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1. WHAT'S NEW AND DIFFERENT?

This 2006-2007 version of the annual appointment, promotion, and tenure procedures manual reflects recent changes in the APT policy, clarifications in that policy, and revisions that we hope will improve the processing of cases.

- Assignment of mentors to entering untenured faculty and provision of promotion criteria and procedures to these faculty (p.14, 21, 23-24, 58)
- Updates to the c.v. during the review process (p.30, 47)
- College Park Professor - initial appointment and renewal procedures (p.12-13, 71)
- Joint appointments: voting rights and revised submission procedures (p.22-23, 41, 67-70, 90-91)
- Mandatory material available for examination by eligible voters (p.20, 25-26, 59)
- Material to be sent with external letters of reference (p.51-54, 57, 78-80)
- Sample letters of intent for new hires (p.52, 82-83)
- Timing of preparation of materials by the candidate (p.46-50, 51, 57)

The formal policy and this manual are posted on the home page of the Office of Faculty Affairs at http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/. Please share the manual with faculty members of all ranks. Candidates for promotion may find it helpful in anticipating their own tenure reviews because it contains input from previous campus APT Committees, the Provost, and President.

Questions regarding APT procedures and policies may be directed to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Ellin K. Scholnick (phone: x5-4252; email: escholni@umd.edu)
2. **Table 1. IMPORTANT DATES FOR 2006-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date Due at Faculty Affairs Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of candidates to be reviewed¹</td>
<td>August 28, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory and non-mandatory reviews for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure²</td>
<td>Beginning January 17, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory tenure review for untenured Associate Professors</td>
<td>Beginning January 17, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews for promotion to Full Professor³</td>
<td>Beginning February 14, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New</strong> appointments to the rank of Associate and Full Professor and Professor of the Practice³</td>
<td>Any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus/Emerita reviews</td>
<td>Any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of length of appointment year</td>
<td>No later than March 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation/withdrawal from consideration</td>
<td>Before candidate is slated to be considered by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for delay of tenure clock</td>
<td>No later than the beginning of mandatory review year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Colleges are requested to provide the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs with the names of possible candidates in order to schedule the delivery date of the dossiers. Tenure cases are usually distributed to members of the Campus APT Committee between mid-January and early March and promotions to professor subsequently. Once the Campus APT schedule for each college has been established, this schedule may be useful in planning college and departmental APT meetings.

²By these deadlines, Colleges should complete their reviews and have the dossiers ready for delivery to the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, 1126 Main Administration.

³Units are strongly encouraged to complete appointment reviews during the Fall and Spring semesters because APT members are less accessible during the summer and winter term and this leads to slower processing.
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** (See policy II-1.00(B))

   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 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 not 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, shall qualify for acceptance in a graduate school, 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 appointment is made annually, with reappointment possible for a maximum of six years. Attainment of a master’s degree in an approved subject area is required before promotion can be considered.

2. **Faculty Extension Assistant**

   The appointee shall be capable of assisting in Extension under the direction of the head of an Extension project and shall have ability and training adequate for the carrying out of the particular methodology required, the assembling of data, and the use and care of any specialized apparatus. The baccalaureate degree shall be the minimum requirement.

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
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 Library Services**

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.

E. 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 (see policy II-1.00(B))

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
7. Professor Emerita, Professor Emeritus

The word emerita or emeritus after the academic title Professor or Associate Professor shall designate a faculty member who has retired from full-time employment in the University of Maryland at College Park at the academic rank of Professor, Research Professor, Associate Professor, or Research Associate Professor after meritorious service to the University in the areas of teaching, research, or service.

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 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 inter-institutional 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 non-renewal, 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
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.

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

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, the appointment of any untenured 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Unless the appointee agrees otherwise, any changes that are hereafter made in paragraphs III.C.1-12 will be applied only to subsequent appointments.
13. 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.

14. 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 (See Appendix D for policy update).
1. At the first level the review committee shall consist of all eligible members of the faculty. Eligible members of the first-level faculty are those full-time permanent members, excluding the chair or dean, who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion or appointment. Professors from allied disciplines may be invited to participate in accordance with the bylaws or procedures of the first-level academic unit. The review committee may establish an advisory subcommittee, but the vote of the entire eligible faculty participating in the review process shall be considered the faculty recommendation of the first-level academic unit. If there are fewer than three eligible faculty members in the first level unit, the dean shall appoint eligible faculty members from related units to ensure that the review committee shall contain at least three persons. Though not an eligible member of the first-level faculty within the meaning of this policy, the chair or dean may, depending on the bylaws or procedures of the first-level unit, participate in the promotion or tenure review, and he or she may, depending on the bylaws of the unit, chair the review committee. 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. The first-level review committee shall appoint an eligible member of the first-level faculty, who may be the chair of the review committee, to be the spokesperson for the committee. Requests for information from higher level review units shall be transmitted to both the faculty spokesperson and the administrator of the first-level 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 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
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 Physical
Sciences; Education; Engineering; Chemical and Life Sciences) and one
from among the five small colleges (Architecture, Planning, and
Preservation; Health and Human Performance; 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
five 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 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 Emeritus Status

1. Associate Professors or full Professors 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 emeritus standing. Only in exceptional circumstances may Professors with fewer than ten years of service to the institution be recommended for emeritus standing.

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 from the eight large colleges (Agriculture and Natural Resources;
Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Business;
Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Education; Engineering;
Chemical and Life Sciences) and one from among the five small colleges
(Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Health and Human
Performance; 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.

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.

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 V.B.1.above.
4. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSEMBLING A DOSSIER AND PREPARING THE CANDIDATE’S CASE

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. The APT policy calls for the following actions by the academic unit which will become the faculty member’s tenure home: (a) the provision of a written copy of the approved Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion upon which the candidate will be evaluated (APT policy lines 356-358) and (b) a meeting with the Chair or Dean to discuss the Criteria with the faculty member (APT policy, lines 356-358), and (c) the appointment of a senior faculty mentor (APT policy, lines 712-724, see also the Senate Task Force Report on Mentoring of Junior Faculty available on Office of Faculty Affairs website). The list of new faculty on a tenure-track and their mentors is due in the Office of the Associate Provost by February 1, 2007. In addition, the Chair or Dean is encouraged to provide all new Assistant and Associate Professors with the unit and college’s promotion procedures and a copy of the manual.

The award of tenure and/or promotion is a milestone in a faculty member’s professional life and represents a significant commitment by the University. The review for tenure and/or promotion is the University’s primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate accomplishment in three areas: (1) research, scholarship, and creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service (APT policy, lines 319-325; 585-596; 667-670; 725-745). Colleges, and in some cases constituent departments, have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these areas.

The candidate’s dossier forms the basis for review at all levels. It is therefore extremely important that it is well prepared and that it includes all relevant information in a form that will be clear to reviewers both within and outside the first level unit.

This section contains the general guidelines for preparing all dossiers. Tables 2, 4 and 6 list the components of a dossier. Non-departmentalized Colleges will obviously omit the material (Chair’s Letter and Department APT report) that requires departmental input. Special cases, including new appointments, will be described in Section 5 and Tables 5 and 6.

A. Elements in a Dossier

An overview: Each dossier contains five major sections. The transmittal form serves as a cover sheet. Ensuing sections are preceded by a colored section divider listing its components and making the material distinctive and easy to locate. Please contact the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for these colored section dividers and maintain the standard order of elements in the packet. Within each

References to the APT policy will be cited by line. Mandatory procedures for dossier preparation and useful suggestions for the content of the dossier and the review process will be printed in specific typefaces.

This procedural manual lists requirements at the University level of review. Department and colleges may ask for more material (e.g., more pieces of scholarship) and more dossiers.
major section are subsections. There are 16 subsections. Please number the pages within each subsection consecutively (e.g., 1-1 [Transmittal Form], 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 [Dean’s Letter], etc.).

In making the required copies of dossiers, please indicate which packet is the original. Because these dossiers will be optically scanned, please DO NOT USE STAPLES OR INCLUDE DOUBLE-SIDED MATERIALS. Two representative pieces of scholarship should accompany JUST the original dossier. Please DO NOT include the supplemental materials within the dossier. Where possible this supplemental material should be single sided. Faculty members may choose to submit a single copy of their teaching portfolio. Colleges are responsible for returning these supplemental materials to candidates after the Campus APT Committee has finished its deliberations. Unless specifically requested, we will not return copies of journal articles.

Dossiers failing to conform to these guidelines will be returned to the College!

SECTION A: TRANSMITTAL FORM

#1. Transmittal Form: (See Table 2). The first page of the dossier should be the transmittal form. It is available on the web at www.faculty.umd.edu/addlforms/transmittal.doc. Information from the transmittal form is entered into both the ARS database and office personnel database, so please check the accuracy of information on the transmittal form, especially the record of votes, the dates of meetings, and the type of appointment (e.g., 9-mo., 12-mo., etc.). For new appointments, the New Faculty Appointment Information form, including the proposed salary and start dates, must accompany the dossier. See Table 7 page 66.

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

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

Summary of Votes: Record the number of (1) positive votes, (2) negative votes, (3) mandatory abstentions, (4) voluntary abstentions, (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc., and (6) the total number eligible to vote. The numbers in categories 1-5 should equal the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body, (e.g., for the first level, the total number of tenured professors within a department at or above the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed, and for the college, the total number of members on the College APT Committee). Please be sure that the numbers recorded on the transmittal form are consistent with the number reported in APT Committee Reports.

