 weeks of decision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Case</th>
<th>Letter From</th>
<th>Contents of Letter</th>
<th>Placement in Dossier</th>
<th>Deadline / Delivery Method</th>
<th>Who May Review the Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Either / both vote(s) negatively</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Decision &amp; rationale of Committee &amp; Dean</td>
<td>After Dean’s Letter</td>
<td>Suggest within 2 weeks of decision</td>
<td>Required: Comm. Chair Optional: Comm. Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both are positive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Case</th>
<th>Letter From</th>
<th>Contents of Letter</th>
<th>Placement in Dossier</th>
<th>Deadline / Delivery Method</th>
<th>Who May Review the Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Cases</td>
<td>Associate Provost</td>
<td>Decision (if vote is negative, rationale)</td>
<td>Before President’s Letter</td>
<td>Following decision of the President</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### President:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Case</th>
<th>Letter From</th>
<th>Contents of Letter</th>
<th>Placement in Dossier</th>
<th>Deadline / Delivery Method</th>
<th>Who May Review the Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision is negative</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Decision (if mandatory case, termination date)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested within 2 weeks of decision, certified mail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision is positive</td>
<td>Decision and effective date of promotion</td>
<td>Front of dossier [Dossier placed in candidate’s personnel file]</td>
<td>Suggested within 2 weeks of decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRANSMITIAL FORM
### Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate’s Name</th>
<th>UID No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Unit</td>
<td>Secondary Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Date to Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Rank</td>
<td>Proposed Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Review</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hire</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Type of Appt: 9-month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Primary Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Home</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Vote Summary</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. APT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>Vol. Man. Absent Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College APT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secondary Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Appointment</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Vote Summary</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. APT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>Vol. Man. Absent Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College APT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College APT Spokesperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. APT Spokesperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Items to be Included in the Dossier

**Review Committee Materials**
1. Transmittal Form
2. Dean’s Letter
3. Candidate Notification from Dean
4. College APT Report
5. Department Chair’s Letter
6. Promotion Criteria
7. Candidate Notification from Chair
8. Department APT Report
9. Advisory Subcommittee Report
10. Candidate’s Summary Statement (signed & dated)

**External Evaluator Materials**
11. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests
12. Declines from Evaluators
13. Credentials of External Evaluators
14. Sample Letter requesting Evaluation
15. Responses of External Evaluators

**Candidate’s Materials**
16. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated)
17. Reputation of Publication Outlets
18. Personal Statement (signed & dated)
19. Student Evaluation Data
20. Peer Evaluation Data
21. Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision

---

August 14, 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT’S IN THE DOSSIER FOR DIFFERENT CASES?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmittal Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Notification Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College APT Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair’s Letter (and Secondary Unit Head’s letter, if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Notification Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. APT Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Evaluative Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (signed &amp; dated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae (signed &amp; dated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Publication Outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Personal Statement (signed &amp; dated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Letters of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials of External Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Responses of External Evaluators (at least 6, 3 chosen by candidate) | ✔ | ✔* | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | †
| Student Evaluations of Teaching | ✔ | ✔ | ✔* | ✔ | ✔ | | |
| Peer Evaluations of Teaching | ✔ | | | | | | |
| Mentoring, Advising, Research Supervision | ✔ | ✔* | ✔* | ✔ | ✔ | | |
| Supplemental Materials | ✔ | | | | | | |
| Retirement Documentation | | | | | | | ✔ |
| Submit: Electronic Copy | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | |

*Not needed for renewal

**Not necessary for College Park Professors. For College Park Professors of extreme stature (e.g., Nobel Laureates), letters may be bypassed.

† Recommendation letters, as for a job application.

‡ See section on Joint Appointments for interweaving input from multiple sources at each level
Appendix B

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

Dear Dr. XXXXX:

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 [X number of] 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 to …….umd.edu as an attachment?

