

September 13, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Members

FROM: Martha Nell Smith
Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: University Senate Meeting on Thursday, September 20, 2012

The first meeting of the University Senate will be held on Thursday, September 20, 2012. The meeting will convene at 3:15 p.m., in the Atrium of the Stamp Student Union. If you are unable to attend, please contact the Senate Office¹ by calling 301-405-5805 or sending an email to senate-admin@umd.edu for an excused absence. Your response will assure an accurate quorum count for the meeting.

The meeting materials can be accessed on the Senate Web site. Please go to <http://www.senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/> and click on the date of the meeting. Remember that each transmittal form provides a statement of the issue, a recommendation, and a summary of the committee's work. These are invaluable in helping to navigate the materials.

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the May 3, 2012, Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair
4. 2011-2012 Senate Legislation Log (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-01) (Information)
5. Approval of the Standing Committee & Council Slates 2012-2013 (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-02) (Action)
6. Special Order of the Day
Kumea Shorter-Gooden
Chief Diversity Officer & Associate Vice President
Making Diversity 'Part and Parcel'

¹ Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

7. Reform of the University APT Committee Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-03) (Action)
8. Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-11) (Action)
9. New Business
10. Adjournment

¹ Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

University Senate

May 3, 2012

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 110

Call to Order

Senate Chair Kasischke called the meeting to order at 3:19 p.m.

Kasischke welcomed the incoming senators and asked that they please stand to be recognized. He announced that they were officially seated for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Election of the Chair-Elect

Chair Kasischke introduced Vincent Novara, Faculty, Libraries, and Matthew Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences as the candidates for Chair-Elect. He opened the floor to nominations. Hearing no additional nominations, he requested that all voting Senators vote on the Chair-Elect. Chair Kasischke announced that Vincent Novara had been elected Chair-Elect.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Kasischke asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the April 19, 2012 meeting. Hearing none he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Outgoing Chair, Eric Kasischke

Chair Kasischke thanked senators for the opportunity to serve as Senate Chair. He also thanked the members of the Senate Executive Committee, the committee chairs, and the Senate Staff for their hard work and dedication. He also welcomed the incoming chair, Martha Nell Smith, and stated that he was confident that she would provide excellent leadership.

Incoming Chair, Martha Nell Smith, thanked Kasischke for his outstanding service and leadership over the past year and presented him with a small token of appreciation.

Special Elections

Chair Smith thanked Mark Leone and the Nominations Committee for their work in developing the slates and the candidates who have agreed to run. She also encouraged senators to volunteer to serve on a senate committee. She then provided instructions on the process for the special elections.

Smith requested that all voting senators take out the ballots for the vote of the Senate Executive Committee and strike out Vincent Novara as a candidate because the chair-elect is an ex-officio member of the SEC. She opened the floor to nominations. Hearing none, she asked senators to complete their ballots.

Smith asked all voting senators to take out the ballots for the vote of the Committee on Committees. She opened the floor to nominations. Hearing none, she asked the senators to complete their ballots.

Smith asked all faculty senators to take out the ballots for the vote of the Athletic Council. She opened the floor to nominations. Hearing none, she asked the faculty senators to complete their ballots.

Smith asked all faculty senators to take out the ballots for the vote of the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF). She opened the floor to nominations. Hearing none, she asked the faculty senators to complete their ballots.

Smith requested that all faculty, staff, and undergraduate senators take out the ballots for the vote of the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). She opened the floor to nominations. Hearing none, he asked the senators to complete their ballots.

Chair Smith stated that Reka Montfort would announce the results of the special elections by email following the meeting.

Smith announced that the Senate Meeting Schedule for 2012-2013 has been finalized and will be emailed to senators. She reminded everyone that only senators or those introduced by senators may speak. For the record, all speakers should state his or her name and constituency prior to speaking.

Committee Reports

2012 Campus Safety Report (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-38) (Information)

Smith stated that the Campus Safety Report had been provided as an informational item from the Campus Affairs Committee.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences and Member of the Campus Affairs Committee, stated that he believes there are discrepancies between what the committee had agreed upon and what is included in the final report. Specifically, the topic for the forum was chosen because sexual assault is underreported on our campus not because of recent events. The conclusion of the report states that the committee would like the issue to be at the forefront. However, the committee did vote on recommendations that were not included in the report and at the judgment of the committee chair in consultation with the senate leadership. Popkin hopes that these recommendations do not go unheeded, and the committee plans to continue its work on this topic.

PCC Proposal to Rename the “Community Health Education” Master of Public Health Area of Concentration to “Behavioral and Community Health” (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-39) (Action)

David Salness, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Rename the “Community Health Education” Master of Public Health Area of Concentration to “Behavioral and Community Health” and provided background information. He explained that the proposal requests a renaming of the area of concentration.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 97 in favor, 3 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Amendment to Activation of the USM Clinical Faculty Titles (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-20) (Action)

Juan Uriagereka, Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the committee’s report. He explained that the committee was requesting a clarification amendment to the recently approved policy in order to make it consistent with existing policy.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 84 in favor, 7 opposed, and 11 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Special Order

Department of Intercollegiate Athletics’ Vision
Kevin Anderson, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics

Smith welcomed Kevin Anderson, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, to make his presentation.

Anderson thanked senators for the opportunity to address them.

Academic Mission

Anderson stated that he is committed to supporting, assisting, and enhancing the integration of athletics within the educational mission, and that Athletics is recruiting student-athletes who are capable of success at our University. He is committed to creating an environment for academic success and enhancing the experience of our student-athletes.

Athletics Mission

Anderson stated that their mission is to be the best intercollegiate athletics program in the country. They strive to teach, develop, and inspire student athletes. They value honor, teamwork, and sportsmanship. Their guiding principles are respect, passion, honor, innovation, candor, focus, and diversity.

Strategic Planning

Anderson explained that they clarified their vision and purpose by engaging the functional units (e.g. facilities, ticket operations, and sport programs). They explored the following: What do we stand for? What are our key values? What business are we in? What do we have passion for? What will success look like? The strategic planning process was inclusive and transparent and included several subcommittees. They began their work in January 2012 and are in the final stages of developing the plan.

Smith thanked Anderson for his presentation and opened the floor to questions.

Q & A

Senator Levey, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, raised concerns about transparency with individual cases of student-athletes. He also asked Anderson about his thoughts about a specialized major for athletes.

Anderson responded that the student-athlete conduct book is clear that there are procedures, policies, and rules by which athletes must abide. That said, some issues regarding students cannot be openly discussed. Dealing with individual cases of violations, the process is as open and transparent as possible. There was a recent article about a curriculum for students interested in going into the sports field not just for athletes. He has discussed this with President Loh briefly and hopes to explore the possibilities further.

Senator Davis, Faculty, A. James Clark College of Engineering, stated that there appears to be a great deal of hypocrisy in college sports. He raised concerns about the demands on the student-athletes who are treated like professional athletes. We should encourage students who want to be professional athletes to come back to the University and earn their degree for free.

Anderson responded that intercollegiate athletics has been compared to slavery. However, he believes that there is value in scholarship if we believe in the student-athlete. There are many athletes who could not get in based on their academic merits alone. Athletics gives them an opportunity that they might not otherwise have. We need to make the best of the system that we have but hopefully the market will adjust to keep the balance. He also addressed the need to discuss the value of a scholarship with parents early on.

Andre Utes, Non-Exempt Staff, Department of Public Safety, asked about the impact on the smaller sports that have athletes who are good at sports and

academics when the focus seems to be on protecting the revenue-generating sports that are not as strong in academics.

Anderson responded that he did not want to cut sports but does have the responsibility to balance the budget, and that eight sports were cut when it could have been as many as ten. The existing policies for young athletes are what we must abide by. We are talking with our incoming athletes about the value of education. That might make these athletes more prepared for success when it comes. He explained that he was given the opportunity to get an education through athletics.

Utes followed up by asking whether it was a good strategy to recruit players who are likely to stay longer over those that might be more successful and leave earlier.

Anderson responded that we are interested in recruiting the outstanding athletes but it is what we do with them afterward that matters the most. He explained that he hired Randy Edsall because he graduated 80-85% of his players including one of the highest rates for African-American players, has academic rules, and holds them accountable. The coaches are committed to the education of our athletes.

Utes followed up by asking whether there could be a program specific for student-athletes such as managing their finances etc.

Anderson stated that the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics is working with Capital One to help teach athletes throughout the nation to manage and budget money. Intercollegiate Athletics is trying to do a better job of helping the athletes to make decisions that will best prepare them for life beyond athletics.

Senator Fagan, Undergraduate, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that the majority of our student-athletes are dedicated to academics and their futures. He commended Anderson and the Athletics Department on their work.

Anderson stated that they have developed a program for student-athletes who became professional to come back and get their degrees.

Purple Line Design Considerations on Campus
Carlo Colella, Associate Vice President, Facilities Management

Smith invited Carlo Colella, Associate Vice President for Facilities Management to make a presentation on the Purple Line.

Overview

Colella reviewed some of the design considerations for the Purple Line. The 16-mile east-west light rail line will run from Bethesda to New Carrollton with twenty-one stations. It is expected that there will be 60,000 daily riders on the line, taking 20,000 cars off the road. This line will connect to the Red, Green, and Orange Metro Lines as well as the MARC, Amtrak, and local bus services. The anticipated capital cost is \$1.9 Billion. Preliminary Engineering began in October 2011 with final design work being completed in Summer 2013 and construction beginning in 2015. The line will begin operation in 2020.

Process

The University has been collaborating with the Maryland Transit Authority (MTA) to integrate the process with the development of the Facilities Master Plan. There have been monthly meetings of the working group to address issues including alignment, station locations, traffic operations, and design elements.