Mandatory abstentions arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice, e.g., at the college and department level. In these cases the faculty member is permitted to vote only at the lower level (APT policy, lines 597-601, 878-880). If the faculty member is eligible to vote within two departments (because both the candidate and the voter have similar joint appointments), the voting faculty member can only vote in the tenure home and must
abstain from voting in the second unit. A mandatory abstention may also arise if a faculty member is a spouse of the candidate.

Consistent with University APT policy, a report of votes is required from just those tenured faculty at or above the level for which the candidate is being reviewed (APT policy, lines 682-686). Hence, even though a unit’s Plan of Organization may allow votes from faculty below the level to which the candidate aspires, or from non-tenured faculty members, those votes should not be recorded on the Transmittal Form or any other part of the dossier.

**Secondary Unit**: If a candidate has a permanent joint appointment in a unit with eligible voters, record the votes of the secondary unit and the recommendations of the unit’s administrator. If the appointment is in a different college from the tenure home, the vote of the College APT Committee and the Dean should also be recorded.

**SECTION B: EVALUATIVE STATEMENTS**

**#2. 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, lines 853-856).

*In evaluating the candidate, the letter should contain an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, mentoring, and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of the Department APT Committee, College APT Committee, or the Department Chair, the reasons underlying the dissent should be explained. Please pay careful attention to negative votes and try to explain the reasons for these votes. Additionally, the Dean has a unique “local” perspective of importance to campus wide decisions. 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. Because colleges differ in their mission, the letter should also discuss the expectations of the college and department for promotion. If the candidate’s original appointment was based on expectations that differ significantly from commonly accepted criteria, the Dean should discuss the source and nature of the criteria on which the candidate is to be evaluated.*

**#3. College APT Committee Report**: This report should 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, lines 851-854) and it should address the same areas as the Department APT report described in **#5**.

*When the vote is not unanimous, it is helpful if the report discusses the reasons for the negative votes or the abstentions. If the assessment differs from the department vote,*
please explain why.
### Table 2. Transmittal Form 2006-2007

Candidate’s Name _______________________________________ UM ID. No. ______________________
Primary Unit _____________________ Secondary Unit
College _____________________ _____________________ ___________________
Present Rank __________________ Date to Rank____________________
Proposed Rank __________________
Mandatory Tenure Review?: YES ___ NO ___ Citizenship _____________________ _____________________
Type of Appointment: 9-Mo__ 9.5-Mo__ 10-Mo__ 12-Mo__ Is this a new appointment? ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Unit (Tenure Home)</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Summary of Votes:</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department APT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Unit (If Joint Appointment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department APT Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College APT Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Name</th>
<th>Phone No. &amp; Email</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary College Dean:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary College APT Spokesperson:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Department Chair:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Dept. APT Spokesperson:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORDER OF ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE DOSSIER**

A. 1. Transmittal Form

B. **Evaluative Statements**

   2. Dean’s Letter
   3. College APT Report
   4. Dept. Chair’s Letter
   5a. Dept. APT Committee Report
   5b. Evaluative Report by IRC
   5c. Optional Minority Report
   6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (signed & dated by candidate)

C. **Personal Statements**

   7. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated)
   8. Reputation of Publication Outlets
   9. Candidate’s Personal Statement (signed and dated)

D. **External Letters of Assessment**

   10. Letter Log
   11. Credentials of Referrees
   12. Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation
   13. Letters of Referrees

E. **Teaching and Mentoring**

   14. Data and Analysis of Student Evaluations
   15. Data and Analysis of Peer Evaluations
   16. Mentorship, Advising, Research Supervision Teaching Dossier (optional)
#4. **Department Chair’s Letter:** The letter should contain the Chair’s independent evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service, and should make a clear recommendation supported by the reasons for it (APT policy, lines 698-701, 801-804).

> As with the Dean’s letter, the University APT Committee finds the Chair’s letter to be most useful when it places the performance of the candidate in the context of the department or discipline and comments on the APT Committee’s report. It is particularly useful for the committee to understand the criteria used to evaluate the candidate and the chair’s assessment of the candidate with respect to those criteria. Committees also look for the Chair’s interpretation of the information about the candidate, not simply a reiteration of information. They seek an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, mentoring, and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of a Department APT Committee, it is helpful to explain the reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative votes when they are known.

#5 **Department APT Committee Report:** (APT policy, lines 791-800) The report of the Departmental APT Committee has two clearly separable parts. The first part 5(a) describing the decision meeting, is ordinarily written by the Chair of the APT Committee or his or her designee and reports the discussions and the exact vote as well as any department 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 5(b), the evaluative report, is often written by an initial review subcommittee (whose members should be identified). It summarizes and evaluates the candidate’s research, service, mentoring, and teaching contributions in light of the standards of the department and of the discipline. Neither report is shown to the candidate. These letters along with the Department Chair’s letter, are transmitted to the higher levels of review (APT policy, lines 801-804).

> It is helpful to consider the following questions when preparing the evaluative report:

a. What are the standards and expectations of the department or the discipline with respect to the candidate and how are they measured?
b. What are the candidate’s major contributions in these areas? Why are these contributions important?
c. Has the candidate met or surpassed the unit’s standards and expectations?
d. What evidence supports the review committee’s evaluation?

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

The following are a set of suggestions for evaluating faculty performance:

a. Research, Scholarly, & Creative Activities

The nature of the faculty member’s work should be summarized. An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the work should then be presented, 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. We strongly recommend submission of published reviews of books and performances, samples of extension publications, etc. For journal publications, where appropriate, the citation rates should be included. Similarly, for extension agents whose scholarship is directed towards producers or consumers, a thorough evaluation of the quality, quantity, and impact of these publications is very helpful.

Often faculty work in collaborative teams. It is therefore important to ascertain the role of the faculty member in that team and the identity of the senior author.

b. Teaching, Advising, & Mentoring

Departments and disciplines must define their standards for successful teaching, advising, and mentoring and should develop mechanisms for measuring a candidate’s progress.

Review committee members should examine materials prepared by the faculty member and evaluate the feedback of colleagues and students.

Prepared materials include course syllabi, examinations, and other instructional material. Judgments of teaching could include an assessment of the care with which instructional
materials have been selected; the rigor and scope of examinations, incorporation of instructional aids, such as films; demonstrations, internet technology, and field trips, and the appropriate use of the course format, including, for example, whether laboratory exercises were integrated with lectures. Also to be considered under prepared materials is any record of the development of techniques or modes of instruction, and the substantial revision of existing courses or development of new courses. Webpages and textbooks authored by the candidate can also constitute a significant contribution to teaching. Funded grants for curriculum development should also be considered. Candidates may facilitate the process of teaching evaluation by providing a teaching portfolio.

Feedback of colleagues and students that should be considered include: (1) surveys of student opinions of teaching, (2) receipt of awards for outstanding teaching, (3) opinions of other members of the candidate’s discipline, particularly if based on class visitations or on attendance at lectures given by the candidate, and (4) evidence of effective learning by the candidate’s students, such as may be shown by the mastery of material by students taught by the candidate in courses prerequisite to those of the informant.

Successful mentors and advisors establish the ongoing, supportive and professional relationships that enable students to benefit from their educational experiences, enter and advance in particular academic and disciplinary cultures, and find rewarding employment. Successful mentors and advisors provide encouragement, specific feedback on performance, ongoing support of scholarship and research, and information about and aid to obtaining professional opportunities. Mentors and advisors serve as role models for younger scholars, be they current students, former students, or junior colleagues. Demonstrations of effective mentoring and advising include but are not limited to: (1) number and caliber of undergraduate and graduate students guided in research by the candidate and their placement in academic positions, postdoctoral labs, graduate programs, etc.; (2) development of or participation in successful bridge programs, summer programs for students in the discipline, the University Research Apprenticeship program (URAP), etc.; (3) service on awards, APT, and mentoring committees in the school or profession; (4) acting as advisor for student groups or clubs; (5) service as a mentor for younger faculty members; (6) organizing professional socialization seminars for graduate students dealing with tips on topics such as submission of article and grant submission, etc.

c. Service
Service contributions should be evaluated carefully, 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., often serves two roles, as documentation of good citizenship and stature in the profession.

The third part 5(c) (Optional) Members of the Department APT Committee who do not think that the APT Committee Report adequately represents their views may write a signed minority APT report that will become part of the dossier (APT policy, lines 797-800).

#6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements: (APT policy, lines 771-790). This summary is designed to insure that committees have correct and complete information about the candidate on which to base their evaluation and to explain to higher-level committees the discipline and how the candidate fits within it. The summary, written by the Department APT Committee or its representative, is a factual statement of the candidate’s accomplishments in the areas of research, scholarship, or creative activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; and service. It is an internal statement not to be mailed to external reviewers. The Summary Statement should place the candidate’s accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the broader discipline and the candidate’s professional achievements in service and teaching in the context of the responsibilities of the unit, the college and the University and the greater community. It should be a neutral description; no evaluation of the candidate’s work should be included. The candidate must be shown the Summary Statement at least 2 weeks before the unit deliberates the candidate’s case. Candidates must certify that they have seen it, and must be allowed to draft a rejoinder before it is used by the department APT Committee as the basis for its discussion and vote. Thus the date on this report should predate the meeting on which the case is decided. If there is a rejoinder, the summary must acknowledge receipt and consideration of the rejoinder. To facilitate production and “certification” of the report, units may wish to inform candidates in advance of the deadlines for seeing the Summary Statement and for return of
The signed Statement with any rejoinder.