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX
Chair, APT Review Committee
Department of XXX

enclosures: CV, personal statement, publications (please list), Department promotion criteria
SAMPLE LANGUAGE FOR CASES OF DENIAL OF PROMOTION

The eligible voting members of the department met on October 25, 2012 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

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 Review 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 Review 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 C

Student Evaluation Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course: UNIV100</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean F07</th>
<th>College Mean*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean S08</th>
<th>College Mean*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean F08</th>
<th>College Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was well-prepared for class.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course was intellectually challenging.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned a lot from this course.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The standards the instructor set for students were...</th>
<th>F07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>F08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Low</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too High</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?</th>
<th>F07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>F08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE Requirement</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Requirement</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click here to download an Excel spreadsheet where you can enter student evaluation numbers for a single course. The sheet is formatted to fit on one page, and after you have completed it for the first course, you can save it as a PDF, then change the numbers for the second course, save it as a second PDF, and etc. When you are finished, all those PDF pages can be added to your dossier file using Acrobat.
This policy complements the University of Maryland System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty, adapting that policy in accordance with the institutional mission of the University of Maryland at College Park. Within the framework of the System Policy, it specifies the criteria and procedures related to faculty personnel actions which shall apply to the University of Maryland at College Park.

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

**TERMINOLOGICAL NOTE**

The procedures spelled out in this document for tenure and promotion review specify three levels of review below the President’s office. For most faculty members these are the department, the college, and the campus levels. However, some faculty members are appointed in colleges and schools that are not departmentalized and that conduct the initial review at the college or school level. For uniform terminology the initial review, whether conducted by a department or a non-departmentalized school or college, is referred to as a “first-level review,” and “department” is usually replaced by “first-level unit.” First-level units thus comprise departments, non-departmentalized schools, and non-departmentalized colleges. Higher levels of review are referred to as “second-level” and “third-level.”
For the purpose of this policy, the term "university" and the term "institution" shall be synonymous and shall mean the University of Maryland at College Park. For the purpose of this policy, the word "days" shall refer to calendar days.

**PURPOSE OF THIS POLICY**

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

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

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

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

**A. Faculty with Duties in Teaching and Research**

1. **Instructor**

   An appointee to the rank of Instructor ordinarily shall hold the highest earned degree in his or her field of specialization. There shall be evidence also of potential for excellence in teaching and for a successful academic career. The rank does not carry tenure.

2. **Assistant Professor**

   The appointee shall have qualities suggesting a high level of teaching ability in the relevant academic field, and shall provide evidence of potential for

---

4 As of November 14, 1995, this title may NOT be used for new appointments.
superior research, scholarship, or artistic creativity in the field. Because this
is a tenure-track position, the appointee shall at the time of appointment
show promise of having, at such time as he or she is to be reviewed for
tenure and promotion in accordance with paragraph I.C.4 of the University
of Maryland System Policy and paragraph III.C.3 of this policy, the qualities
described under "Associate Professor" below. In most fields the doctorate
shall be a requirement for appointment to an assistant professorship.
Although the rank normally leads to review for tenure and promotion,
persons appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor after the effective date
of this policy shall not be granted tenure in this rank.

3. **Associate Professor**

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

4. **Professor**

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

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

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

1. **Faculty Research Assistant**

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

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

3. **Research Assistant Professor; Assistant Research Scientist; Assistant Research Scholar; Assistant Research Engineer**

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

4. **Research Associate Professor; Associate Research Scientist; Associate Research Scholar; Associate Research Engineer**

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

5. **Research Professor; Senior Research Scientist; Senior Research Scholar; Senior Research Engineer**

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

6. **Assistant Artist-in-Residence; Associate Artist-in-Residence; Senior Artist-in-Residence**

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

C. Field Faculty

1. Associate Agent

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

2. Faculty Extension Assistant

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

3. Faculty Extension Associate

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

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

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

5. Senior Agent (parallel to the rank of Associate Professor)

In addition to the qualifications of an Agent, the appointee must have
demonstrated achievement in program development and must have shown
originality and creative ability in designing new programs, teaching
effectiveness, and evidence of service to the community, institution, and profession. Appointment to this rank may carry tenure.