Design/Roadway Configuration Elements

Colella stated that they have considered multiple lane configurations in order to enhance the pedestrian experience, accommodate bicycles, and maintain access for vehicles. After weighing the benefits and disadvantages, they have developed a recommendation that best meets the goals for the University and MTA Purple Line. The preferred option is the three-lane road where transit (buses and light rail) is in outside lanes and one-way westbound traffic in the center lane. The advantages of this option are that it minimizes the footprint, improves westbound traffic, improves transit services, allows for managed use of center lane, and reduces cut-through traffic on campus. In any event, the Purple Line will require a traffic signal. However, the "M" traffic circle restricts the flow of traffic with a signal. The preferred option is to make the "M" a part of a public landscape (adjacent to the intramural fields) in order to consolidate traffic movements and streamline pedestrian flow. The advantages to this change are enhancing the "M" as an iconic space, improving traffic and transit operations, and making safer pedestrian crossings.

Smith thanked Colella for his presentation and opened the floor to questions.

Q & A

Evan Ponchick, Past Undergraduate Senator, Robert H. Smith School of Business, inquired about the two-lane option limited just to public transportation.

Colella responded that there was a pilot closure of Campus Drive. The challenge is that such a closure limits personal vehicles from getting from one side of campus to the other. If we go to a 3-lane option and decide that we do not need that lane, then it could revert to landscape.

Senator Rolston, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that he was part of the Purple Line Working Group. The group raised concerns about the route through the center of campus. He said that this feels like a bait and switch because there is much more redirection and expansion that was

originally discussed. He advised that the University stand up for what is best for the University.

Colella responded that the two-lane option does not support the traffic needs of that area. However, it could be reverted down the road.

Dean Hamilton, Undergraduate Studies, stated that the "M" should be rotated to face the Campus Drive entrance so it is more visible.

Senator Burns, Undergraduate, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, inquired about the timing from the College Park Station to the Bethesda Station.

Colella responded that the end-to-end trip is 55 minutes but the MTA site has all of the travel times between the stations.

Burns also asked about the impact on metro fees.

Colella responded that he did not have that data. However, having the Purple Line will reduce metro bus service.

Senator Farshchi, Undergraduate, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that the artistic renderings do not appear realistic regarding the size of the trees. Would the trees be relocated to clear the view of the "M"?

Colella responded that the large trees would be removed and new trees planted. Some existing trees near Symons would remain but those in the intersection would be removed.

Senator Idsardi, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, inquired how the lanes would be limited to specific types of vehicles and also about the maintenance cost associated with shared lanes.

Colella responded that there would be signs for public transportation dedicated lanes. Maintenance of the public transportation lanes is the responsibility of the MTA.

Senator Lubrano, Graduate Student, Robert H. Smith School of Business, asked whether buses use the light rail lanes or are re-routed.

Colella stated that all forms of public transportation would share the same lanes.

Senator Asudegi, Graduate Student, A. James Clark College of Engineering, asked whether there were safety and environmental studies conducted.

Colella stated that there was a preliminary environmental impact study and the final study is underway. This includes noise measurements. Regarding safety, we have an agreement with the MTA that restricts the speed of the light rail to 15 MPH on

campus. They would be expected to stop for pedestrians and at crosswalks. There are other examples of this without safety issues.

Chair Smith wished the senators an enjoyable summer.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-01
Title:	2011-2012 Senate Legislation Log
Presenter:	Senate Office
Date of SEC Review:	August 29, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	September 20, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	Informational item – no vote is necessary
Statement of Issue:	The Senate Legislation Log is an overview of the work brought to the Senate during the 2011-2012 academic year. The log shows all completed legislation as well dates of subsequent approvals following Senate approval. In addition, there is a table of continuing legislation that was not completed last year but will continue into the 2011-2012 academic year.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	The Log is provided for informational purposes.
Committee Work:	N/A
Alternatives:	N/A
Risks:	N/A
Financial Implications:	N/A
Further Approvals Required:	N/A

Completed University Senate Legislation 2011-2012

Senate Doc #	Action	Date of Senate Action	Disposition	Date
08-09-06	Revisions to the College of Education Plan of Organization	4/19/2012	Presidential Approval	5/1/2012
08-09-15	Proposal for a Tobacco-Free Campus	9/21/2011	Presidential Approval	9/26/2011
09-10-07	Review of the Final Exam Policy	9/21/2011	Complete: The Senate reviewed the Provost's response	9/21/2011
09-10-22	Review of the University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog	9/26/2011	Completed	9/26/2011
09-10-49	Preservation of Shared Governance During Reorganizations, Consolidations, and Mergers	12/8/2011	Presidential Approval	1/17/2012
10-11-06	Re-evaluation of the Student Teacher Evaluations at UMD	2/27/2012	Complete: The APAS Committee accepted the Provost's Report	2/27/2012
10-11-11	Proposal to Review the University of Maryland Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts and Calculation of Grade Point Average	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval	11/21/2011
10-11-33	Consideration of a Campus-Wide Helmet Policy at the University of Maryland	10/20/2011	Presidential Approval	11/2/2011
10-11-34	Request to Review Domestic Partner Benefits	12/8/2011	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval	1/18/2012 3/26/2012
10-11-38	Student-Initiated Courses (SICs) Proposal	5/17/2012	Complete	5/17/2012
10-11-45	Review of the Public Employees' and Retirees' Benefit Sustainability Commission Report	2/16/2011	Complete: The SEC voted not to take further action	2/16/2012
10-11-46	Facilities Master Plan Review	9/21/2011	Presidential Approval	9/26/2011
10-11-49	Revisions to the School of Public Health Plan of Organization	12/8/2011	Presidential Approval	1/17/2012
10-11-57	Request for Non-Exempt Staff Issues and Development Review	12/8/2011	Presidential Approval	1/13/2012
10-11-59	Faculty Satisfaction with Student Academic Dishonesty Honor Review Procedures	3/8/2012	Complete	3/8/2012
11-12-01	2010-2011 Legislation Log	9/21/2011	Complete: The Senate reviewed the legislation log	9/21/2011
11-12-02	Approval of the 2011-2012 Committee & Council Slates	9/21/2011	Presidential Approval	9/26/2011
11-12-04	Proposal to Restrict Smoking on Campus	9/7/2011	Complete: The SEC voted not to charge a Senate Committee with reviewing the proposal	9/7/2011
11-12-05	Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints	4/19/2012	Complete	4/19/2012

11-12-06	Policies on the Employment of Adjunct Faculty	3/8/2012	Presidential Approval	3/13/2012
11-12-07	Amendment to the UMCP Policy for a Student's Medically Necessitated Absence From Class	9/21/2011	Presidential Approval	9/26/2011
11-12-08	Title Updates in the Senate Bylaws	3/8/2012	Presidential Approval	3/13/2012
11-12-09	Proposal to Retain "Clear and Convincing Evidence" as the Evidentiary Standard in Sexual Harassment Cases	3/8/2012	Complete: The Senate reviewed the report	3/8/2012
11-12-10	Updates to Procedural Requirements Pertaining to Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence	12/8/2011	Presidential Approval	1/17/2012
11-12-13	PCC Proposal to Rename the Department of Geography to Geographical Sciences	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	11/21/2011 1/30/2012 4/24/2012
11-12-14	PCC Proposal to Rename the B.S. in Geography to Geographical Sciences	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	11/21/2011 1/30/2012 4/24/2012
11-12-15	PCC Proposal to Rename the M.A. and Ph. D. in Geography to Geographical Sciences	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	11/21/2011 1/30/2012 4/24/2012
11-12-16	PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Arts Program in Second Language Acquisition	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval Board of Regents Approval MHEC Approval	11/21/2011 4/19/2012 6/14/2012
11-12-17	PCC Proposal to Establish a Graduate Certificate in Second Language Acquisition	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval Board of Regents Approval MHEC Approval	11/21/2011 4/19/2012 6/14/2012
11-12-18	PCC Proposal to Establish a New Master and Doctoral Program in Higher Education, Student Affairs, and International Education Policy	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval Board of Regents Approval MHEC Approval	11/21/2011 4/19/2012 5/18/2012
11-12-19	PCC Proposal to Change the Name of the Master and Doctoral Programs in Counseling and Personnel Services to Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, and Counselor Education	11/9/2011	Presidential Approval MHEC Approval Chancellor's Approval	11/21/2011 5/18/2012 7/20/2012
11-12-20	Activation of the USM Clinical Faculty Titles	5/3/2011	Presidential Approval Presidential Approval	3/13/2012 5/9/2012
11-12-21	Nominations Committee Slate 2011-2012	12/8/2011	Presidential Approval	1/17/2012
11-12-23	Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the University Senate	4/19/2012	Presidential Approval	5/1/2012
11-12-24	BOR Staff Awards 2011-2012	6/22/2012	Complete: The Board of Regents selected the recipients of the 2012 Staff Awards	6/22/2012

11-12-25	PCC Proposal to Change the Name of the PhD in Public and Community Health to Behavioral and Community Health	3/8/2012	Presidential Approval MHEC Approval Chancellor's Approval	3/13/2012 6/7/2012 7/20/2012
11-12-26	PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Principles of Public Health	4/4/2012	Presidential Approval MHEC Approval	4/10/2012 6/7/2012
11-12-27	Proposal to Implement SARPP Presentation at New Faculty/Staff Orientation	1/26/2012	Complete: The SEC voted to forward the proposal to the Vice President for Administrative Affairs and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for action	1/26/2012
11-12-28	Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty and Staff	2/22/2012	Complete: The SEC voted to charge the Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees to review the proposal separately	2/22/2012
11-12-29	PCC Proposal to Establish an Executive Master of Public Health in Public Health Practice and Policy	4/4/2012	Presidential Approval Chancellor's Approval MHEC Approval	4/10/2012 4/18/2012 7/3/2012
11-12-31	Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements	4/19/2012	Presidential Approval	5/1/2012
11-12-32	Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty	2/16/2012	Presidential Approval	5/1/2012
11-12-33	PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies	4/4/2012	Presidential Approval BOR Approval MHEC Approval	4/10/2012 6/28/2012 7/17/2012
11-12-34	Proposal to Establish an Area of Concentration in Conducting for the Doctor of Musical Arts Degree Program	4/4/2012	Presidential Approval	4/10/2012
11-12-36	2012 Review of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service	4/19/2012	Presidential Approval	5/14/2012
11-12-37	Transition Meeting Slate 2012	5/3/2012	Complete	5/3/2012
11-12-38	Campus Safety Report 2012	5/3/2012	Complete: The Senate reviewed the report	5/3/2012
11-12-40	Proposal to Reintroduce Early Morning Shuttle Service for Facility and Residential Management Workers	4/17/2012	Complete	4/18/2012

Pending University Senate Legislation 2011-2012

Senate Doc #	Name	Requester	Reviewing Committee	Date Received	Senate Status
<i>Legislation Reviewed from Prior Years</i>					
08-09-20	Academic Integrity	David Freund, Chair of the Student Conduct Committee (SCC)	Student Conduct Committee	12/15/2008	Under Review.
10-11-24	Proposal to Review the Practice of Scanning License Plates	Mark Leone	David Allen, Director of Transportation Services & David Mitchell, Director of Public Safety	4/15/2011	Under Review.