SECTION C: PERSONAL STATEMENTS

#7. Format of a Curriculum Vitae: The faculty member’s curriculum vitae should be signed and dated to certify that it is accurate and current. The c.v. should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and should be included in each request for external evaluation. **The c.v. that is read by the Department APT Committee and sent to external referees is the official c.v. for the candidate. If there are subsequent changes, the first level administrator should forward a memo containing these changes to higher levels of review.** Thus the date on the c.v. must predate the date of the voting meeting and the committee must not change the c.v. during the course of the review!! The c. v. should present a portrait of the candidate’s accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible. To aid the review committees, it should include, in the order shown, the following information:

1. Personal Information

   List the candidate’s name, department (joint appointments should indicate percentage of each appointment), current rank, year of university appointment to current rank, educational background (including institutions, dates and degrees), and employment background (in reverse chronological order).

2. Research, Scholarly, & Creative Activities

   In each category, published works should be listed first, in chronological order, followed by works not yet published but accepted for publication. **Pieces in preparation that are not completed and not reviewed should not appear on a c.v.** The candidate should distinguish between authored and edited works and between refereed and non-referred outlets, should clarify the status of work accepted but not yet published, and should identify his or her contribution to multi-authored works. Please list all authors, in the order they appear on the publication. Because disciplines differ in the way senior authorship is listed, please indicate the works on which the candidate is the senior

4The one exception is working papers, customary in certain fields such as economics and mathematics. These should be listed in section 2 l. Other.
author. When the research is published in a foreign language, the translation of the title should be included.

a. Books.5

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

b. Articles in Referred Journals.

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

c. Monographs, Reports, and Extension Publications.

d. Book Reviews, Other Articles, Notes.

e. Talks, Abstracts, and Other Professional Papers Presented.

i. Invited talks, etc.
ii. Refereed conference proceedings.
iii. Unrefereed conference proceedings.

f. Films, CDs, Photographs, Webpages, etc.

Specify the nature of the faculty member’s contribution.

g. Exhibits, Performances, Demonstrations, & Other Creative Activities.

Specify the nature of the faculty member’s contribution.

5Please specify whether a completed manuscript has been accepted without the need for further revisions.
h. Original Designs, Plans, Inventions, Software, and/or Patents.

i. Contracts and Grants.

List source, amount awarded, time period, and role (e.g., principal investigator).

j. Fellowships, Prizes, and Awards.

k. Editorships, Editorial Boards, & Reviewing Activities for Journals and Other Learned Publications

l. Other (specify type).

3. Teaching, Mentoring, and Advising

a. Courses taught in the last five years. Indicate approximate enrollments and any unusual formats.

b. Course or Curriculum Development.

c. Manuals, Notes, Software, Webpages & Other Contributions to Teaching.

d. Teaching Awards & Other Special Recognition.

e. Advising (other than research direction): Indicate approximate numbers of students per year.
   i. Undergraduate.
   ii. Graduate.
   iii. Other advising & mentoring activities (advising student groups, special assignments, recruiting, faculty mentorship, etc.)

f. Advising: Research Direction. The name of student and academic year(s) involved should be indicated, as well as placement of the student(s). List completed work first.

   i. Undergraduate.
   ii. Master’s.
iii. Doctoral.

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

4. Service.

a. Professional.

i. Offices and committee memberships held in professional organizations (include dates).
ii. Reviewing activities for agencies.
iii. Other unpaid services to local, state, and federal agencies.
iv. Other non-University committees, commissions, panels, etc.
v. International activities not listed above.
vi. Paid consultancies (optional).

b. Campus.

i. Departmental.
ii. College.
iii. University.
iv. Special administrative assignments.
v. Other.

c. Community, State, National.

d. Service Awards and Honors.

#8. Reputation of Publication Outlets: The department should provide an appraisal of the reputations of the journals, presses, and other outlets (e.g., theaters, exhibits, etc.) for the candidate’s scholarship/creative activity. Indicate whether peer review is required, and when possible, the rate of acceptance to the journal or other medium. Departments should develop a standard, stable, credible method of rating journals and should present these ratings. Often
departments or disciplines rate journals for their impact.

*One of the most helpful ways of evaluating the reputation of journals is a chart that lists the journals in the candidate’s field in rank order and indicates the articles appearing in journals of a given rank, e.g., two in the top ranked journal, two in the second ranked journal, etc. The listing can be confined to just those journals in which the candidate published.*

#9. **Candidate’s Personal Statement:** (APT policy, lines 589, 650-656). 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 of research or scholarship, the progress made in addressing these questions and the directions of future research. These statements should be relatively short, less than 3-4 pages, and directed toward readers who may not be specialists in the candidate’s field. The personal statement should be signed and dated. The statement should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and should be included in each request for external evaluation (APT policy, lines 650-653).

**SECTION D: EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS**

#10. **Log of Letters of Evaluation:** 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 (APT policy, lines 707-711).

The committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a letter was sent, even if the reviewers do not reply or refuse to write. The refusals should be part of the dossier. Include dates letters were requested, and the dates when either the evaluation was received or the reviewer refused to write a review. Table 3 provides the format for the letter log. The order of letters in the dossier should correspond to the order of letters in the log and the letters should be grouped by requestor (candidate or review unit). Because the first level APT Committee should have access to the same external letters as subsequent levels of review, late arriving
letters should NOT be included in the dossier nor used for deliberations. If additional letters were solicited by the committee to determine the role of the candidate in collaborative research, the letter soliciting the input and the responses should appear following the evaluative section of the First Level APT Committee Report. They do not belong in this section.

Table 3. Letter Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referee</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Date Replied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>9-1-06</td>
<td>9-10-06/Declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit’s Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>9-1-06</td>
<td>9-28-06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#11. **Credentials of External Evaluators:** The credentials of each external evaluator should be provided in a paragraph. Do NOT include c.v.s of evaluators.

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

#12. **Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations:** (See Appendix A for sample letters). The letter used to solicit external evaluations, usually sent by the Chair of the Department APT Committee, should indicate the criteria for promotion, and should include the candidate’s c.v., and personal statement and a list of scholarly and teaching materials being sent to the evaluator. The letter should be neutral, asking for an honest evaluation rather than for support for the faculty member’s promotion. The letter should ask the evaluator to comment on:

- the candidate’s ranking among his or her professional peers (or cohort).

---

6The unit should provide expectations to candidates about the amount of materials reviewers should be reasonably asked to evaluate.
• the candidates chances for promotion and where appropriate, tenure, in the evaluator's department, a key element in the evaluation.
• the impact of the candidate’s work on the field.
• the quality of the candidate’s teaching. 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.

#13. **Responses of External Evaluator**: The Chair of the First-Level Review Committee should receive suggestions of potential reviewers from the candidate. Then the Committee should select from that list and choose their own referees. The committee should solicit the external evaluations well in advance of their deadline. Committees should request a minimum of six responses from external evaluators (outside UMCP), at least three but no more than half of the referees shall be chosen by the candidate (APT policy, line 707-711). Only letters that arrive for timely consideration before the vote of the first-level unit should be included in the dossier. Should an insufficient number of letters be received, the case may still go forward. *However, units should be aware that the absence of the requisite number of letters may weaken the case for the candidate. Although the contents of the letters are to be shared with eligible voters at each level of review, these letters are highly confidential and should not be shared with the candidate or others who will not be voting on or evaluating the candidate for promotion.*

The following procedures should be followed in presenting letters:

• All letters received in response to solicitation must be included in their entirety if the letters arrive for timely consideration by the first level of review.
• Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation.
• Indicate clearly on each letter whether the evaluator was selected by the candidate or committee.

*Sometimes the candidate and the APT Committee choose the same referees. **If** the candidate and the committee compile independent lists of referees, the department may wish to label as its own the referees who appear on both lists.*
It is strongly recommended that committees and candidates take into account the following issues in selecting their evaluators and that Deans review the committee’s choice of external referees.

- Avoid choosing an evaluator who is the candidate’s dissertation advisor, former teacher, co-author, or student.
- 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.
- The credibility of evaluators is an important factor in judging the merits of the candidate’s case and the evaluator’s input. Because an evaluator is asked to address whether the candidate would be promoted at his or her institution, the prestige of the institutional affiliation of the evaluator and the accomplishments of the evaluator should be taken into account in selecting external referees.
- Candidates often are confused about the procedures for selecting external referees. It is useful to inform them of the University’s perspective on appropriate referees and the right of the department to select from the candidate’s nominations for referees the specific ones the APT Committee deems appropriate.
- When seeking a promotion to professor, international letters are helpful because they attest to international reputation.

SECTION E: TEACHING

#14. Data and Analysis of Student Teaching Evaluations: Summarize and analyze the data on teaching evaluations. (See Appendix B for sample table) Do not send raw, unanalyzed data. Sometimes departments include a summary in their APT report. If so, simply indicate in this section the page where the summary can be found.

- Include a clear explanation of the rating system as well as a comparison with the norms of the department and/or college. A term such as “average teacher” is meaningless without statistical information specifying the meaning of “average.”

- Provide an explanation of the level and student composition of the courses and a sample questionnaire. If a particular instructor’s teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses or if there was a particularly
significant event in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known.

#15. Data and Analysis of Peer Evaluation of Teaching: Many departments engage in peer review of teaching and analyze classroom visits by colleagues. At a minimum, 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 like Honors, Gemstone, and College Park Scholars, participation in programs for the improvement of teaching, and teaching awards received by the candidate. Departments may require a teaching portfolio including syllabi, examinations, and other instructional material. Only ONE copy of the portfolio may be submitted to the University APT Committee.