6. **Principal Agent (parallel to the rank of Professor)**

In addition to the qualifications of a Senior Agent, the appointee must have demonstrated leadership ability and evidence of service to the community, institution, and profession. The appointee must also have received recognition for contributions to the Cooperative Extension Service sufficient to establish a reputation among State, regional and/or national colleagues, and should have demonstrated evidence of distinguished achievement in creative program development. Appointment to this rank carried tenure.

**D. Faculty Engaged Exclusively or Primarily in Clinical Teaching**

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

1. **Clinical Assistant Professor**

The appointee shall hold, as a minimum, the terminal professional degree in the field, with training and experience in an area of specialization. There must be clear evidence of a high level of ability in clinical practice and teaching in the departmental field, and the potential for clinical and teaching excellence in a subdivision of this field. The appointee should also have demonstrated scholarly and/or administrative ability.

2. **Clinical Associate Professor**

In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Assistant Professor, the appointee should ordinarily have had extensive successful experience in clinical or professional practice in a field of specialization, or in a subdivision of the departmental field, and in working with and/or directing others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate students, fellows, and residents or interns) in clinical activities in the field. The appointee must also have demonstrated superior teaching ability and scholarly or administrative accomplishments.

3. **Clinical Professor**

In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Associate Professor, the appointee shall have demonstrated a degree of excellence in clinical practice and teaching sufficient to establish an outstanding regional and national reputation among colleagues. The appointee shall also have demonstrated extraordinary scholarly competence and leadership in the profession.
Library faculty hold the ranks of Librarian I-IV. Each rank requires a master’s degree from an American Library Association accredited program or a graduate degree in another field where appropriate. The master’s degree is considered the terminal degree. Appointments to these ranks are for 12 months with leave and other benefits provided to twelve-month tenured/tenure track faculty members with the exception of terminal leave, sabbatical leave, and non-creditable sick leave (collegially supported).

Permanent status is an institutional commitment to permanent and continuous employment to be terminated only for adequate cause (for example, professional or scholarly misconduct; incompetence; moral turpitude; or willful neglect of duty) and only after due process in accordance with relevant USM and campus policies. Librarians at the rank of Librarian I and Librarian II are not eligible for permanent status. Permanent status is available for library faculty holding the rank of Librarian III and Librarian IV. Those candidates without permanent status applying for the rank of Librarian III and Librarian IV shall be considered concurrently for permanent status.

1. **Librarian I**

   This is an entry-level rank, assigned to librarians with little or no professional library experience. This rank does not carry permanent status.

2. **Librarian II**

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

3. **Librarian III**

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

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

F. Additional Faculty Ranks

1. Assistant Instructor

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

2. Lecturer

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

3. Senior Lecturer

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

4. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

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

5. **Affiliate Assistant Professor, Affiliate Associate Professor, Affiliate Professor, Affiliate Librarian II, Affiliate Librarian III, and Affiliate Librarian IV**

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

6. **Visiting Appointments**

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

7. **Emerita, Emeritus**

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

8. **Distinguished University Professor**

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

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

10. **College Park Professor**

This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative or performing artists, or researchers who would qualify for appointment at the University of Maryland at College Park at the level of professor but who normally hold full-time positions outside the University. Holders of this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal investigators, and participate in departmental and college shared governance. Initial appointment is for three years and is renewable annually upon recommendation to the Provost by the unit head and dean. Appointment as a College Park Professor does not carry tenure or expectation of salary.