10-11-36	Review of the Policy on Intellectual Property	Elisabeth Smela	Research Council	12/9/2010	Under Review.
10-11-56	Review of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute (MFRI) Plan of Organization	Wayne Colburn, MFRI	ERG	4/12/2011	Under Review.
<i>Legislation Reviewed from 2011-2012</i>					
11-12-03	Reform of the University APT Committee Procedures	Arthur M. Eckstein	Faculty Affairs Committee	6/2/2011	Under Review.
11-12-11	Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection	Kaiyi Xie, SGA President	Senate	9/16/2011	Under Review.
11-12-12	Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure	Anna Bedford, GSG President & Kaiyi Xie, SGA President	Student Affairs Committee	10/5/2011	Under Review.
11-12-22	Expansion of Promoting Responsible Action in Medical Emergencies	Brandon Levey, Undergraduate Senator	Student Conduct Committee (SCC)	11/18/2011	Under Review.
11-12-30	Proposal to Implement a Retroactive Withdrawal Policy at the University of Maryland	Samantha Roman, Undergraduate Student	Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee	2/4/2012	Under Review.
11-12-35	Proposed Policy for Parental Leave for Staff	ADVANCE Program	Staff Affairs Committee	3/9/2012	Under Review.
11-12-39	PCC Proposal to Rename the "Community Health Education" Master of Public Health Area of Concentration to "Behavioral and Community Health"	PCC Committee	PCC Committee	4/17/2012	Pending Approval. Waiting on MHEC Notification
11-12-41	Revisions to the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation (ARCH) Plan of Organization	School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation	Faculty Affairs Committee	3/26/2012	Under Review.
11-12-42	Improving Accountability and Transparency of the University Senate	Student Government Association Executive Board	Student Government Association Executive Board	4/25/2012	Under Review.
11-12-43	Review of the University of Maryland Policies and Procedures on Sexual Harassment	President Loh & Senate Executive Committee	Joint President/Senate Sexual Harassment Policies & Procedures Task Force	5/3/2012	Under Review.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-02
PCC ID #:	n/a
Title:	2012-2013 Senate Standing Committee and University Council Slates
Presenter:	Vincent Novara, Chair of the 2012-2013 Committee on Committees
Date of SEC Review:	August 29, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	September 20, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	Presentation of the Senate Standing Committee and University Council Slates, as generated by the Senate Committee on Committees, to be approved by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the University Senate.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	n/a
Recommendation:	To approve the slates as presented.
Committee Work:	The Committee on Committees met on May 21 and May 29, 2012 to review all of the committee volunteers and their statements. The Committee on Committees had 102 membership openings to fill on the regular standing committees of the Senate, and 275 volunteers from the various constituencies on campus. The committee endeavored to create balanced standing committee memberships, representing a variety of colleges, disciplines, constituencies, and gender. The committee selected faculty, staff, and students volunteers to fill the open positions. The committee members used

	<p>the volunteers’ top three choices from their preference form to place them onto respective committees. The Committee on Committees members were assigned responsibilities for further recruitment as needed.</p> <p>The 2012-2013 Committee on Committees approved the final slate on July 17, 2012. Following the final placements, the Senate Office alerted all of the volunteers as to whether they had been placed on a committee for the 2012-2013 academic year.</p> <p>The Senate Office and the Chair of the Committee on Committees worked together to fill committee vacancies that arose following the meetings throughout the summer.</p> <p>Additionally, the Senate Chair-Elect worked with the Provost’s Office to create a slate of candidates for the University Library Council. In accordance with the Library Council Bylaws, the slate of Library Council appointees was approved by both the Senate Committee on Committees and the Senior Vice President and Provost.</p> <p>Lastly, the Senate Chair worked with the Vice President for Research and Chief Research Officer and the Vice President of Information Technology and Chief Information Officer to create the slate of appointees for the University Research Council and the University IT Council, as well.</p>
Alternatives:	To not approve the slates.
Risks:	There are no related risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	Presidential approval.

Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS)

Nominated

Agisilaos Iliadis	Faculty	ENGR	2014
Richard Klank	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Nadine Sahyoun	Faculty	AGNR	2014
Piotr Swistak	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Ling Tang	Faculty	CMNS	2014
Neha Goyal	Graduate Student	ENGR	2013
Sean Luechtefeld	Graduate Student	ARHU	2013
Justin Dent	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
David Lieb	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2013
Sarah Yang	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2013

Ex-Officio

Donna Hamilton	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	UGST	2013
Britt Reynolds	Ex-Officio-Director of Undergraduate Admissions	SVPAAP	2013
Douglas Roberts	Ex-Officio-Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2013
Mark Shayman	Ex-Officio-Graduate School Rep	ENGR	2013

Continuing Members

Joanne Archer	Faculty	LIBR	2013
Linda Coleman	Faculty	ARHU	2013
Reid Compton	Faculty	CMNS	2013
David Glenn	Faculty	LIBR	2013
Michael Montague-Smith	Faculty	CMNS	2013

Chair

Christopher Davis	Chair	ENGR	2013
-------------------	-------	------	------

Campus Affairs

Nominated

Mark Stewart	Exempt Staff	VPAA	2014
Janie Dubois	Faculty	AGNR	2014
Carla Montori	Faculty	LIBR	2014
Joseph Richardson	Faculty	BSOS	2013
Stanley Young	Faculty	ENGR	2014
William Chodkowski	Graduate Student	PUAF	2013
Zhujun Qing	Graduate Student	BMGT	2013
Renee Sicchitano	Non-Exempt Staff	ARHU	2014
Andrew Do	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2013
Pauline Portillo	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013

Ex-Officio

Megan Bailey	Ex-Officio-GSG Rep	BSOS	2013
Barbara Gill	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013
Kerry McCoy	Ex-Officio-Chair of Coaches Council	PRES	2013
Elizabeth Pandya	Ex-Officio-SGA Rep	BSOS	2013
Kumea Shorter-Gooden	Ex-Officio-Chief Diversity Officer	SVPAAP	2013
Neil Tickner	Ex-Officio-VP University Relations Rep	VPUR	2013
Carolyn Trimble	Ex-Officio-VP Admin. Affairs Rep	VPAA	2013
John Zacker	Ex-Officio-VP Student Affairs	VPSA	2013

Continuing Members

Missy Meharg	Faculty	PRES	2013
William Walters	Faculty	CMNS	2013

Chair

Marcia Marinelli	Chair	VPSA	2013
------------------	-------	------	------

Educational Affairs

Nominated

Lisa Barnard	Exempt Staff	BMGT	2014
Kimberly Bethea	Exempt Staff	VPSA	2014
Patricia Campbell	Faculty	EDUC	2014
Aristos Christou	Faculty	ENGR	2013
Kristen Corrigan	Faculty	GRAD	2013
Judith Hallett	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Thelma Harley	Faculty	AGNR	2014
Brian Nelson	Faculty	BMGT	2014
Lelyn Saner	Faculty	VPR	2014
Nedelina Tchangalova	Faculty	LIBR	2014
Matthew Hart	Graduate Student	EDUC	2013
Tatios Kebrab	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013
Jamil Scott	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013

Ex-Officio

Elizabeth Beise	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013
Elizabeth Beise	Ex-Officio-Chair of PCC	SVPAAP	2013
Cynthia Hale	Ex-Officio-Graduate School Rep	GRAD	2013
Ryan Heisinger	Ex-Officio-SGA Rep	ARHU	2013
Ismail Inlek	Ex-Officio-GSG Rep	CMNS	2013
Carol Rogers	Ex-Officio-Chair Gen Ed.	JOUR	2013
Katherine Russell	Ex-Officio-Director of Honors Rep	UGST	2013
Ann Smith	Ex-Officio-Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2013

Continuing Members

Bonnie Dixon	Faculty	CMNS	2013
William Lamp	Faculty	CMNS	2013
Ronald Luna	Faculty	BSOS	2013
Jandelyn Plane	Faculty	CMNS	2013

Chair

Wolfgang Losert	Chair	CMNS	2013
-----------------	-------	------	------

Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG)

Nominated

Kenneth Ingram	Faculty	AGNR	2014
Terrence McCall	Faculty	UGST	2014
Gregory Miller	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Tammatha O'Brien	Faculty	CMNS	2014
Amanda Field	Graduate Student	CMNS	2013
Jayna Resman	Graduate Student	CMNS	2013
Catherine Fisanich	Non-Exempt Staff	CMNS	2014
Michael Shallcross	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2013
Ashmi Sheth	Undergraduate Student	BMGT	2013

Ex-Officio

Pamela Phillips	Ex-Officio-Associate VP IRPA	SVPAAP	2013
David Rieger	Ex-Officio-Director of Human Resources Rep	VPAA	2013