#16. Mentorship, Advising, Research Supervision: A list of past and current undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has served as principal advisor should be provided in the c.v. in separate sections. Where relevant, lists or numbers of past and current graduate and undergraduate students for whom the candidate has served as academic advisor should be included. This section should also include evaluative discussion of undergraduate and graduate advising, supervision of theses and dissertations, and mentoring of student and colleagues.

Appendices to the Dossier (one copy only)

Two Representative Samples of Scholarship: Each candidate should identify two samples that are representative of his or her scholarly productivity.

Teaching dossier (optional). See # 15 above.
### Table 4. APT Dossier Check Sheet 2006 - 2007

**NAME:** __________________________  **DEPT.** ______________________  **RANK:** _______________________

**APPOINTMENT TYPE:**  MANDATORY  DISCRETIONARY  NEW APPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copies of Dossier— 1 Original &amp; 14 Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transmittal Form— Check Accuracy of Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dean’s Letter &amp; Recommendation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College APT Committee Report Including the Vote &amp; the Basis for Recommendation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chair’s Letter &amp; Recommendation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Dept. APT Committee Report of the Decision Meeting Including the Vote of the Eligible Faculty &amp; the Basis for the Recommendation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Evaluative Report by Initial Review Sub-committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Minority APT Report (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Summary Statement of Personal Achievements Signed &amp; Dated by Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae Signed &amp; Dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reputation of Journals &amp; Other Forms of Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Candidate’s Personal Statement, Signed &amp; Dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Letter Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Credentials of Referees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sample Letter Used to Solicit References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Responses of External Evaluators— <strong>At least SIX Letters</strong> should be requested, three (3) selected by the candidate and three (3) by the Committee. If more letters are included, no more than half may be suggested by the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Data &amp; Analysis of Student Teaching Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Data &amp; Analysis of Peer Evaluation of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mentorship, Advising, and Research Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Material:** 2 representative samples of scholarship **(only 1 copy required);** teaching dossier (optional)

* There may be two of these if there is a joint appointment
B. Who Prepares What?

The Candidate Is Responsible For:

- Providing the Curriculum Vitae in the approved format, signed and dated. This document should be submitted BEFORE external letters are solicited.
- Reviewing and signing the Summary Statement of Personal Achievements (APT policy, lines 779-782). This document should be signed BEFORE the first level unit votes and should be made available for the first level APT committee before it meets.
- Providing a Personal Statement (APT policy, lines 650-656). This signed and dated document should be prepared BEFORE external letters are solicited.
- Suggesting the names of qualified external evaluators (APT policy, lines 707-711).
- 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 First-Level Review Committee.
- Selecting samples of his or her scholarship for reviews by higher-level review committees and working with the review committee to select a sample of materials for external reviewers to evaluate.
- Providing any other relevant information requested by the First-Level Review Committee (e.g., reviews of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of awards).

The First-level\(^7\) Review Committee Is Responsible For:

- Gathering the appropriate information and documents from the candidate.
- Drafting the Summary Statement of Personal Achievements and presenting it to the candidate for approval two weeks PRIOR to the time it will be distributed to the faculty (APT policy, lines 779-782).
- 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 referees to evaluate, and providing discriminating evaluation of the importance and special perspective of the evaluators (APT policy, lines 707-711).

\(^7\)The first-level is the department or a non-departmentalized college (APT, lines 15-23).
• Obtaining documentation on teaching and mentorship from students and colleagues.
• Obtaining available documentation on service.
• Evaluating or ranking the journals and other outlets in which the candidate’s scholarship is disseminated.
• Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service (APT policy, lines 667-670) based on the candidate’s c.v., Summary Statement of Professional Achievements, Personal Statements, external letters, teaching materials and internally generated reports.
• Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate’s case for tenure and/or promotion (APT policy, lines 682-691).
• Writing two reports on (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the committee’s recommendation and a justification for it, and the date of the meeting and (b) an evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential for future contributions, (APT policy, lines 791-800). This latter report is often prepared by an Initial Review Committee and is usually available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.
• Representing the departmental perspective to higher levels of review (APT policy, lines 841-850; 895-903).

The Department Chair or Dean of a Non-departmentalized College Is Responsible For:

• Reviewing the unit’s Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the conduct of reviews and that the review conforms to the procedures.
• Being aware of changes in the APT policy and procedures-consult the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs web page for updates: www.faculty.umd.edu/policies.
• Providing new tenured and tenure-track faculty with APT information such as departmental and University policies, this Manual, and first level unit promotion criteria (APT policy, lines 356-360; 637-642). One helpful organizing device is the new faculty checklist available through the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs’ web page: www.faculty.umd.edu/startup/checklist.html. Additionally administrators should notify faculty in writing of changes to the criteria.
• For assistant professors and untenured associate professors, implementing annual and faculty contract review procedures and other mentoring activities (APT policy, lines 712-727).
• Setting a schedule for the conduct of reviews, including insuring that the APT review process is launched by the end of each spring semester.
• Making sure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to keep the procedure moving smoothly and
If the chair is permitted to attend.

- If candidates withdraw from the process, forwarding a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean (APT policy, lines 768-770) and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- Insuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted and that the appropriate material is available to eligible voting faculty.\(^8\)
- Writing a letter to the Dean (APT policy, lines 801-804) making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case and making available a copy for those faculty who participated in the deliberations who wish to see it.
- Notifying candidates within two weeks and in writing of the Chair's and Department APT Committee's decisions and reasons for them. (APT policy, lines 927-928). If both the Department APT Committee and Department Chair vote to deny tenure, the letter must be sent by certified mail (APT policy, lines 1013-1014).
- Inspecting dossiers for accuracy, completeness, and conformity to these guidelines.
- Sending the dossier to the Dean's Office, and if the candidate does not pass the first level review providing sufficient information for the Dean to determine that the review was conducted appropriately (APT policy, lines 765-767).\(^9\)
- Answering questions posed by upper level review committees (APT policy, lines 841-846, 895-901).
- For new appointments, including the New Faculty Appointment Information form, which provides information on the length of appointment year, start date, and projected salary. The form is available on the web at www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/LetterLog.doc.

Upper-level Review Committees\(^{10}\) Are Responsible For:

- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.
- Meeting with lower level APT representatives when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing should be provided in advance (APT policy, lines 846-848, 901-903).

\(^3\)If the chair is permitted to attend.

\(^8\)For non-departmentalized colleges, the provost has the responsibility for certification.

\(^9\)APT committees of departmentalized colleges and the campus.
• Writing a report that includes an evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the committee’s recommendation including the justification for it, the membership of the committee, and the date of the decision meeting (APT policy, lines 837-840, 906-916).

The Dean Is Responsible For:

• Reviewing the College’s Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the appointment of a college review committee and the role of the dean with respect to the committee.
• Reviewing and approving college and unit promotion criteria.
• Insuring that the review conforms to those procedures.
• Recommending appointees to the Campus APT and Campus Appeals Committee (APT policy, lines 874-877, 1095-1100).
• Informing Chairs of changes in the APT policy and procedures and discussing with Chairs his/her evaluation of the preceding year’s APT process and outcomes.
• Preparing a schedule for submission of dossiers to the units in the college and informing departments of that schedule in a timely manner.
• When candidates are denied tenure and/or promotion at the first level of review, certifying the procedural appropriateness of the review, and writing a letter sent by certified mail to the candidate that informs the candidate of the outcome (APT policy, lines 1013-1014), and the consequences of this denial. Copies should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. Please retain the correspondence and the dossier.
• Appointing members of the College APT Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization (APT policy, lines 816-818).
• Providing staffing for the College APT Committee and insuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted.
• Reviewing the recommendations of the prior level of review and the College APT Committee and writing a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case (APT policy, lines 837-840, 851-856).
• Informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Committee of the outcome of the College APT’s and Dean’s deliberations.
• Informing the College APT Committee of the Dean's decision (APT policy, lines 936-942).
• Inspecting the dossier for accuracy, completeness, and conformity to these guidelines.
• Forwarding the ORIGINAL dossier and 14 copies to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (APT policy, lines 837-840).
• Meeting with the University APT Committee to address questions they raise (APT policy, lines 895-901).
• For new appointments, including the New Faculty Appointment Information form, which provides information on the length of appointment year, start date, and projected salary.
5. **INSTRUCTIONS FOR DOSSIERS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES**

The dossiers and the route of approval vary for different types of candidates. Table 5 charts the approval routes for faculty with appointments in a single unit.

**Table 5. Steps in the Review of Faculty with Appointments in Single Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion or New Appointment</th>
<th>Dept. APT Committee</th>
<th>Dept. Chair</th>
<th>College APT Committee</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Campus APT Committee</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. &amp; Full Prof., Sr. &amp; Principal Agents w/ or w/o Tenure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. &amp; Full Prof., Sr. &amp; Principal Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Appointment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Appointment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. of the Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. of the Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in non-departmentalized colleges the first two steps in the review are performed by the eligible voting faculty and the Dean of the College, and then the review proceeds to the Campus APT committee (where appropriate) and then the Provost and President.