11. **University of Maryland Professor**

This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative or performing artists, or researchers who have qualified for full-time appointments at the University of Maryland, Baltimore at the level of professor, who are active in MPowering the State programs, and who also qualify for full-time appointment at the University of Maryland, College Park at the level of professor. Holders of this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal investigators, and participate in departmental and shared governance. Initial appointments are for three years and are renewable annually upon recommendation to the Provost by the unit head and dean. This is a non-paid, non-tenure track title but initial appointments must follow the procedures for appointment as a new tenured Professor.

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

II. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

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

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

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

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

Each college, school, and department shall develop brief, general, written Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. The criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions fall into three general categories: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of students; (2) performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity; (3) performance of professional service to the university, the profession, or the community. The relative importance of these criteria may vary among different academic units, but each of the categories shall be considered in every decision. The criteria for appointment to a faculty rank or tenure shall be the same as for promotion to that rank (or for tenuring at the rank of associate professor), whether or not the individual is being considered for an administrative appointment. An academic unit’s general Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion must receive the approval of the next level administrator. Any exceptional or unusual arrangements relating to criteria for tenure and/or promotion shall be specified in
writing at the time of appointment and shall be approved by the faculty and administrator
of the first-level unit, by the dean of the school or college, and by the Provost.

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

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

A. Teaching and Advisement

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

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

B. Research, Scholarship, and Artistic Creativity

Research, scholarship and artistic creativity are among the primary functions of the
university. A faculty member’s contributions will vary from one academic or
professional field to another, but the general test to be applied is that the faculty
member be engaged continually and effectively in creative activities of distinction.
Each academic unit shall develop and disseminate the criteria for evaluating
scholarly and creative activity in that unit.
Research or other activity of a classified or proprietary nature shall not be considered in weighing an individual's case for appointment or promotion.

C. Service

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

III. APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY

A. Search Process

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

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

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

B. Offers of Appointment

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

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

C. Provisions Related to Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

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

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

2. Subject to any special conditions specified in the letter of appointment, full-time appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor shall be for an initial term of one to three years. The first year of the initial appointment shall be a probationary year, and the appointment may be terminated at the end of that fiscal year if the appointee is so notified by March 1. In the event that the initial appointment is for two years, the appointment may be terminated if the appointee is so notified by December 15 of the second year. After the second year of the initial appointment, the appointee shall be given one full year’s notice if it is the intention of the University not to renew the appointment. If the appointee does not receive timely notification of nonrenewal, the initial appointment shall be extended for one additional year. An initial appointment may be renewed for an additional one, two, or three years. Except as set forth in paragraph III.C.3 below, an appointment to any term beyond the initial appointment shall terminate at the conclusion of that additional term unless the appointee is notified in writing that it is to be renewed for another term allowable under University System policies or the appointee is granted tenure. Such appointments may be terminated at any time in accordance with paragraphs III.C.5-11.

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

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

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

a. The President may terminate the appointment of a tenured or
tenure-track appointee for moral turpitude, professional or scholarly
misconduct, incompetence, or willful neglect of duty, provided that
the charges be stated in writing, that the appointee be furnished a
copy thereof, and that the appointee be given an opportunity prior to
such termination to request a hearing by an impartial hearing officer
appointed by the President or a duly appointed faculty board of
review. With the consent of the President, the appointee may elect a
hearing by the President rather than by a hearing officer or a faculty
board of review. Upon receipt of notice of termination, the
appointee shall have thirty (30) calendar days to request a hearing.
The hearing shall be held no sooner than thirty (30) calendar days
after receipt of such a request. The date of the hearing shall be set by
mutual agreement of the appointee and the hearing officer or faculty
board of review. If a hearing officer or a faculty board of review is
appointed, the hearing officer or board shall make a
recommendation to the President for action to be taken. The
recommendation shall be based only on the evidence of record in the
proceeding. Either party to the hearing may request an opportunity
for oral argument before the President prior to action on the
recommendation. If the President does not accept the
recommendation of the hearing officer or board of review, the
reasons shall be communicated promptly in writing to the appointee
and the hearing officer or board. In the event that the President
elects to terminate the appointment, the appointee may appeal to the
Board of Regents, which shall render a final decision.