Continuing Members

Jess Jacobson	Exempt Staff	PRES	2013
Terry Owen	Faculty	LIBR	2013
Alina Twist	Faculty	VPR	2013
Jianhua Zhu	Faculty	AGNR	2013

Chair

Devin Ellis	Chair	BSOS	2013
-------------	-------	------	------

Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI)

Nominated

James Bond	Exempt Staff	VPSA	2014
Sharon Epps	Faculty	LIBR	2014
Naeemah Raqib	Faculty	AGNR	2014
Janet Tunney	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Carol Ido	Graduate Student	INFO	2013
Steve Mobley	Graduate Student	EDUC	2013
Lauren Grant	Non-Exempt Staff	ARCH	2014
Lindsey Johnson	Non-Exempt Staff	CMNS	2014
Lisa Brice-Aguirre	Undergraduate Student	LTSC	2013
Tiana Fernandez	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013
Patricia Tuon	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Alexander Ullman	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013

Ex-Officio

Gloria Bouis	Ex-Officio-Director of Office of Diversity, Education, & Compliance	SVPAAP	2013
Warren Kelley	Ex-Officio-Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2013
Ari Schnitzer	Ex-Officio-Administrative Affairs Rep	VPAA	2013
Kumea Shorter-Gooden	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013

Continuing Members

Susan Elliott	Exempt Staff	VPAA	2013
Elizabeth Wineke	Exempt Staff	SVPAAP	2013
Diego Hernandez	Faculty	EDUC	2013
Laura Logie	Faculty	ARHU	2013
Charles Schuster	Faculty	AGNR	2013
Cynthia Shaw	Non-Exempt Staff	UGST	2013

Chair

Leslie Felbain	Chair	ARHU	2013
----------------	-------	------	------

Faculty Affairs

Nominated

Jill Fosse	Exempt Staff	LIBR	2014
Radu Balan	Faculty	CMNS	2013
Claudia Brugman	Faculty	VPR	2014
Charles Fenster	Faculty	CMNS	2014
Katie King	Faculty	ARHU	2013
Patrick McCluskey	Faculty	ENGR	2014
Jose Naharro-Calderon	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Marc Pound	Faculty	CMNS	2014
Mona Asudegi	Graduate Student	ENGR	2013
Crystal Romeo	Graduate Student	CMNS	2013
Alexander Ferstenberg	Undergraduate Student	LTSC	2013

Ex-Officio

Dale Anderson	Ex-Officio-Director of Human Resources Rep	VPAA	2013
Michele Eastman	Ex-Officio-President's Rep	PRES	2013
Juan Uriagereka	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013

Continuing Members

Patricia Cossard	Faculty	LIBR	2013
Klaus Hubacek	Faculty	BSOS	2013
Sally Koblinsky	Faculty	SPHL	2013

Chair

Ellin Scholnick	Chair	PRES	2013
-----------------	-------	------	------

General Education

Nominated

Nina Harris	Exempt Staff	PUAF	2014
Philip Burke	Faculty	EDUC	2014
Mary Choquette	Faculty	UGST	2014
Jessica Enoch	Faculty	ARHU	2013
Xin He	Faculty	SPHL	2014
Elise Miller-Hooks	Faculty	ENGR	2014
Carol Rogers	Faculty	JOUR	2014
Carl Morrow	Graduate Student	EDUC	2013
Joseph Kucevich	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Brian Moserowitz	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2013
Patricia Mullaney-Loss	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013

Ex-Officio

Cathy Barks	Ex-Officio-University Honors Rep	UGST	2013
Douglas Roberts	Ex-Officio-Associate Dean of General Education	UGST	2013
Laura Slavin	Ex-Officio-Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2013
Greig Stewart	Ex-Officio-Executive Director of College Park Scholars rep	UGST	2013

Continuing Members

Andrew Baldwin	Faculty	AGNR	2013
Denny Gulick	Faculty	CMNS	2013
David Kirsch	Faculty	BMGT	2013
Sangeetha Madhavan	Faculty	BSOS	2013
Madlen Simon	Faculty	ARCH	2013

Chair

Carol Rogers	Chair	JOUR	2013
--------------	-------	------	------

IT Council

Vacancies

Faculty Member (Appointment)

Nominated

Benjamin Bederson	Faculty	CMNS	2013
Jimmy Lin	Faculty	INFO	2013

Ex-Officio

Linda Clement	Ex-Officio-VP for Student Affairs	VPSA	2013
David Cronrath	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep-Dean	ARCH	2013
Lucy Dalglish	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep-Dean	AGNR	2013
Patrick O'Shea	Ex-Officio-VP for Research	VPR	2013
Jennifer Preece	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep-Dean	INFO	2013
Robert Specter	Ex-Officio-VP for Administrative Affairs	VPAA	2013
Patricia Steele	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep-Dean	LIBR	2013
Peter Weiler	Ex-Officio-VP for University Relations	VPUR	2013

Continuing Members

There are currently no continuing members in this group.

Chair

Ann Wylie	Chair	SVPAAP	2013
-----------	-------	--------	------

Library Council

Nominated

Richard King	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Marla McIntosh	Faculty	AGNR	2014
Terry Owen	Faculty	LIBR	2014
Mia Smith-Bynum	Faculty	SPHL	2014
Victor Yakovenko	Faculty	CMNS	2014
Amanda Hawk	Graduate Student	ARHU	2013
Sarah Balzer	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013

Ex-Officio

Elizabeth Beise	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013
Vincent Novara	Ex-Officio-Senate Chair-Elect	LIBR	2013
Gary White	Ex-Officio-Libraries	LIBR	2013

Continuing Members

Avis Cohen	Faculty	CMNS	2013
Michael Israel	Faculty	ARHU	2013
Michael Kurtz	Faculty	INFO	2013
Mark Leone	Faculty	BSOS	2013
Debra Shapiro	Faculty	BMGT	2013

Chair

Ira Chinoy	Chair	JOUR	2014
------------	-------	------	------

Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC)

Nominated

Albert Calogero	Faculty	JOUR	2014
Cindy Clement	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Yasmeen Shah	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Hugh Turner	Faculty	BMGT	2014
Patrick Warfield	Faculty	ARHU	2014
John Bender	Graduate Student	CMNS	2013
Brendan Berman	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2013
Lebona Hailu	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013

Ex-Officio

Elizabeth Beise	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013
Robert Gaines	Ex-Officio-Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2013
Mark Shayman	Ex-Officio-Graduate School Rep	ENGR	2013
Desider Viktor	Ex-Officio-Dean of Libraries Rep	LIBR	2013

Continuing Members

Isabel Lloyd	Faculty	ENGR	2013
Clare Lyons	Faculty	ARHU	2013
David Myers	Faculty	AGNR	2013
Patricia Shields	Faculty	CMNS	2013
William Stuart	Faculty	BSOS	2013

Chair

William Idsardi	Chair	ARHU	2013
-----------------	-------	------	------

Research Council

Nominated

Sandra Gordon-Salant	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Bradley Hatfield	Faculty	SPHL	2014
Douglas Oard	Faculty	INFO	2014
Jason Rudy	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Elisabeth Smela	Faculty	ENGR	2013
Aaron Dinin	Graduate Student	ARHU	2013
Mark Herrera	Graduate Student	CMNS	2013
Maia Werbos	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2013

Ex-Officio

Michele Eastman	Ex-Officio-President's Rep	PRES	2013
Ken Gertz	Ex-Officio-VP Research	VPR	2013
Donna Hamilton	Ex-Officio-Undergraduate Studies Rep	UGST	2013
Antoinette Lawson	Ex-Officio-Director of ORA Rep	VPR	2013
Arthur Popper	Ex-Officio-Graduate School Rep	CMNS	2013

Continuing Members

Dean Kitchen	Exempt Staff	CMNS	2013
Nathan Fox	Faculty	EDUC	2013
Iqbal Hamza	Faculty	AGNR	2013
Karen Lips	Faculty	CMNS	2013

Chair

Jordan Goodman	Chair	CMNS	2014
----------------	-------	------	------

Staff Affairs

Vacancies

Non-Exempt Service and Maintenance staff member (Non-Exempt Staff)

Nominated

Sandra Allen	Exempt Staff	CMNS	2014
Bobbi Donley	Exempt Staff	VPR	2014
Taryn Faulkner	Exempt Staff	GRAD	2013
Deborah Grover	Exempt Staff	ARHU	2014
Amit Vaish	Faculty	ENGR	2014
Regina King	Non-Exempt Staff	ENGR	2014
Mary Lepore	Non-Exempt Staff	VPAA	2013
Cliffonia Royals Howard	Non-Exempt Staff	ARHU	2014
Dara Stoney	Exempt Staff Contingent II	AGNR	2014
Rev Ward	Non-Exempt Staff Contingent II	VPSA	2013
Carolyn Atkins	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Afua Boateng	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2013

Ex-Officio

Denise Best	Ex-Officio-SEC Staff Rep	GRAD	2013
Gloria Blackwell	Ex-Officio-VP Administrative Affairs Rep	VPAA	2013
Willie Brown	Ex-Officio-CUSS Rep	OIT	2014
Dolores Jackson	Ex-Officio-CUSS Rep	CMNS	2014
Albert Lauer	Ex-Officio-CUSS Rep	CMNS	2013
Steve Petkas	Ex-Officio-SEC Staff Rep	VPSA	2013
Julie Potter	Ex-Officio-VP University Relations Rep	VPUR	2013
Maureen Schrimpe	Ex-Officio-CUSS Rep	VPSA	2014
Brooke Supple	Ex-Officio-VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2013
Carolyn Trimble	Ex-Officio-Director of Human Resources Rep	VPAA	2013
Chuck Wilson	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	SVPAAP	2013
Dana Wimbish	Ex-Officio-CUSS Rep	VPAA	2013