Table 6. summarizes the differences in the contents of dossiers for diverse appointments. The ensuing section notes special considerations for each kind of appointment.
Table 6. What’s in a Dossier for Different Cases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Promotions (Section A)</th>
<th>Emeritus (Section E)</th>
<th>Appointment and Renewal of Prof. of Practice* (Section D)</th>
<th>New Tenured or Tenure-track Appointments(B) &amp; College Park Professors (Section F)</th>
<th>Joint Appointments† (Section C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transmittal Form</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dean’s Letter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College APT reports</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chair’s Letter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dept. APT Report</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Summary Statement of Personal Achievements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. C.V.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “Journal” Reputation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal Statement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Letter Log</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Credentials of Referees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sample Letter to Evaluators</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. External Letters (6 or more, 3 chosen by candidate)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Student Ratings of Teaching</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>✓ **</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>✓ **</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mentoring</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Copies (including the original)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “A” signifies necessary for Appointment, “R” necessary for Renewal  
**Not necessary for College Park Professors
† See section on Joint Appointments for interleaving input from multiple sources at each level.
A. Tenure/promotion Process for Faculty with Appointments in Single Department

Fifteen copies of the dossier are needed (original + 14 copies). One should be retained by the College.

1. Nomination of Candidates:

Reviews are mandatory for:

- All Assistant Professors in their sixth year of appointment at this rank (APT policy, lines 464-465);
- All Associate Professors appointed without tenure and currently in their third year of appointment (APT policy, line 487-490);
- Candidates who were previously denied tenure or promotion, and whose cases were returned by the Appeals Committee to the level of review at which the error was found.

Nonmandatory reviews may be initiated for untenured Assistant Professors and any Associate Professor:

- By department nomination;
- By self-nomination. Faculty members may request to be reviewed any year that is consistent with the department’s plan of organization (APT policy, lines 756-757) and may appeal to the Dean (or Provost, if a non-department college) in writing within 30 days if the candidate’s request for a review is denied. If the request for review is denied at that level, within 30 days the candidate may appeal in writing to the Provost (or President, if a non-departmentalized college) (APT policy, lines 1256-1265).

A candidate appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor ordinarily begins a six-year probationary period. Because, the decision to offer tenure is of great importance in the life of the University, it requires extensive information. Therefore, ordinarily candidates for tenure will have served the full probationary period of six years. However, some candidates arrive with prior academic service and they have accumulated several years of research and teaching experience before their mandatory review year at this University. These candidates come up for early tenure only in a technical sense and may have been promised an “early” review at the time of their appointment. In other cases, a candidate is reviewed for tenure before having served a total of six years on the faculty of any college or university. Nevertheless, these exceptionally accomplished members already may have met the unit’s expectations for scholarly output, student mentoring, and expert teaching. In such instances of early tenure, the recommendation must be supported by especially convincing
evidence to gain approval. Letters from the Chair and the Dean should address the issues of early promotions justifying why the promotion is merited now, and why there is convincing evidence of a sustained academic trajectory.

2. Withdrawal from consideration:

Candidates for tenure may voluntarily withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the President’s decision (APT policy, lines 769-770). When untenured faculty members withdraw at the time of mandatory review, the faculty member is entitled to an additional one-year contract at the individual's current rank. The letter of resignation should be submitted to the Department Chair, with copies to the Dean and Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor may write to their Chair to withdraw their candidacy at any time prior to the President’s decision (APT policy, lines 769-770). A copy of the letter should be forwarded to the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

3. Steps beyond the 1st level of review

If either the unit or its administrator support the case, it goes forward (APT policy, lines 758-762).

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation by both the first-level chair and the first-level APT committee, the review will not proceed further. The Chair should also inform the Dean who must certify that the procedures to evaluate the candidate conformed to the regulations in the APT policy (APT policy, lines 762-768; For complete details see Section 6).

Copies of the letter informing the candidate of the negative outcome of the review, the candidate’s dossier, and the Dean’s certification letter must be submitted to the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

B. New Appointments of Associate and Full Professors

New appointments at the rank of Professor and Associate Professor (regardless of tenure status) and Senior and Principal Agents must be reviewed by faculty committees and administrators at all levels. No offer of appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent or Principal Agent will be valid unless the President has approved the appointment. New Assistant Professor and Agent appointments are not handled by the University APT process.
Fifteen copies (1 original + 14 copies) of the dossier are needed.

New appointments may be submitted at any time. All requests for new appointments must be accompanied by a separate memo that provides the information in Table 7 that is necessary for presidential approval of the appointment.

Table 7. New Appointment Personnel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The following information is provided for the candidate indicated below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment: (Check One) 9 month _____ 12 month _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Start Date: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

For 12-Month Appointments - July 1
For 9-Month Appointments - August 23

| Salary: $ ________________ (State Supported) |
| $ ________________ (External Funding) |

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

Primary Department: ____________________
Secondary Department: ____________________

Dossiers for new appointments look different from the dossiers of candidates being promoted from within, e.g., they lack a Summary of Personal Achievements and a Personal Statement. They should, however, contain as much information as possible on the candidate’s performance or potential performance as a teacher, mentor, and advisor, as well as on the candidate’s scholarship. External letters of evaluation should be solicited from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from reviewers suggested by the department. For tenure cases, it is essential that the question of tenure be addressed, both in the departmental APT report and in the external letters. Letters soliciting recommendations for a new tenured appointment should pose the question of whether the candidate merits a tenured appointment. This is especially important if the candidate does not currently hold tenure at an academic institution.

---

11However, during summer and winter breaks the processing of cases is often slower due to the unavailability of campus APT members.
C. Joint (Split) Appointments-Appointment and Review Process

Fifteen copies (1 original + 14 copies) of the dossier are needed.

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

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

Review of newly hired joint appointments as well as promotions for candidates with joint appointments: In joint appointments, tenure resides in one department or unit (the primary one), which is 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. Additionally, when a faculty member spends considerable time in the secondary department or unit, even when the appointment is temporary, omission of information from the secondary unit or department does the primary department and the candidate a disservice. Given the variety of arrangements for joint appointments, it is difficult to find a uniform procedure for promotion and tenure reviews. In this section, we provide different scenarios, reflecting three different kinds of joint appointment.

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

Who can vote: To be eligible to vote within the first-level unit the faculty member
(a) must hold a tenured appointment in the University
(b) must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion
(c) must hold a regular appointment in the unit (with a given percentage of time attached)

---

12 This newly approved change to the APT policy is included in Appendix D.
There are two exceptions. Chairs and Deans cannot vote as faculty in their first level units. When there are fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty in a unit, Deans may appoint faculty from related units as voting faculty to ensure the review committee contains at least three persons. But these faculty also may not vote on the candidate more than once.

**Review process:** These procedures apply when the two departments or units reside within different colleges. The process is simpler when the two units reside within the same college and even simpler still when one or both of the units is a non-departmentalized college.

1. In order to coordinate the review process, at the inception of the review, the Chairs (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 mutually agreed upon list of external referees and a letter that solicits evaluation of the candidate. Ordinarily this letter should be signed by both Department APT Chairs. The two units may also wish to form a joint review committee consisting of members of both units who would then deliver their reports to the respective units for consideration and voting.

2. The secondary unit should conduct a complete review and make its recommendation before the case is considered by the primary unit. Note that 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.

3. The primary unit votes based on its own review and the material furnished by the secondary unit. If the recommendations of the two units disagree, the Chair of the primary unit’s APT Committee should ask the administrator of the secondary unit and the spokesperson for the secondary unit’s APT Review Committee to answer questions about the deliberations of the secondary unit.

The primary unit is responsible for preparing the candidate’s dossier for forwarding to

---

13 There are two exceptions. Chairs and Deans cannot vote as faculty in their first level units. When there are fewer than 3 eligible voting faculty in a unit, Deans may appoint faculty from related units as voting faculty to ensure the review committee contains at least three persons. But these faculty also may not vote on the candidate more than once.
higher levels of review in the college where the primary unit is located and also forwarding the credentials for review by the college of the secondary unit.\textsuperscript{14} The secondary unit’s review should be incorporated into the candidate’s file when the candidate’s dossier is forwarded to the higher levels for review.

4 a. In cases where the candidate’s appointment is split across colleges, the secondary college APT Committee deliberates and votes first. The secondary college APT Committee evaluates the dossier, which includes material from all previous reviews. After voting, the secondary college APT forwards it report and the letter from its Dean to the primary college.

4 b. The primary college and its Dean evaluate the entire dossier and transmit their judgments and the entire dossier to the University APT Committee.

Table 8- A brief road map to the joint appointment process:

1. Two departments or units meet to decide on external referees
   Letters are sent under joint signature of APT Chairs.
   A joint initial review committee (IRC) or separate IRCs may be appointed.

2. Secondary unit performs review
   Secondary unit APT Committee votes and writes a report.
   Secondary unit administrator writes a letter.
   Material is forwarded to Primary unit.

3. Primary unit completes review
   The APT Committee considers its own material and the material supplied by Secondary unit committee.
   Primary unit votes and writes a report.
   Primary unit administrator writes a letter.

   IF SAME COLLEGE: go to 4 b.
   IF DIFFERENT COLLEGE: go to 4 a.

4 a. Secondary College APT Committee evaluates dossier that includes material from all previous reviews;
    College APT Committee votes and writes a report;
    Secondary Dean writes a letter;
    Secondary Dean forwards material to Dean of the Primary College.

4 b. Primary College APT Committee evaluates dossier that includes material from Primary and

\textsuperscript{14} When the secondary unit is a non-departmentalized college, the secondary college completes its review, forwards it to the primary unit which forwards it to the primary college.
Secondary units’ reviews;
Primary College APT Committee votes and writes reports;
Primary Dean writes letter;
Primary Dean assembles a dossier including all previous deliberations and forwards it to University APT Committee.