b. Under exceptional circumstances and following consultation with
the chair of the faculty board of review or appropriate faculty
committee, the President may direct that the appointee be relieved
of some or all of his or her University duties, without loss of
compensation and without prejudice, pending a final decision in the
termination proceedings. (In case of emergency involving threat to
life, the President may act to suspend temporarily prior to
to consultation.)

c. The appointee may elect to be represented by counsel of his or her
choice throughout the termination proceedings.

6. If an appointment is terminated in the manner prescribed in paragraph
III.C.6, the President may, at his or her discretion, relieve the appointee of
assigned duties immediately or allow the appointee to continue in the
position for a specified period of time. The appointee's compensation shall
continue for a period of one year commencing on the date on which the
appointee receives notice of termination. A faculty member whose
appointment is terminated for cause involving moral turpitude or
professional or scholarly misconduct shall receive no notice or further
compensation beyond the date of final action by the President or Board of
Regents.

7. The University may terminate any appointment because of the
discontinuance of the department, program, school or unit in which the
appointment was made; or because of the lack of appropriations or other
funds with which to support the appointment. Such decisions must be made
in accordance with written University policies. The President shall give a
full-time appointee holding tenure notice of such termination at least one
year before the date on which the appointment is terminated.
8. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, the appointment of any untenant faculty member, fifty percent or more of whose compensation is derived from research contracts, service contracts, gifts or grants, shall be subject to termination upon expiration of the research funds, service contract income, gifts or grants from which the compensation is payable.

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

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

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

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

13. The appointee shall be subject to all applicable policies and procedures duly adopted or amended from time to time by the University or the University System, including, but not limited to, policies and procedures regarding annual leave; sick leave; sabbatical leave; leave of absence; outside employment; patents and copyrights; scholarly and professional misconduct; retirement; reduction, consolidation or discontinuation of programs; and criteria on teaching, scholarship, and service.

D. Provisions Relating to Formal Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

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

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

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

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

IV. PROMOTION, TENURE, AND EMERITUS REVIEW

The Provost shall develop detailed written procedures, implementing the University and the System policies on appointment, promotion, and tenure. This set of procedures shall be known as the University’s Implementation of the University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy and these procedures shall govern the University’s decision-making. The procedures developed shall be subject to review and approval by the University Senate. The Provost shall also develop useful guidelines, suggestions, and advice for candidates for tenure and/or promotion and for academic units responsible for carrying out reviews of candidates. Each year the Provost shall publish the University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual. This manual shall contain the entire text of the University’s Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy, the University’s implementation of this policy, and the guidelines, suggestions, and advice for candidates and for academic units. The University’s Implementation should contain the University’s required procedures clearly identified as such. All guidelines, suggestions, and advice in the Manual must be so labeled and distinguished from the required procedures.

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

The University’s required procedures and the required procedures of each academic unit to which a candidate belongs shall apply to promotion and tenure decisions for all full-time faculty and for academic administrators who hold faculty rank, or who would hold faculty rank if appointed.
The Provost has the responsibility for systematically monitoring the fair and timely compliance of all academic units with the approved procedures of this Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Policy and for the prompt remedying of any failure to fulfill a provision of this Policy that occurs prior to the institution of a formal tenure and/or promotion review. A violation of procedural due process during a formal review for tenure and/or promotion is subject to the provisions of Section V, The Appeals Process.