Continuing Members

Pia Valdivia	Exempt Staff	ARHU	2013
Govardhan Reddy	Faculty	CMNS	2013
Margaret Saponaro	Faculty	LIBR	2013
Darren Simpson	Non-Exempt Staff	VPAA	2013

Chair

Carolyn Trimble	Chair	VPAA	2013
-----------------	-------	------	------

Student Affairs

Nominated

Kevin Anderson	Exempt Staff	PRES	2014
Linda Moghadam	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Austin Gardner	Graduate Student	ENGR	2013
Valerie Lubrano	Graduate Student	BMGT	2013
Gilbert Nunez	Graduate Student	BSOS	2013
Karam Rajab	Graduate Student	ENGR	2013
Linda Billotti	Undergraduate Student	SPHL	2013
Alyssa Carlson	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013
Sarah Hogue	Undergraduate Student	JOUR	2013
Kevin Lacherra	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Katlin Meissinger	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013
Marcella Morris	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Matthew Popkin	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Noah Robinson	Undergraduate Student	BSOS	2013
Neel Sanghvi	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2013
Amy Schofield	Undergraduate Student	SPHL	2013

Ex-Officio

Sarah Bauder	Ex-Officio-Provost's Rep	GRAD	2013
Alyson Goff	Ex-Officio-University Relations Rep	VPUR	2013
Marsha Guenzler-Stevens	Ex-Officio-VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2013
Mary Hummel	Ex-Officio-VP Student Affairs Rep	VPSA	2013
Gagandeep Kohli	Ex-Officio-GSG Rep	INFO	2013
Marc Limansky	Ex-Officio-Administrative Affairs Rep	VPAA	2013
Shaundra Myers	Ex-Officio-Graduate School Rep	GRAD	2013
Dennis Passarella-George	Ex-Officio-Resident Life Rep	VPSA	2013
Samantha Zwerling	Ex-Officio-SGA Rep	AGNR	2013

Continuing Members

Brandon Dula	Exempt Staff	VPSA	2013
Christina Harb	Faculty	ARHU	2013
Maryann Jones	Faculty	CMNS	2013

Chair

Joshua Hiscock	Chair	EDUC	2013
----------------	-------	------	------

Student Conduct

Nominated

David Freund	Faculty	ARHU	2014
Katherine Izsak	Faculty	BSOS	2013
Gideon Mark	Faculty	BMGT	2013
Nan Ratner	Faculty	BSOS	2014
Patricia Joseph	Graduate Student	BSOS	2013
Jacob Piekarz	Undergraduate Student	ENGR	2013
Zachary Schmid	Undergraduate Student	ARHU	2013
Hava Schwab	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2013
Seda Tolu	Undergraduate Student	CMNS	2013

Ex-Officio

Andrea Goodwin	Ex-Officio-Judiciary Office Rep	VPSA	2013
----------------	---------------------------------	------	------

Continuing Members

There are currently no continuing members in this group.

Chair

Jason Speck	Chair	LIBR	2013
-------------	-------	------	------



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-03
Title:	Reform of the University APT Procedures
Presenter:	Charles Fenster, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	Fall 2012
Date of Senate Review:	September 20, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report 4. For information only
Statement of Issue:	<p>The University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) of Faculty (II-1.00(A)) sets the standards for appointment and promotion to the various faculty ranks at the University. The APT Policy is implemented through the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure explains the structure of the APT process, provides general instructions for conducting reviews, deals with specific types of appointments, addresses final decisions, concerns, and appeals, and provides forms and samples used in the process. The procedures specify three levels of review: the first-level (unit/departmental) review, the college-level review, and the university-level review. An APT Committee, governed by these guidelines, exists at each level to review all cases and ensure the quality of our faculty.</p> <p>In June 2011, Arthur Eckstein, Professor of History, submitted a proposal to the University Senate regarding the guidelines and practices of the University APT Committee. Specifically, the proposal calls for a review of whether the committee's current practices are fair and equitable.</p> <p>The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was charged by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with reviewing the proposal on September 12, 2011. The SEC asked that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the proposal and advise on whether the current procedures are appropriate.</p>

Relevant Policy # & URL:	http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/1112APT.pdf
Recommendation:	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that a joint task force be formed between the Office of the Provost and the University Senate to conduct a broad review of the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure. This task force should be composed of tenured/tenure-track faculty who reflect the variety of levels, disciplines, and roles on our campus. It should be charged with reviewing the University's existing procedures, as well as those of our peers, and advising on whether changes should be made. Areas that the task force could consider include: the current process for requesting letters and evaluating non-responses from external evaluators, the evaluation of teaching and whether a teaching dossier is appropriate, and a review of the candidate notification process. In addition, the taskforce should develop a regular review cycle and a process for subsequent reviews of the APT procedures.</p>
Committee Work:	<p>The FAC initially reviewed the proposal and decided to form a subcommittee to examine the issue and report back to the Committee. The subcommittee reviewed the proposal and peer comparison data and consulted with representatives from the Office of Faculty Affairs. They determined that the procedural issues raised in the proposal itself were based on specific cases and were not indicative of a systematic issue. However, the subcommittee focused on three broad areas of the APT review that may benefit from further analysis: the interpretation of unsent letters from external evaluators, the role of student and peer evaluations, and the candidate notification process.</p> <p>The subcommittee discussed its recommendations with the FAC and noted that the APT Policy explicitly requires that "the procedures developed shall be subject to review and approval by the University Senate". Ultimately, the FAC agreed that there should be a standardized review cycle for both the APT policy and the procedures that implement it.</p> <p>The FAC met on April 12, 2012, to consider the information collected over the course of its review and make potential recommendations. The committee agreed that a broader review of the APT Procedures should be conducted and that a formal review cycle be established to oversee the yearly updates sanctioned by the Council of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs (CADFA).</p>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed recommendation and the

	current ad hoc review process for the APT Procedures would remain.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed changes, it could miss an opportunity to ensure that the APT Policy implemented appropriately.
Financial Implications:	There are no significant financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Senate Document 11-12-03

Reform of the University APT Procedures

May 2012

BACKGROUND:

The University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) of Faculty (II-1.00(A)) sets the standards for appointment and promotion to the various faculty ranks at the University. This policy recognizes and encourages the achievement and excellence of our faculty members by awarding tenure and promotion.

The APT Policy is implemented through the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/>) (Appendix 3), which is maintained by the Office of Faculty Affairs. This procedural document explains the structure of the APT process, provides general instructions for conducting reviews, deals with specific types of appointments, addresses final decisions, concerns, and appeals, and provides forms and samples used in the process. Both the policy and procedures specify three levels of review: the first-level (unit/departmental) review, the college-level review, and the university-level review. An APT Committee, governed by these guidelines, exists at each level to review all cases and ensure the quality of our faculty.

In June 2011, Arthur Eckstein, Professor of History, submitted a proposal to the University Senate regarding the guidelines and practices of the University APT Committee. Specifically, the proposal calls for a review of whether the committee's current practices are fair and equitable. Thus, it focuses on the implementation procedures.

CURRENT PRACTICE:

The APT Guidelines Manual outlines the necessary elements to be included in each candidate's dossier. Information regarding the candidate's research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/advising/mentoring, and service are included. This document is initially prepared by the candidate and relevant unit and includes a curriculum vita (CV), a summary of professional achievements, a summary of the reputation of publication outlets, the candidate's personal statement, external evaluations, student and peer teaching evaluations, and an overview of mentorship activities. The unit-level APT committee and administrative unit head initially review the dossier. The review process continues hierarchically through the college-level and university-level committees and their respective administrators. The review from each

level is appended to the dossier as it goes through the process. The President makes the final decision on all cases.

Each dossier normally includes letters of evaluation from at least six widely recognized authorities in the field, half of which must be from persons nominated by the candidate. A log of evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write is included in the dossier. Credentials of all external evaluators and a sample letter used to solicit the evaluation are also included. Currently, according to the procedural manual, committees are only allowed to interpret non-responses that have substantive comment (e.g. emails from candidates), but not absence of answers from external referees.

Dossiers also include teaching information on each candidate including student evaluations, peer evaluations, and mentorship, advising, and research supervision. The student evaluations should include an explanation of the rating system and a comparison with departmental/college norms. An explanation of the level and student composition of courses is also provided. Peer evaluations include classroom visitations, an evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, and teaching innovations. Mentorship and advising are outlined through a list of the candidate's past and current undergraduate and graduate students. A teaching portfolio and other types of information can also be submitted for review as materials supplemental to the dossier itself. APT committees are expected to consult supplemental materials whenever questions arise about the candidate's performance in any relevant area.

The unit-level review process for promotions, both at the assistant to associate level and associate to full level, are considered in the fall semester on staggered timelines. Candidates are informed of final decisions towards the end of the spring semester. Department heads are required to send a notification letter to promotion candidates within two weeks of submission of the dossier to the next level. However, current policy does not require notification from the college-level review through the final decision, although this is a common practice in some colleges.

COMMITTEE WORK:

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was charged (Appendix 1) by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with reviewing the proposal entitled "Reform of the University APT Committee Procedures" (Appendix 2) on September 12, 2011. The SEC asked that the FAC review the proposal and advise on whether the current procedures are appropriate.

The FAC initially reviewed the proposal and decided to form a subcommittee to examine the issue and report back to the Committee. The subcommittee reviewed the proposal and peer comparison data and consulted with representatives from the Office of Faculty

Affairs. They determined that the procedural issues raised in the proposal itself were based on specific cases and were not indicative of a systemic issue. Overall, the process appears to be reasonable. However, the subcommittee focused on three broad areas of the APT review that may benefit from further analysis: the interpretation of unsent letters from external evaluators, the role of student and peer teaching evaluations, and the candidate notification process.