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

If a candidate holds a temporary appointment in a secondary unit that is neither a department nor a non-departmentalized school, 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. The format of the advice will be determined by the unit’s plan of organization. If the input is in the form of a vote, the vote may NOT include those eligible to vote at the first level elsewhere on the candidate. The director’s letter should be available to eligible voting members of the primary unit before they vote.

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

The chair or director of the secondary unit writes an evaluative letter to the chair of the primary unit which is available to the primary unit faculty before they vote. The faculty in the temporary unit do NOT vote on the candidate.

D. Professor of the Practice (see APT policy, lines 289-302).

Four copies (1 original + 3 copies) of the dossier are needed for both the appointment and contract renewal process.

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

The approval route starts with the review by the first-level unit APT Committee including input from the first level administrator, and then requires endorsement of the Dean (but not the College APT Committee), a committee composed of the Deans of the Graduate School and Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and then the Provost and the President.

2. Reappointment of the Professor of the Practice also requires presidential approval based on letters of
endorsement from the Department Chair and Dean and the same campus committee (the Deans of the Graduate School and Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) that approved the original appointment. No department vote nor solicitation of outside letters is required. These letters and supporting material, such as a c.v. and teaching evaluations, should be forwarded (in an abbreviated dossier with material assembled in the order listed in Table 6) 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 last year of a contract.

E. Emerita/Emeritus Status (APT policy, lines 1017-1073)

Retiring Associate or Full Professors who have been faculty members for at least ten years are eligible for nomination to Emerita/Emeritus status. The review for Emerita/ Emeritus status is ordinarily performed during the last semester of the candidate’s employment (APT policy, lines 1028-1031). Faculty at or above the candidate’s pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/Emeritus status (APT policy, lines 1037-1040). Candidates for Emerita/Emeritus status are not reviewed by faculty committees beyond the first-level APT Committee. Reviews beyond the first level are conducted by the Dean, Provost, and President (APT policy, lines 1062-1069).

Two copies (Original + 1 copy) of the dossier are needed.

Dossiers for Emerita/ Emeritus candidates may be submitted at any time, but the preferred time period is between April 1 and May 15. Please specify the date on which Emerita/Emeritus status is to become effective.

F. College Park Professor (APT policy, lines 303-313)

Fifteen copies (1 original + 14 copies) of the dossier are needed.

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 they usually hold full time positions elsewhere. Initial appointment (for a period of three years) must follow the procedures for any appointment for new tenured professors (see B. above). After an initial appointment of three years, reappointment of College Park Professors must be made annually. The basis for reappointment shall be active participation in the graduate program and the intellectual life of the unit. Appointment renewal is based on recommendations by the unit head and Dean to the Provost.
Please forward the renewal material through the Office of Faculty Affairs.

6. **NEGATIVE VOTES ON PROMOTIONS**

A. **Both the First-level APT Committee and its Administrator Vote Negatively.**

The unit head (chair or dean) 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 in **general** terms the reason for the denial. The letter should include the APT vote (APT policy, lines 927-934).

The administrator at the next higher level\(^{15}\) must also write a letter (a) stating the case has been reviewed to ascertain that there was no violation of substantive or procedural due process (APT policy, lines 765-767), and (b) where appropriate, specifying the date of termination of employment. The letter should be sent by **certified mail**.

*Sample letters:*

```
Dear........:

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

For letters to Associate Professors\(^{16}\):

I, therefore, accept the judgement of the Department APT Committee and the departmental 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
```

\(^{15}\)The Dean for departmentalized colleges and the Provost for non-departmentalized colleges such as Journalism.

\(^{16}\)The same letter is applicable to Assistant Professors denied early promotion if the rank is described as promotion to Associate Professor.
warrant promotion at a later date.

For letters to Assistant Professors and untenured Associate Professors undergoing Mandatory Review:

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

Please accept my best wishes in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,
Dean ...

cc: Department Chair, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

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.

If there was no substantive or procedural due process violation, the review process stops without consideration at higher levels. If there is a violation, the Dean (or Provost when the case began at the College level) must return the case to the first level in order to correct the error and rehear the case (APT policy, lines 767-768). This may or may not lead to a different recommendation.

B. Disagreement Between the Chair and APT Department Committee

As long as there is one positive recommendation (from either the first level administrator or first level APT Committee), the case will proceed to all subsequent levels for review (APT policy, lines 758-762). The Chair is still obligated to write a letter within two weeks of the APT deliberations, informing the candidate of the outcome of the decision including the vote and the rationale.

C. Negative Votes at Higher Levels
The APT policy recognizes that members of the candidate’s unit are usually in the best position to evaluate the candidate in terms of his or her discipline and in terms of the needs of the unit (APT policy, lines 593-596). However, higher levels exercise independent judgment and may, at times, disagree with the recommendation of the first level. In cases of disagreement at the College level, the College APT Committee is obligated to call in the Chair of the Department and Chair of the Department APT Committee (APT policy, lines 841-846, 895-901). The college committee should provide a written list of questions to serve as a basis for discussion. Whenever either or both faculty and administrator recommendations are negative at the second level of review, the Dean shall send the candidate a letter summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which those decisions were based. This letter, too, should be sent by certified mail.

Negative recommendations by the second-level APT Committee and/or the second-level administrator do not stop the review process. The case will proceed to the third-level review (APT policy, lines 906-908). As in college level reviews, if there is disagreement between the Campus APT Committee and first level reviews, the Committee will invite the Dean, the Chair, and Chairs of their respective APT Committees to discuss the case and will attempt to provide them with a written list of anticipated points of discussion (APT policy, lines 901-903). Whatever the recommendation of the third-level committee the case will proceed to the President, who in conjunction with the Provost, makes the final decision (APT policy, lines 908-910). If it is negative, the President will then inform the candidate by certified mail (APT policy, lines 1013-1014).

7. APPEALS OF DENIAL OF TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Candidates may appeal the denial of a request to be considered for review (APT policy, lines 1110-1114), the denial of Emeritus status (APT policy, lines 1033-1036), and the denial of promotion and tenure. This section deals only with denial of promotion and/or tenure (APT policy, lines 602-604).

A. Grounds for Appeals (APT policy, lines 1129-1157)

The two bases for appeal are: violation of substantive or procedural due process. Neither permits substituting the academic judgment of a new committee for the judgment of those in the original review process.

---

17For joint appointments, the appropriate APT committee and chair/director of the secondary unit should participate.
A substantive due process violation refers to decisions that are based on an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration, such as the candidate’s gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, and sexual orientation or on the candidate’s exercise of protected First Amendment rights (e.g., freedom of speech). Substantive violations also arise when the decision is arbitrary or capricious.

Violations of procedural due process arise when the decision was influenced by failures to take a procedural step or fulfill a procedural requirement stipulated in the Plan of Organization of the department and college or the Campus APT policy. Thus these violations pertain to the formal conduct of the review.

In each case, the appeal rests on claims that a violation occurred that unduly influenced the decision and the redress for any appeal is to correct the procedural or substantive error by returning the case to the site at which it occurred and correcting the error.

B. Avoiding Situations that Could Lead to Appeals

Contentious negative decisions that lead to appeals have a detrimental effect on the functioning of a department. Units should examine their guidelines and expectations for candidate review to ensure that they meet University standards. Candidates should be informed of these guidelines at the time they are appointed (APT policy, lines 356-360, 637-642) and the processes should be reviewed with each candidate at the inception of their reviews. Units will also facilitate the eventual promotion and tenure review process by giving special attention to the process of pre-tenure review and by informing junior faculty of changes in the department’s directions and expectations.

There are some recurring procedural issues that arise in appeals cases. Not all of these will be legitimate bases for appeals, but they are problematic. The errors arise from:

a. Failure to set a deadline for completion of steps in the review process, e.g., when a candidate needs to produce all the material needed for review;

b. Failure to set guidelines about the amount of material (scholarly publications, teaching dossier) that will be made available to external reviewers and about who decides (candidate, review committee or both) what and how much material should be sent;

c. Misunderstanding or inconsistencies in the way external reviewers are selected
(e.g., that the unit is not obligated to select every reviewer nominated by the candidate;

d. Failure to include all the necessary queries in the letter to reviewers, particularly the judgment whether the candidate would be promoted to the same rank at the reviewer’s institution.

e. Failure to provide the Summary Statement of Personal Achievements to the candidate two weeks before the departmental review. Problems also arise if the candidate’s objections are not acknowledged in the Summary Statement and included as a separate attachment to the report (APT policy, lines 771-790).

f. Failure to allow the candidate to send a memo with updates to the c.v. during the review process and failure of administrators to forward those updates. Note, however that the deadline for receipt of updates is the date on which the dossier is sent to the Associate Provost’s Office for distribution to the third level of review.

g. Failure to notify the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review process at each level of the review. This letter must include the specific vote and a brief synopsis of the reason for the decision (APT policy, lines 927-934). Note that this problem obviously does not affect the voting process.

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

It is the responsibility of the faculty member who believes that a substantive or procedural violation has occurred in a meeting to object at that time and ask for a resolution of the problem. Should the faculty member conclude later that a substantive or procedural due process error has occurred, it is imperative that the faculty member quickly inform the Department Chair, the Dean, or the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs of the problem and seek a resolution (Senate Document No. 99-00-13).

C. The Appeals Process

1. A request for an appeal must be made in writing to the President within 60 calendar days of receipt of notification of the final decision not to grant a tenured appointment or a promotion (APT policy, lines 1110-1116). The letter should
specify the exact grounds for the appeal and it should focus on the grounds permitted by University policy.

2. If the request to consider the merits of an appeal is granted, all the supporting material for the appeal must be submitted no later than 120 days after notification of the final decision (APT policy, lines 1116-1120) to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for dissemination to the Appeals Committee.