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

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

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are responsible for providing their academic unit with an accurate curriculum vitae detailing their academic and professional achievements. Candidates holding faculty rank at the University shall also make a written Personal Statement advocating their case for tenure and/or Promotion, based on the facts in their c.v., on the applicable Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion, and on their perspective of those achievements in the context of their discipline. Both the c.v. and the Personal Statement shall be presented in the form required by the University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual at the beginning of the academic year in which a formal review for tenure and/or promotion will occur. These two documents shall be included with each request for external evaluation and shall be included in the promotion dossier reviewed at each level within the University. Within the University review system, units and administrators may express their judgments on the contents and on the significance of elements in either of the candidate’s documents. Units may only ask in neutral language for external evaluators to comment on elements of these documents as part of their review but not suggest conclusions.

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

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

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

A. First-level Review

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

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

Although they do not have voting privileges, other faculty and the head of the first-level unit may be invited to participate in discussion about the candidate if the plan of organization and the bylaws of the unit permit.
Advisory Subcommittee: The first-level unit review committee may establish an advisory subcommittee to gather material and make recommendations, but the vote of the entire eligible faculty of the first-level unit shall be considered the faculty recommendation of the first-level unit.

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

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

Joint Appointments: Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment (in their tenure home) and one or more secondary appointments (in the unit or units that are not their tenure home). When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for appointment, promotion and/or tenure, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows:

- If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary unit, then the secondary unit’s advice to the primary unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the chair or director of the secondary unit.

- If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized school, then the director’s recommendation will be informed by advice from the faculty in the unit who are at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the unit’s plan of organization. If the plan of organization includes a vote, the vote may not include those eligible to vote elsewhere on the candidate.

- If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized
school, then there shall be both a vote of the faculty in the unit who are at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires and a written recommendation by the head of that unit. The restriction on multiple faculty votes continues to apply in this instance.

The secondary unit’s review of the candidate shall be provided to the first-level unit review committee and the first-level administrator. If the chair/director of the secondary unit is also a member of the candidate’s primary unit, the chair/director may participate in the deliberations of the primary unit, but may not vote on the candidate’s promotion in that unit.

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

3. Each first-level unit shall provide for the mentoring of each assistant professor and of each untenured associate professor by one or more members of the senior faculty other than the chair or dean of the unit. Mentors should encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Mentors also need to be frank and honest about the progress toward fulfilling the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Following appropriate consultations with members of the unit’s faculty, the chair or dean of the unit shall independently provide each assistant professor and each untenured associate professor annually with an informal assessment of his or her progress. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

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

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

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

5. The tenure or promotion case shall go forward to the next level of review if fifty percent of the faculty vote cast is favorable (or such higher percentage as may be established by procedures or guidelines of the first-level unit) or if the recommendation of the administrator of the first-level unit is favorable. If both faculty and unit administrator recommendations are negative, the case shall be reviewed at the next level only by the dean (or, in the case of a non-departmentalized school or college, the Provost). The dean (or Provost) shall review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process, as defined in Section V.B.1.b. If the dean (or Provost) believes that the candidate has not received due process, he or she shall direct the unit to reconsider. The candidate may withdraw from his or her review at any time prior to the President's decision.

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

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

8. The recommendation of the first-level administrator shall likewise be in
writing. The administrator’s recommendation shall be transmitted to the
second-level review and shall be made available to all eligible members of
the first-level faculty.