The subcommittee discussed its review with the FAC. Committee members noted that the procedures for evaluating varying degrees of “nonresponses” from evaluators, from no correspondence to a detailed response on why an evaluator could not respond, should be considered further. Specifically, concerns should be raised if the number of non-responses is comparable to the number of actual letters. The committee also discussed the usefulness of teaching dossiers, and whether candidates should be encouraged to systematically produce and update such valuable repositories of information about their teaching practices. In addition, the committee added a new concern regarding whether a notification letter should be sent to candidates following the college-level review.

When the subcommittee presented its report to the FAC, it also discussed the APT Guidelines, which are currently updated by the Office of Faculty Affairs as information becomes relevant after every APT season (e.g. through Appeals rulings), in consultation with the Council of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs (CADFA). The subcommittee noted that the APT Policy explicitly requires that “the procedures developed shall be subject to review and approval by the University Senate”. The FAC agreed that there should be a standardized review cycle for both the APT policy and the procedures that implement it, and that while the policy itself may normally rest unchanged for long periods of time, it is healthy to establish a reasonable period of oversight for the procedures as they are updated through the mechanism of the CADFA.

The FAC met on April 12, 2012, to consider the information collected over the course of its review and make potential recommendations. The committee agreed that a broader review of the APT Procedures should be conducted and that a formal review cycle be established to oversee the yearly updates sanctioned by the CADFA.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that a joint taskforce between the Office of the Senior Vice President & Provost and the University Senate be formed to conduct a broad review of the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure. This task force should be composed of tenured/tenure-track faculty who reflect the variety of levels, disciplines, and roles on our campus. It should be charged with reviewing the University’s existing procedures, as well as those of our peers, and

advising on whether changes should be made. Areas that the task force could consider include: the current process for requesting letters and evaluating “non-responses” from external evaluators, the evaluation of teaching and whether a teaching dossier is appropriate, and a review of the candidate notification process. In addition, the task force should develop a regular review cycle and a process for subsequent review of the APT procedures.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, September 12, 2011

Appendix 2: Proposal - Reform of the University APT Procedures

Appendix 3: University of Maryland’s Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

APPENDIX 1



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	September 12, 2011
To:	Charles Fenster Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Reform of the University APT Committee Procedures
Senate Document #:	11-12-03
Deadline:	April 2, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the attached proposal entitled, “Reform of University APT Committee Procedures” and make recommendations on whether the current procedures are appropriate.

The University Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee services a vital role in ensuring the quality of the faculty at our University. It is important that their procedures for review have clearly defined guidelines so that the process can be fair and equitable to our faculty. The SEC requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the committee’s current procedures and advise on whether they should be revised.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review APT Committee procedures at our peer institutions.
2. Consult with the University’s Office of Faculty Affairs regarding the current procedures and their advantages and disadvantages.
3. Review whether the current APT Committee procedures are fair and equitable.
4. Review whether the current metrics for reviewing APT candidates are appropriate.
5. If appropriate, recommend whether specific changes should be made to the current APT Committee procedures.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than April 2, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

Name:	Professor Arthur M. Eckstein
Date:	May 25, 2011
Title of Proposal:	Reform of University APT Committee Procedures
Phone Number:	301-405-4301
Email Address:	ameckst1@umd.edu
Campus Address:	2134 TLF
Unit/Department/College:	Department of History
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Faculty
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>1. This year the University APT Committee employed the number of external reviewers who declined to write letters as a significant factor in rejecting candidates for promotion to full professor. This even occurred in a case where all of the actually received letters of recommendation were (a) strongly positive, (b) said the candidate would receive promotion to full professor at their institution (e.g., Johns Hopkins, UCLA, Stanford, Yale), and (c) came from prominent figures in the candidate's field. The Committee nevertheless viewed the number of "declines to write" as an issue--an indirect indication of a candidate's alleged low standing in the field.</p> <p>2. The University APT Committee has also recently employed raw student evaluations of popularity, coming out as "average", as a determinative factor in denying a candidate promotion to full professor despite that candidate's stellar record of scholarship and publication (two books, an edited book, numerous articles, editorship of a prominent journal.)</p> <p>3. The University APT Committee, further, has recently used an argument that someone had remained too long in rank as an associate professor before publishing a second book as a reason to deny promotion to full professor (this time despite a stellar teaching record). What is the justification of the University APT Committee for not rewarding those who improve themselves by writing a book after a long delay? If this becomes the rule, then there will be little incentive indeed for those who are long in</p>

	<p>rank to attempt to restart their scholarly production.</p> <p>What are the precedents for these three policies? When were these policies written down? Where were these policies written down? When and how were Departments, and candidates, officially notified that these were now significant or even determinative factors in promotion? Were these policies applied uniformly across all cases?</p>
<p>Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The incoming University APT Committee should be told by the Senate that they cannot use the number of declined invitations to review as a negative factor in determining promotion when the number of outside reviewers meets the number required (or more) by the promotion guidelines, and all letters received are positive. The number of declined invitations should not be a relevant, let alone an important factor, in decision to promote in such a situation. 2. The incoming University APT Committee should be told by the Senate that raw student evaluations entered by computer should not be used as the determinative metric in evaluating teaching ability. They constitute both inadequate data and highly skewed data. In many Departments the rate of return is both low (for instance, 43% in once case this year) and distorted (especially towards those who dislike a course). In addition, several studies have shown that there is a significant statistical correlation between high student evaluations and the easiness of the course. Numeric ratings given by computer in Week 13 of a tougher than average course cannot be the determining metric for showing if a professor is a good teacher. In my own Department the method of computerized student evaluations is viewed as so dangerous and inaccurate that the untenured are advised to stick to the old in-class paper evaluations, which give a much higher rate of return and a more accurate evaluation. The University APT should be told that the raw data of student evaluations is not a valid tool for evaluating the quality of teaching. The quality of dissertations directed or mentored, new courses developed, the quality of “A” papers in undergraduate courses—all of these would be better ways by which to judge the effectiveness of teaching. 3. In Arts and Humanities Departments, and often in the Social Sciences, the basis for promotion to full professor is usually the publication of a second book (the first book having brought

	<p>tenure and promotion to associate professor). The incoming University APT Committee should be told by the Senate that “hiatus” in publication of a second book should not be considered an insuperable obstacle to promotion to full professor as long as it is followed by significant publication.</p>
<p>Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:</p>	<p>The incoming University APT Committee should be given explicit instructions by the Senate on these three matters.</p> <p>The faculty hurt by the arbitrary application this year of these new and sudden “standards” must be made whole, and the damage to their careers undone.</p>
<p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>I enclose the official letter I received as Chair of a Departmental APT Promotion committee, with the first two of these issues stated in writing as the reasons for rejection of a candidate with a stellar record of publication.</p>

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to senate-admin@umd.edu or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!

A grayscale image of a human brain, viewed from the side, with a planet (likely Mars) in the background. The brain's surface is highly detailed, showing gyri and sulci. The planet is in the upper right corner, showing its characteristic polar ice caps. The background is dark with some faint stars or distant galaxies.

University of Maryland
2012-2013
Guidelines for Appointment
Promotions and Tenure

2012-2013 UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES MANUAL

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

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

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

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE APT PROCESS

This section includes instructions on:

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

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE APT PROCESS

A. Sources of Information

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

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

B. The Structure of Reviews

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

C. Useful Definitions

APT Review Committee

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

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

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

Joint Appointment

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

Quorum

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

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

Yes

No

Abstention (two types) – these actions count toward quorum

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

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

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

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

This section includes instructions on:

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

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

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. Soon after the candidate's arrival, the APT Policy calls for **the administrator of the academic unit that will become the faculty member's tenure home to (a) meet with the candidate and provide a written copy of the approved promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated (APT Policy 389-393; 671-676) and (b) appoint one or more senior faculty mentors. (APT Policy 801-813; see also the Senate Task Force Report available at www.faculty.umd.edu/mentoring)** The list of new tenure-track faculty and their mentors is due in the Office of the Associate Provost by February 1, 2013.

The review for tenure and promotion is the University's primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university. **Faculty members are expected to demonstrate accomplishment in three areas: (1) research, scholarship, and creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service. (APT Policy 406-437; 701-711)** Colleges and Departments must have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these areas. These criteria should be included in requests for external evaluations and in the dossier after the letter written by the Department Chair. Upper-level APT review committees and administrators rely on the criteria to assess fitness for appointment or promotion equitably. It is vital that reviewers at all levels keep these criteria in mind as they consider individual cases.

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

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

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

B. The Electronic Dossier

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

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

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

C. Elements in a Dossier

An overview: Every dossier will be submitted in electronic form. Optionally, representative pieces of scholarship may be submitted. Inclusion of a teaching dossier is

also optional. These additions may be specified in the form of a URL (preferred for very large documents) or they may be uploaded to the area on the APT website for supplemental materials. In unusual cases (e.g., for large, non-electronic pieces of scholarship) a hard copy may be forwarded as a supplement under separate cover. Colleges are responsible for returning all supplemental materials to candidates after the Campus APT Review Committee has finished its deliberations. Dossiers failing to conform to these guidelines will be returned to the College for corrective action before they are submitted for evaluation to the Campus APT Review Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

Mandatory abstentions often arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice, e.g., at the College and Department levels. In these cases, **the faculty member is permitted to vote only at the lower level. If a faculty member is eligible to vote within two Departments (because both the candidate and the voter have similar joint appointments), the voting faculty member may only vote in their tenure home and must abstain from voting in the second unit. (APT Policy 631-635; 911-914; 966-969)** A mandatory abstention may arise for other reasons, such as when a faculty member is the candidate's partner.

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

Only tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is to be promoted or appointed may vote on that candidate's case. (APT Policy 718-720)

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

- #2. a. **Dean's Letter: This letter should state the Dean's personal assessment of the reasons the candidate merits or does not merit promotion. (APT Policy 943-945)**

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

b. When either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean make a negative recommendation, the Dean should: **(1) write a brief letter to the candidate summarizing the nature of the considerations on which the negative decision was based, (2) allow the Chair of the College APT Review Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information in the summary letter, and (3) include this letter in the dossier directly following the Dean's letter. (APT Policy 1023-1038)** Members of the College APT Review Committee may see the Dean's letter. A summary is not necessary if both College-level recommendations are positive.