3. The Appeals Committee then meets to examine the documents and to interview people who have information relevant to the appeal (APT policy, lines 1167-1170). Upon completion of the investigation, the committee will prepare a report to the President based on the weight of the evidence before it (APT policy, lines 1179-1183). The report should include their findings with respect to the grounds for appeal, and, where appropriate, recommendations for corrective action, which may include return of the matter to the stage where the error was made and action to eliminate the harmful effects the error may have had on the review process. The Appeals Committee does not decide on the merits of the case for promotion. It merely evaluates whether there is sufficient evidence for the claim that there was a substantive or procedural error.

4. The President makes the final decision whether to accept the Appeal Committee’s analysis of the validity of the appeal and their recommendations for corrective action (APT policy, lines 1190-1195). Under no circumstances does the President grant promotion or tenure at that point. The case is remanded to where the error occurred for re-review.

5. The decision during the re-review is based on judgments of the candidate’s accomplishments at the time of the original review.

6. If the appeal will not be completed before the expiration of the appellant’s term of appointment, the appellant may request the President to extend the contract an additional year with the understanding that this extension does not produce a claim to tenure through length of service (APT policy, lines 1248-1254).
APPENDIX A

Sample Letter # 1 to External Evaluator

Date

Dear Dr. XXX:

Prior to recommending promotion, the Department of XXX at the University of Maryland, College Park, seeks the opinions of recognized scholars in the candidate’s field outside our institution. Dr. XXX is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with permanent academic tenure. In the belief that you may be familiar with his/her work, I would appreciate receiving a confidential letter of reference from you with regard to these considerations.

Enclosed you will find a summary of Dr. XXX’s professional qualifications, along with copies of publications selected by the candidate. I would, in particular, appreciate your response to the following:

1. Are the quality and quantity of Dr. XXX’s published works at a level appropriate for her/him to be considered for this promotion?

2. Would you recommend him/her for a comparable position in your department? (Would he/she be granted tenure at your University?)

3. What is Dr. XXX’s ranking in his/her area of expertise? It would be especially helpful if you were to identify some of the best people in the field (at the same level) and compare Dr. XXX’s ranking with them.

4. What is your assessment of Dr. XXX’s reputation nationally and abroad?

5. Can you identify any major contributions Dr. XXX has made?

Activities such as teaching, advising, and University and public service also enter into evaluation of candidates. We do not expect, however, that external referees will always have had the opportunity to judge these, and we therefore ask that you comment on these only as you feel you are able.

If you are unable, or prefer not to furnish the requested information, I would appreciate being informed at your earliest convenience. Your response will be treated in a confidential manner according to the procedures governing promotion at the University of Maryland. I would appreciate your preserving the confidentiality...
of this request.

While I realize the burden of time and effort my request imposes, I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience, but before October 1st, since promotion deliberations commence the first weeks of October. I will be grateful to know your opinions in this matter of critical importance to Dr. XXX’s career. I thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely yours,

XXX X. XXXXXXXXX
Chair, APT Committee
Department of XXX

enc: cv, personal statement, unit criteria, two articles
Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

I am writing to request your evaluation of the qualifications of Dr. XXXX XXX for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of XXXX with Tenure.

In accordance with Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy and Procedures 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, and the candidate’s teaching abilities and performance. In addition, your comments on the candidate in comparison to others in the field at a comparable stage in their careers and a statement of whether or not you would recommend promotion/tenure at your institution are requested.

To assist in your evaluation, I am enclosing the following information: Dr. XXX’s latest curriculum vitae and personal statement, copies of three papers 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 valuation. I would be very grateful if you could respond to us in writing no later than October 6, 2006.

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX
Chair, APT Committee
Department of XXX

enclosures: c.v., personal statement, publications, unit criteria
## APPENDIX B

### Summary of DEPT Student Teaching Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE TYPE:</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY:</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Dr.C</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># EVALUATIONS:</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=poor, 2=adequate, 3=good, 4=excellent, 5=outstanding

1A Knowledge of subject 4.5 4.6 4.5 4.7 4.4 4.5
1B Degree of preparation for class sections 4.2 4.3 4.1 4.5 4.1 4.1
1C Use of the class sections 3.8 3.9 3.8 4.1 3.6 3.7
1D Ability to present material clearly 3.8 3.9 3.8 4.3 3.9 3.8
1E Willingness to present opposing views fairly 3.9 3.9 4 4.3 3.7 3.5
1F Management of class discussion 3.7 3.8 3.7 4.2 3.6 3.5
1G Scheduling deadlines for class work 4.1 4.2 4.2 4.5 4.1 4.1
1H Helpfulness of feedback on work 3.8 3.8 3.9 4.2 3.8 3.7
1I Accessibility to students outside of class 3.9 4.1 4.0 4.2 3.8 3.8
1J Enthusiasm for the subject 4.5 4.6 4.5 4.7 4.5 4.4

2.0 Instructor’s overall performance 4.0 4.1 4.0 4.4 3.9 3.9

3A Appropriateness of texts & course packets 3.9 3.9 3.9 4.0 3.9 3.9
3B Appropriateness of assignments & tests 3.9 4.0 4.0 4.2 3.8 3.8
3C Integration of theory & practical applications 3.8 3.9 3.7 4.1 3.8 3.7
3D Overall organization of the course 3.8 3.9 3.6 4.1 3.8 3.8
3E Development of analytic skills due to course 3.7 3.8 3.5 3.9 3.7 3.6
3F Educational value of the course for you 3.8 3.9 3.6 4.1 3.8 3.8

1=Too Little, 3=Just Right, 5=Too Much

4A Depth at which material was covered 3.1 3.2 3.2 3.3 3.0 3.0
4B Overlap between readings & classes 3.0 3.0 3.2 3.4 2.9 2.8
4C Amount of work required 3.4 3.5 3.2 3.4 3.5 3.6
4D Preparation for class by other students 3.0 3.0 2.9 3.0 3.0 3.0
4E Amount of teamwork with other students 2.7 2.6 2.7 2.8 2.5 2.4
APPENDIX C
SAMPLE LETTERS OF INTENT FOR NEW FACULTY HIRES

Offer letters vary depending on the rank, discipline and content of the offers themselves. However, there are some important standard elements. The following templates, borrowed liberally (and often literally) from letters used by CMPS, can be used as a guide. This is an offer letter, not the University contract which must be signed to finalize the appointment.

1. Sample Letter for ASSISTANT PROFESSOR/AGENT Hires

Dear Dr. HIRE’S NAME:

I am very pleased to offer you, with the approval of the Dean, an appointment as an Assistant Professor/Agent in the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME at the University of Maryland, College Park. On behalf of my colleagues in the department and with the enthusiastic support of Dean DEAN’S NAME, I would like to express our excitement at the prospect of your joining our faculty. The specific details of your appointments are as follows.

Your academic appointment is as Assistant Professor/Agent in the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME within the College of COLLEGE’S NAME. This is a three-year, full-time, tenure-track position. The appointment is effective DATE OF APPOINTMENT.

Since the University is required by a Board of Regents policy to verify that new tenure-track faculty have received the highest degree appropriate to their field (or that all requirements for that degree have been satisfactorily completed and the degree will be awarded at a forthcoming commencement), you will need to provide either an official transcript with a seal showing that the degree was awarded or a letter from the Registrar, on the stationary of the degree-granting institution, showing which degree was awarded and the date it was conferred.

The appointment is renewable for up to an additional three years, based on a favorable evaluation completed during the third year of the initial appointment. Under normal circumstances, you will be considered for tenure during the sixth year of your appointment. Should tenure not be granted, you will be offered a terminal one-year appointment.

Choose the appropriate paragraph below consistent with the type of appointment

1. The appointment is on a twelve-month basis at an initial annual base salary rate of SALARY. Your base salary rate may be adjusted annually thereafter in accordance with University salary guidelines and appropriations, and in response to your annual performance review. Typically these salary appropriations are received by the University through its annual budget process, and may include merit and cost-of-living allocations (COLA). Seventy-five percent (75%) of your base salary will be paid from State funds, and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of your salary must be provided from sponsored research funds secured by you through the normal University grant solicitation process to government or private agencies. Given the outstanding nature of your research, I have no doubt that you will be fully successful in securing the funds to support the sponsored research portion of your base salary. In the event that you do not have sufficient sponsored research funds to pay the approved sponsored research salary portion, you may elect to change your appointment status to a full-time academic year (9-month) appointment. This academic year appointment would carry a salary rate that is equal to the State portion of your 12-month salary. You should understand that such a conversion might have adverse effects on the contribution and calculation of your retirement and leave benefits.
OR

2. The appointment is on a 9-month basis at a base salary rate of SALARY. Your base salary rate may be adjusted annually thereafter in accordance with University salary guidelines and appropriations, and in response to your annual performance review. Typically these salary appropriations are received by the University through its annual budget process, and may include merit and cost-of-living allocations (COLA).

The following three paragraphs specify additional components of the offer and will vary across academic units

1. To facilitate the establishment of your research program, the University will:

   • Provide suitable office space, furniture, and laboratory space to accommodate your research activities. The University will provide up to $ MONEY to enable you to purchase appropriate computing and laboratory equipment and furniture, support any additional laboratory renovation expenses, and to fund other appropriate research-related activities. These funds may be considered available to you immediately upon arrival at the University of Maryland, and should be expended within three years.

   • Supply funds for graduate student or postdoctoral student support

   • Guarantee summer support (or some part of the non-state supported fraction of the salary) for some initial number of years.