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

B. Second-level Review

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

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

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

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

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

C. Third-level Review

1. A third- or campus-level review committee shall be established in the following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members holding
the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges (Agriculture
and Natural Resources; Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences;
Business; Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences; Education;
Engineering; School of Public Health) and one from among the four small
colleges (Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Information Studies;
Journalism; Public Policy). Since this committee shall make its
recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's high
standards for tenure and/or promotion have been met, members of this
committee shall have a track record of outstanding academic judgment
along with sufficient intellectual breadth and depth to be capable of
comparing and judging candidates from varied disciplinary, cross-
disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. No small college shall be
represented on the committee more frequently than once in every three
terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from the Deans of the
Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive Committee, and from the
faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time administrative position may
serve as a voting member of the committee. The Provost shall be a non-
voting ex-officio member. A committee member who is entitled to vote in a
lower-level review of a candidate shall not be present for the discussion of
that candidate and shall not vote on that candidate. Appointments to the
third-level review committee from the eight large colleges shall be for three
years while the appointment from one of the four small colleges shall be for
two years, with the terms staggered so that approximately one-third of the
committee is replaced each year. No one may serve two consecutive terms.
The third-level review committee shall elect its own chair and alternate
chair. The committee members must maintain absolute confidentiality in
their consideration of cases. Outside of the committee meetings, members
of the third-level review committee shall not discuss specific cases with
anyone who is not a member of the third-level review committee. The
membership of the committee shall be made public at the time of the
committee's appointment. Every member of the campus community must
respect the integrity of the appointment, tenure and promotion process and
must refrain from attempting to discuss cases with committee members or
to lobby them in any way.

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

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

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

D. Notification to Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

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

E. Presidential Review

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

F. General Procedures Governing Promotion and Tenure

1. With the exception of the third-level review committee, in their reviews of
tenure and promotion recommendations from lower levels, upper-level
administrators or review committees may not seek or use additional
information from outside sources concerning a candidate’s merits unless:
   (1) the materials forwarded from lower levels indicate the presence of a
   significant dissenting vote or divided recommendations from a lower level;
   (2) representatives from the first-level unit participate in the selection of
   additional persons to be consulted; and (3) the assessments received from
   these external sources are shared with and considered by the first-level
   review committee and by the unit’s chair or dean; and (4) the review
   committee and the unit’s academic administrator have the opportunity to
   reconsider their recommendations in the light of the augmented promotion
dossier. The third-level review committee may seek additional information
on any candidate as it chooses, although it must follow (2), (3) and (4) as
described above. In doing so, the committee should ask the Provost to
obtain the additional information from the Dean, who would then consult
with the Department Chair to obtain faculty input. The evidential basis for
upper-level committees and administrators should be restricted to the
materials as assembled and evaluated by the first-level unit, with the
exception of information obtained in compliance with the procedures just
described. Candidates for tenure or promotion, however, are permitted to
bring to the attention of the university administration any changes in their
circumstances which might have a significant bearing on the tenure or
promotion question. In the event that candidates for tenure or promotion
bring information of this sort to the attention of upper-level committees or
administrators after the first-level review has been concluded, these
committees or administrators may take these changes into account in
reaching their decisions and may elect to send the case back to the first-level
for reconsideration.

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

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

4. A faculty member who would otherwise receive a formal review for tenure
may waive the review by requesting in writing that he or she not be
considered for tenure. A faculty member who has waived a tenure review
shall receive whatever terminal appointments he or she would have
received if tenure had been denied. A faculty member at any rank who has
been denied tenure and who is ineligible for further consideration shall
receive an additional and terminal one-year appointment in that rank.

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

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

G. Procedures Governing the Granting of Emerita/Emeritus Status

1. Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors,
Research Associate Professors, Research Professors, Senior Agents, Principal
Agents, Librarians III, and Librarians IV who have been members of the
faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park for ten or more years,
and who give to their chair or dean proper written notice of their intention
to retire, are eligible for nomination to emerita/emeritus status (see I.E.7
Emerita, Emeritus). Only in exceptional circumstances may Professors with
fewer than ten years of service to the institution be recommended for
emerita/emeritus status.
2. The decision whether or not to award emeritus standing shall be based primarily on the candidate's record of significant accomplishment in any of the three areas of (1) teaching and advisement, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity, and (3) service.

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

4. The review committee of the first-level unit shall consist of all eligible members of the faculty. Eligible members of the faculty are all full-time tenured associate and full professors, as appropriate, excluding the chair or dean. The vote of the entire eligible faculty shall be considered the recommendation of the faculty. The chair or dean shall submit a recommendation separately; the recommendation of the chair or dean shall be considered together with all relevant materials by administrators at higher levels.