- #3. College APT Review Committee Report: This report must include the date of the meeting and the names of Committee members. **The report should include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation. (APT Policy 940-945)** It should address the same areas as the Department APT report described in #5. *When the vote is not unanimous, the report should try to explain the reasons for the negative votes or the abstentions. If the assessment differs from the department vote, an explanation should be provided. Minority reports are permissible but not required.*

- #4. a. Department Chair's Letter: **The letter should contain the Chair's independent evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service, and should make a clear recommendation supported by the reasons for it. (APT Policy 758-759)** *An explanation should be provided for negative votes and voluntary abstentions. For joint appointments, the head of the secondary unit should also provide a letter that is inserted in the same section as, and immediately following, the Department Chair's letter.*

The Chair's letter is most useful when it places the performance of the candidate in the context of the Department or discipline, and it comments on the APT Review Committee's report. It is particularly useful for informing the Committee about the criteria used to evaluate the candidate and the Chair's assessment of the candidate with respect to those criteria. These criteria should be appended to the Chair's letter. While the letter may

summarize the basic information about the case, APT Review Committees expect the Chair's interpretation of the information about the candidate: an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of a Department APT Review Committee, it is helpful to provide reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative faculty votes and abstentions when they are known.

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

c. The notification letter must be sent to promotion candidates within two weeks of the submission of the dossier to the next level. The Chair should: (a) write a brief letter summarizing the vote and the general nature of the considerations on which the department and chair's decision was based, (b) allow the Chair of the Department APT Review Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information before the letter is sent to the candidate, (c) send the summary assessment to the candidate, and (d) include the letter in the dossier which will be forwarded to the next level of review. (See Table 6, Appendix A) Voting members of the faculty may see the chair's letter. (APT Policy 1016-1038) The notification letter should never refer to the content of confidential assessments from external evaluators.

#5. Report of the Department APT Review Committee: (APT Policy 880-889) This report has two clearly separate parts (5a and 5b), neither of which is shown to the candidate. In addition, the Department APT Review Committee may include an optional Minority Report (5c) in cases of major disagreement. Both (or all three) reports above are incorporated into the dossier sent by the Chair to higher levels of review.

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

#5b. The Department Evaluative Report: The Department may form an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as an Initial Review Committee, or IRC), whose members should be identified, to complete this report. (APT Policy 746-750) The evaluative report evaluates the candidate's research or creativity, service, mentoring and teaching contributions in light of the standards of the Department and the discipline.

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

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

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

The following are suggestions for summarizing and evaluating faculty performance:

a. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

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

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

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

b. Teaching, Advising and Mentoring

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

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

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

c. Service

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

#5c. **Optional Minority APT Report: Members of the Department APT Review Committee who do not think that the APT Review Committee Report adequately represents their views may write a signed minority APT report that will become part of the dossier. (APT Policy 886-889)** A minority APT report is intended to be employed for major disagreements, not for presenting minor variations in wording.

#6. **Summary Statement of Professional Achievements:** This summary report is often written by an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as an Initial Review Committee, or IRC)—whose members should be identified—or its representative. The purpose of the summary is to ensure that committees have correct and complete information about the candidate on which to base their evaluation and explanations of the candidate’s credentials. It is a factual statement of the candidate’s accomplishments in the areas of: research, scholarship, or creative activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; and service. The summary statement is not to be mailed to external reviewers. It should place the candidate’s accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the broader discipline, and the candidate’s professional achievements in service and teaching in the context of the responsibilities of the Department, the College, the University and the greater community. It should be a neutral description; no evaluation of the candidate’s work should be included. The candidate must be shown the Summary Statement at least two weeks before the Department deliberates about the candidate’s case. Candidates must certify in writing that they have seen the document (which may be achieved by signing the document), and must be allowed to draft a rejoinder before it is used by the Department APT Review Committee as a basis for its discussion and vote. The date on this report (and any rebuttal by the candidate) should predate the meeting on which the case is decided. If there is a rejoinder, the summary must acknowledge receipt and consideration of the rejoinder. (APT Policy 860-879) *To facilitate production and “certification” of the report, Departments may wish to inform candidates in advance of deadlines for reviewing the Summary Statement and for return of the signed Statement with any rejoinder.*

#7. **Curriculum Vitae: The candidate’s *curriculum vitae* must be signed and dated by the candidate to certify that it is accurate and current. (APT Policy 682-684; 687-692)** The *CV* should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and should be included in each request for external evaluation. The *CV* that is sent to external evaluators is the official *CV* for the candidate. If there are subsequent changes in the candidate’s credentials (e.g., additional funding, new external recognition), the Chair should forward a memo containing these changes to higher levels of review and this document should be appended to the candidate’s *CV* in the electronic dossier. Memos may be added to the dossier up until the point when the dossier is signed by the President of the University. However, candidates should avoid multiple requests for such additions, especially for minor changes (e.g., reviewing activities, paid consulting).

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

#8. **Reputation of Publication Outlets:** The Department should provide an appraisal of the reputations of the journals, presses and other outlets (e.g., theaters, exhibits, etc.) for the candidate’s scholarship/creative activity. Indicate whether peer review is required for each

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

Reputation of Publication Sources

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

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

#9. Candidate's Personal Statement: This statement provides candidates with the opportunity to make a case for their promotion based on a demonstrated record of achievement. The statement ordinarily describes the questions addressed by the candidate and indicates their importance to the candidate's field, progress made in addressing these questions and directions of future creative work. (APT Policy 684-687) These statements should be relatively short, 3-4 pages, and directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate's field. The personal statement should be signed and dated. The statement should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and must be included in each request for external evaluation. **The document may not be changed after it is submitted to the APT Review Committee representative for letter writers to evaluate. (APT Policy 687-692)**

#10. Log of Evaluation Letters: The Review Committee shall solicit letters of evaluation from at least six widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that shall include individuals nominated by the candidate. Among the letters requested, at least three and at most one-half must be from persons nominated by the candidate. (APT Policy 796-800) *APT Review Committees at all levels question the credibility of letters from the candidate's mentors and collaborators, and heed closely the comments of evaluators from highly ranked institutions and, where appropriate, evaluators holding the rank of professor. The committee will also heed closely the comments of evaluators who are documented as among the outstanding leaders in the field. It is suggested that, at a minimum, six of the letters be selected from evaluators who are not the candidate's mentors and collaborators. Up to two additional letters (for a total of at least eight) may be from a mentor or collaborator as long as sufficient explanation is provided by the Chair of the APT Review Committee and/or Department Chair. An allowable exception is the case where an appropriately small number of the six letter writers have had a one-time or temporally distant collaboration.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following guidelines should be followed in presenting letters:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Candidate Is Responsible For:

- Providing the *Curriculum Vitae* in the approved format, signed and dated. This Document should be submitted before external letters are solicited.
- **Signing and dating the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements. (APT Policy 868-871)**
- **Providing a signed and dated Personal Statement. (APT Policy 684-687)** This document should be prepared before external letters are solicited.
- **Suggesting the names of qualified external evaluators. (APT Policy 798-800)**
- Providing documentation on teaching (e.g., syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, teaching evaluations in a teaching portfolio).
- Providing publications or other forms of scholarship to the Department Committee.
- Selecting samples of scholarship for reviews by higher-level review Committees and working with the APT Review Committee to select materials for external reviewers.
- Providing any other relevant information requested by the Department Review Committee (e.g., of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of awards).

The Department APT Review Committee Is Responsible For:

- Gathering information and documents listed in the preceding section from the candidate.
- **Drafting the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and presenting it to the candidate for approval two weeks prior to the time it will be distributed to the faculty and ensuring its prompt return. (APT Policy 860-871)**
- **Requesting at least six external evaluations (with at least three names selected from the candidate's list), using the candidate's input to select the sample of material for evaluators to evaluate, and providing a brief summary of the qualifications of the evaluators. (APT Policy 796-800)**
- Obtaining documentation on teaching and mentorship from students and colleagues.
- Obtaining available documentation on service.
- Evaluating journals and other outlets in which candidate's scholarship is disseminated.
- **Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service (APT Policy 697-708), based on the candidate's CV, personal statements, external letters, scholarly and teaching materials and internal reports.**
- **Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion. (APT Policy 716-727)**
- **Writing reports on: (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and a justification for it, and the date of the meeting; and (b) a separate evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions. (APT Policy 880-884) *This latter report is often prepared by an advisory committee and is usually available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.***
- **Reviewing the Chair's summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy. (APT Policy 1025-1031) *(Usually done by APT Chair)***
- **Representing the Department APT Review Committee's perspective to higher levels of review, if the need emerges. (APT Policy 930-939)**

The Department Chair is Responsible for:

- Ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted, and that the appropriate material is available to eligible voting faculty.
- **Writing a letter to the administrator at the next higher level making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case, and including the Department's promotion criteria. (APT Policy 890-893)**
- **Notifying candidates in writing, summarizing both the Chair's and Department APT Review Committee's decisions and reasoning within two weeks of the Committee's decision meeting (APT Policy 1016-1028; Appendix A, Table 6). A copy of this summary letter should be available for faculty who participated in the deliberations who wish to see it, and it should be included in the dossier. If both the Department APT Review Committee and Chair vote to deny tenure and/or promotion, the letter must be sent by certified mail. (APT Policy 1103-1104)**
- Inspecting dossiers for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- For new appointments, including the length of appointment year, start date, and projected salary in a separate memo (see Table 5, Appendix A) accompanying the appointment request. If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- **Sending the dossier to the next level of review, and if the candidate does not pass the initial review, providing sufficient information for the administrator at that**

- level (Dean or Provost) to determine that the review was conducted appropriately. (APT Policy 851-853)
- **Answering questions putatively posed by upper-level review committees. (APT Policy 930-939; 984-994)**
- **If candidates withdraw from the process, forwarding a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. (APT Policy 857-859)**
- Reviewing the Department's Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the conduct of reviews, and that the review conforms to the guidelines.
- Being aware of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and disseminating these changes to the faculty. The Office of Faculty Affairs web page should be consulted for updates: www.faculty.umd.edu/policies.
- **Meeting with new tenured and tenure-track faculty to provide APT information, such as Department and University policies, this Manual, and Department promotion criteria. Subsequently, administrators should notify faculty in writing of changes to the criteria. (APT Policy 389-393; 671-676)**

Upper-level APT Review Committees Are Responsible For:

- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.
- **Meeting with lower level APT representatives when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing should be provided in advance. (APT Policy 930-939; 984-994)**
- **Writing a report that includes an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and the justification for it, the membership of the Committee, and the date of the decision meeting. (APT Policy 940-943; 995-997)**
- For the College Review Committee, when either the Dean or the Committee makes a negative recommendation, ensuring that the Dean's summary letter notifying the candidate of the negative recommendation accurately reflects Committee deliberations.