   • Provide annual travel funds in the amount of $ MONEY.

2. I am aware of the real cost of transferring between institutions, and to assist with these costs the University will provide up to $ MONEY to cover reasonable moving expenses for your household and professional items. The University can provide assistance and coordination of your move, and you should contact ADMINISTRATOR’S NAME, the director of administrative services for our department, for further information. The University also provides Dual Career Assistance and Relocation Assistance. For more information, please contact Rhonda Malone, Director of Faculty Mentoring and Development or refer to her website, www.faculty.umd.edu.

3. The University has a workload policy of five three-hour course equivalents per year for regular faculty. However, for faculty in this department who are active in research and involved with student research advising, this load reduces to NUMBER courses per year. You will not be required to teach any formal courses during the first year of your appointment. In addition, all faculty contribute service to the College and Campus, and I expect that you will participate in these activities as required.

This offer will remain open for NUMBER days, during which time you should sign the enclosed contract and return it to me.

I speak for many colleagues when I say that we are truly enthusiastic about your appointment here. I believe we can provide support for your academic career by offering a stimulating intellectual environment and engagement with a talented and diverse student body. We look forward to working with you as our colleague.

Yours sincerely,

CHAIR’S NAME
Chair
2. Sample Letter for TENURE-TRACK ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/SENIOR AGENT Hires

Dear Dr. HIRE’S NAME:

I am very pleased to offer you an appointment as a tenure-track Associate Professor/Senior Agent in the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME at the University of Maryland, College Park. This offer is made with the approval of the Dean of the COLLEGE’S NAME and is contingent on the final approval of the Provost and President.

On behalf of my colleagues, and with the enthusiastic support of Dean DEAN’S NAME, I would like to express our excitement at the prospect of your joining our faculty. Your leadership and energy will help us to advance the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME to the top ten ranking to which we aspire.

The specific details of your appointments are as follows:

This is a three-year, full-time, tenure-track position. The appointment is effective DATE OF APPOINTMENT. Under normal circumstances, you will be considered for tenure during the third year of your appointment. Should tenure not be granted, you will be offered a terminal one-year appointment. The appointment is effective DATE OF APPOINTMENT.

Choose the appropriate paragraph below consistent with the type of appointment

1. The appointment is on a twelve-month basis at an initial annual base salary rate of SALARY. Your base salary rate may be adjusted annually thereafter in accordance with University salary guidelines and appropriations, and in response to your annual performance review. Typically these salary appropriations are received by the University through its annual budget process, and may include merit and cost-of-living allocations (COLA). Seventy-five percent (75%) of your base salary will be paid from State funds, and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of your salary must be provided from sponsored research funds secured by you through the normal University grant solicitation process to government or private agencies. Given the outstanding nature of your research, I have no doubt that you will be fully successful in securing the funds to support the sponsored research portion of your base salary. In the event that you do not have sufficient sponsored research funds to pay the approved sponsored research salary portion, you may elect to change your appointment status to a full-time academic year (9-month) appointment. This academic year appointment would carry a salary rate that is equal to the State portion of your 12-month salary. You should understand that such a conversion might have adverse effects on the contribution and calculation of your retirement and leave benefits.

OR

2. The appointment is on a 9-month basis at a base salary rate of SALARY. Your base salary rate may be adjusted annually thereafter in accordance with University salary guidelines and appropriations, and in response to your annual performance review. Typically these salary appropriations are received by the University through its annual budget process, and may include merit and cost-of-living allocations (COLA).

The following three paragraphs specify additional components of the offer and will vary across academic units

1. To facilitate the establishment of your research program, the University will:
• Provide suitable office space, furniture, and laboratory space to accommodate your research activities. The University will provide up to $MONEY to enable you to purchase appropriate computing and laboratory equipment and furniture, support any additional laboratory renovation expenses, and to fund other appropriate research-related activities. These funds may be considered available to you immediately upon arrival at the University of Maryland, and should be expended within three years.

• Supply funds for graduate student or postdoctoral student support

• Guarantee summer support (or some part of the non-state supported fraction of the salary) for some initial number of years.

• Provide annual travel funds in the amount of $MONEY.

2. I am aware of the real cost of transferring between institutions, and to assist with these costs the University will provide up to $MONEY to cover reasonable moving expenses for your household and professional items. The University can provide assistance and coordination of your move, and you should contact ADMINISTRATOR’S NAME, the director of administrative services for our department, for further information. The University also provides Dual Career Assistance and Relocation Assistance. For more information, please contact Rhonda Malone, Director of Faculty Mentoring and Development or refer to her website, www.faculty.umd.edu.

3. The University has a workload policy of five three-hour course equivalents per year for regular faculty. However, for faculty in this department who are active in research and involved with student research advising, this load reduces to NUMBER courses per year. However, you will not be required to teach any formal courses during the first year of your appointment. In addition, all faculty contribute service to the College and Campus, and I expect that you will participate in these activities as required.

I will inform you when the offer has received final approval. At that point, the offer will remain open for NUMBER days, during which time you should sign the enclosed contract and return it to me.

I speak for many colleagues when I say that we are truly enthusiastic about your appointment here. I believe we can provide support for your academic career by offering a stimulating intellectual environment and engagement with a talented and diverse student body. We look forward to working with you as our colleague.

Yours sincerely,

CHAIR’S NAME
Chair
3. Sample Letter for TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/PROFESSOR/PRINCIPAL AGENT/SENIOR AGENT Hires

Dear Dr. HIRE’S NAME:

I am very pleased to offer you an appointment as a tenured Associate Professor/Professor/Senior Agent/Principal Agent in the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME at the University of Maryland, College Park. This offer is made with the approval of the Dean of the COLLEGE’S NAME and is contingent on the final approval of the Provost and President.

On behalf of my colleagues, and with the enthusiastic support of Dean DEAN’S NAME, I would like to express our excitement at the prospect of your joining our faculty. Your leadership and energy will help us to advance the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME to the top ten ranking to which we aspire.

The specific details of your appointments are as follows:

Your academic appointment is as Associate Professor/Professor/Senior Agent/Principal Agent in the Department of DEPARTMENT’S NAME within the College of COLLEGE’S NAME. This is a full-time position that carries tenure. The appointment is effective DATE OF APPOINTMENT.

Choose the appropriate paragraph below consistent with the type of appointment

1. The appointment is on a twelve-month basis at an initial annual base salary rate of SALARY. Your base salary rate may be adjusted annually thereafter in accordance with University salary guidelines and appropriations, and in response to your annual performance review. Typically these salary appropriations are received by the University through its annual budget process, and may include merit and cost-of-living allocations (COLA). Seventy-five percent (75%) of your base salary will be paid from State funds, and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of your salary must be provided from sponsored research funds secured by you through the normal University grant solicitation process to government or private agencies. Given the outstanding nature of your research, I have no doubt that you will be fully successful in securing the funds to support the sponsored research portion of your base salary. In the event that you do not have sufficient sponsored research funds to pay the approved sponsored research salary portion, you may elect to change your appointment status to a full-time academic year (9-month) appointment. This academic year appointment would carry a salary rate that is equal to the State portion of your 12-month salary. You should understand that such a conversion might have adverse effects on the contribution and calculation of your retirement and leave benefits.

OR

2. The appointment is on a 9-month basis at a base salary rate of SALARY. Your base salary rate may be adjusted annually thereafter in accordance with University salary guidelines and appropriations, and in response to your annual performance review. Typically these salary appropriations are received by the University through its annual budget process, and may include merit and cost-of-living allocations (COLA).

The following three paragraphs specify additional components of the offer and will vary across academic units

1. To facilitate the establishment of your research program, the University will:
• Provide suitable office space, furniture, and laboratory space to accommodate your research activities. The University will provide up to $MONEY to enable you to purchase appropriate computing and laboratory equipment and furniture, support any additional laboratory renovation expenses, and to fund other appropriate research-related activities. These funds may be considered available to you immediately upon arrival at the University of Maryland, and should be expended within three years.

• Supply funds for graduate student or postdoctoral student support

• Guarantee summer support (or some part of the non-state supported fraction of the salary) for some initial number of years.

• Provide annual travel funds in the amount of $MONEY.

2. I am aware of the real cost of transferring between institutions, and to assist with these costs the University will provide up to $MONEY to cover reasonable moving expenses for your household and professional items. The University can provide assistance and coordination of your move, and you should contact ADMINISTRATOR’S NAME, the director of administrative services for our department, for further information. The University also provides Dual Career Assistance and Relocation Assistance. For more information, please contact Rhonda Malone, Director of Faculty Mentoring and Development or refer to her website, www.faculty.umd.edu.

3. The University has a workload policy of five three-hour course equivalents per year for regular faculty. However, for faculty in this department who are active in research and involved with student research advising, this load reduces to NUMBER courses per year. You will not be required to teach any formal courses during the first year of your appointment. In addition, all faculty contribute service to the College and Campus, and I expect that you will participate in these activities as required.

I will inform you when the offer has received final approval. At that point, the offer will remain open for NUMBER days, during which time you should sign the enclosed contract and return it to me.

I speak for many colleagues when I say that we are truly enthusiastic about your appointment here. I believe we can provide support for your academic career to prosper by offering a stimulating intellectual environment and engagement with a talented and diverse student body. We look forward to your long and distinguished career as our colleague.

Yours sincerely,

CHAIR’S NAME
Chair
APPENDIX D

This section supercedes section IV A. 1

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 and (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 unit 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.
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