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause

If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member whose appointment the campus administration seeks to terminate for cause requests a hearing by a hearing officer, the hearing officer shall be appointed by the President from a college or school other than that of the appointee, with the advice and consent of the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate. If the appointee requests a hearing by a faculty board of review, members of the board of review shall be appointed by the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate from among tenured Professors not involved in administrative duties.

V. THE APPEALS PROCESS

A. Appeals Committees

1. The President shall appoint an appeals committee. This committee shall consist of nine faculty members holding the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges (Agriculture and Natural Resources; Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Business; Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences; Education; Engineering; School of Public Health) and one from among the four small colleges (Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy).

No small college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive Committee, and from the faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time administrative position and no one who has participated in the promotion and tenure review process of the appellant shall serve on the campus appeals committee. Appointment to the campus appeals committee shall be for one year, and no one may serve two consecutive terms. Appeals committees shall elect their own chairs. The committee members must maintain absolute confidentiality in their consideration of cases.
2. Special appeals committees at the college, school or campus level shall be appointed by the dean, Provost or President in a manner consistent with the policies, bylaws, or practice of the respective unit.

B. Guidelines and Procedures for Appeals

1. Negative Promotion and/or Tenure Decisions

a. Mandatory and Non-Mandatory Reviews

When a candidate for promotion and/or tenure receives notification from the President, dean or chair that promotion or tenure was not awarded, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting that the President submit the matter to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request shall be in writing and be made within sixty (60) days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than one hundred and twenty (120) days after notification unless otherwise extended by the President because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that, should the President accept the request and refer the appeal to the Campus Appeals Committee, these letters shall be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

b. Grounds for Appeal

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

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

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

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 arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

c. **Standard of Proof**

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

d. **Responsibilities and Powers of the Appeals Committee**

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

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

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

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

5. The President shall attach great weight to the findings and
recommendations of the committee. The decision of the
President shall be final. The decision and the rationale shall
be transmitted to the appellant, the department chair, dean,
chair(s) of the relevant APT committee(s) and Provost in
writing.

e. Implementation of the President’s Decision

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

2. The Provost shall appoint a Provost’s Representative to
participate in all stages of the implementation of the
corrective actions specified in the approved plan for the re-
review, including participation in the meeting or meetings at
which the academic unit discusses, reviews, or votes on its
recommendation for tenure and/or promotion for the
appellant. The Provost’s Representative shall participate in
these activities but does not have a vote. After the academic
unit completes its review, the Provost’s Representative shall
prepare a report on all of the elements of corrective action
specified in the approved plan and this report will be
included with the complete dossier to be reviewed at higher
levels within the University. The Provost’s Representative
shall be a senior member of the faculty with no previous or
potential involvement at any level of review or appeal
pertaining to the consideration of the appellant for tenure
and/or promotion except for the participation as Provost’s
Representative as defined in this paragraph.
3. The Provost's request and the administrator's approved plan of implementation must be included in the dossier from the inception of the review. Re-reviews begin at the level of review at which the violation(s) of due process occurred and evaluate the person's record at the time the initial review occurred unless otherwise specified by the President. The administrator at the level at which the errors occurred, in addition to evaluating the candidate for promotion, must certify that each of the corrective actions has been taken and describe how the actions have been implemented. Re-reviews must proceed through all levels of evaluation including Presidential review. The Provost's review of the dossier will include an evaluation of compliance with the requirements imposed in the President's decision to grant the appeal. If the Provost discovers a serious failure by the unit to comply with the corrective actions required, the Provost shall formulate and implement a new plan for corrective action with respect to the appellant. In addition, the Provost shall inform (in writing) the administrator of the unit where the failure arose and the Provost shall take appropriate disciplinary action.

1314  f. Extension of Contract

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

1321  2. Decision Not to Review

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

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

3. **Decision Not to Renew**

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

4. **Emeritus Standing**

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