The Dean of a College is Responsible for:

- Reviewing the College's Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the appointment of a College Review Committee and the role of the Dean with respect to the Committee.
- Ensuring that the review conforms to those guidelines.
- Reviewing and approving College and Department promotion criteria.
- **Recommending appointees to the Campus APT and Campus Appeals Committee. (APT Policy 962-964; 1188-1190)**
- Informing Chairs of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and discussing with Chairs their evaluation of the preceding year's APT process and outcomes.
- Preparing a schedule for submission of dossiers to the Departments in the College, and informing them of that schedule in a timely manner.
- **When candidates are denied tenure and/or promotion at a lower level of review, certifying the procedural appropriateness of the review, and writing a letter sent by certified mail to the candidate within two weeks of the decision that informs the candidate of the outcome, the procedural appropriateness of the review, and**

the consequences of this denial. (APT Policy 851-856) Copies should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained. (A summary letter is not necessary if at least one Department-level recommendation is positive.)

- **Appointing members of the College APT Review Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization. (APT Policy 905-907)**
- Providing staffing for the College APT Review Committee and ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted.
- **Reviewing recommendations of the prior level of review and the College APT Review Committee, and writing a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case. (APT Policy 926-929; 943-945)**
- **When either the Dean or the College APT Review Committee make(s) a negative APT decision, writing a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Review Committee summarizing the outcome of the College APT Review Committee's and Dean's deliberations, and the rationale behind it. (APT Policy 1023-1025; see Table 6, Appendix A) This summary letter should be available to members of the College APT Review Committee who can decide to amend it, and the letter should be included in the dossier. (APT Policy 1028-1038)**
- Inspecting the dossier for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Forwarding an electronic file and a hard copy of the original material plus another hard copy to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- **Meeting with the University APT Review Committee to address questions they may raise. (APT Policy 984-994)**
- For new appointments, including in a separate memo accompanying the dossiers, the terms of appointment, start date and projected salary in appointment requests. (See Table 5, Appendix A) If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.

III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

This section contains instructions on:

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

III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CASES

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

A. Promotion Review for Faculty with Appointments in One Unit

1. Nomination of Candidates:

Reviews are mandatory for:

- **All Assistant Professors and Agents in their sixth year of appointment at this rank; (APT Policy 497-498)**
- **All Associate Professors and Senior Agents appointed without tenure and currently in their third year of appointment; (APT Policy 517-521)**
- Candidates who were previously denied tenure or promotion, and whose cases were returned by the Appeals Committee to the level of review at which the error was found.

Non-mandatory reviews may be initiated for untenured faculty.

- By Department nomination.
- By self-nomination. **Faculty may request to be reviewed any year that is consistent with a Department's plan of organization (APT Policy 845-846) and may appeal to the Dean (or Provost, if a non-departmentalized college) in writing within 30 days if the candidate's request for a review is denied. If the request for review is denied at that level, within 30 days the candidate may appeal in writing to the Provost (or President, if a non-departmentalized college). (APT Policy 1349-1364)**

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

2. Withdrawal from consideration:

Candidates for promotion may voluntarily withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the President's decision by writing a letter to the Department Chair. (APT Policy 857-859) Copies of the letter of withdrawal should be forwarded to the Dean and Office of Faculty Affairs. When an untenured faculty member withdraws at the time of mandatory review, the faculty member is entitled to an additional one-year contract at the individual's current rank. (APT Policy 1092-1094)

3. Steps beyond the first level of review:

If either the Department APT Review Committee or the Chair supports the case, it goes forward (APT Policy 847-851).

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation by both Chair and Department APT Review Committee, the review will not proceed further and the candidate must be notified of the situation. The Chair must also inform the administrator at the next level (e.g., Dean) who must certify that the procedures to evaluate the candidate conformed to the regulations in the APT Policy (APT Policy 851-856). To “close out” the case, copies of the letter informing the candidate of the negative outcome of the review, the candidate’s dossier, and the Dean’s certification letter must be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

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

New faculty appointments to the ranks of Professor and Principal Agent carry tenure and must be reviewed under the University APT process. New faculty appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor and Senior Agent may be with or without tenure. New appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor and Senior Agent with tenure require review under the University APT process. New appointments to these ranks without tenure may proceed for review and approval by the President based on a recommendation from the Provost, unless questions arise, in which case the President may direct that the proposed appointment undergo an unofficial “tenurability” review by University APT committees prior to presidential consideration. No offer of appointment to the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent or Principal Agent (regardless of tenure status) is valid in the absence of presidential approval. New faculty appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor and Agent are not handled under the University APT process.

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

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

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

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

Ordinarily, the memo specifies:

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

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

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

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

- (a) **must hold a tenured appointment in the University,**
- (b) **must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion,**
- (c) **must hold a regular appointment in the unit (with a given percentage of time attached),**
- (d) **may only vote in a single unit providing the plan of organization permits it, and at only one level of review,**
- (e) **must vote at the Department level of review and in the tenure home, when there is the opportunity to vote more than once.¹ (APT Policy 716-742)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Road Map to the Joint Appointment/ Review Process

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

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

D. Professor of the Practice (**see APT Policy 322-335**)

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

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

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

E. Emerita/Emeritus Status (**APT Policy 301-309**)

Associate/Full Professors and Principal/Senior Agents who have been faculty members for at least ten years are eligible for nomination to Emerita/Emeritus status. Recommendations for Emerita/Emeritus status will only be considered after the faculty member has submitted a letter of resignation and retirement or an approved retirement agreement, as well as a copy of a memo from the Benefits Office confirming that the faculty member has met with them. (Refer to <http://faculty.umd.edu/Retirement/index.html> for more information.) **The review is ordinarily conducted during the candidate's last semester of employment. (APT Policy 1121-1124) Faculty at or above the candidate's pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/Emeritus status. (APT Policy 1130-1134) Candidates for Emerita/Emeritus status are not reviewed by faculty committees beyond the Department APT Review Committee. Reviews beyond the Department are conducted by the Dean, Provost, and President. (APT Policy 1155-1160)** Materials submitted for emeriti appointments should include a copy of the above referenced documents. (See Appendix A, Table 4)

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

F. College Park Professor (**APT Policy 336-346**)

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

IV. FINAL DECISIONS, CONCERNS THAT ARISE AND APPEALS

This section includes instructions on:

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

IV. FINAL DECISIONS, CONCERNS THAT ARISE AND APPEALS

A. Denial at the Department Review

If both the Department APT Review Committee's and the Chair's recommendation are negative, the Chair must inform the candidate by certified mail within two weeks of the date of the decision. The letter should state the faculty decision and the administrator's decision and summarize briefly in general terms the reason for the denial. This letter should include the APT vote. (APT Policy 1016-1023; see Appendix C for examples)

The Department forwards the case only to the Dean. The Dean will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If not, the Dean will remand the case to the Department to reconsider. If no error has occurred, the dean must write a letter (a) stating that the case has been reviewed to ascertain that there was no violation of substantive or procedural due process, and (b) where appropriate, specifying the date of termination of employment. (APT Policy 851-856) The letter should be sent by certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. The Office of Faculty Affairs is available for consultation or advice in matters pertaining to this process. For examples of possible wording for notification letters, see Appendix C.

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

B. Moving Through Higher Levels of Review

As long as there is one positive recommendation at the Department level (from either the APT Review Committee or the Chair) the case will proceed to all subsequent levels for review. (APT Policy 847-851) That is, the case will proceed through the College and University faculty committees and administrator reviews.

During higher levels of review, questions may arise regarding a recommendation from a lower level of review. In such cases, the College or University APT Review Committee shall meet with the APT Review Committee Chair(s) and Administrator(s) from the lower levels. A written list of questions will be provided to the lower level representatives in advance to serve as a basis for discussion. (APT Policy 930-939; 984-994)

Whenever either or both faculty and administrator recommendations are negative at higher levels of review, a letter must be sent to the candidate summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which those decisions were based. (APT Policy 1023-1025) The College-level notification letter should be included in the dossier file appended to the Dean's letter and should be sent by certified mail.

C. Awarding or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion

Final authority for any appointment that confers tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent, or Principal Agent resides solely with the President. (APT Policy 1040-1044) The President will inform the candidate of the final disposition of

the case. If the decision is negative, the President will inform the candidate by certified mail. (APT Policy 1103-1106)

D. When Issues Arise During the Review Process

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

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

E. Appeals Process for Denial of Promotion (APT Policy 1178-1347)

1. Grounds for Appeals (APT Policy 1222-1250)

The two bases for appeal are: violation of substantive due process or violation of procedural due process. Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected First Amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials. (APT Policy 1242-1250)

Violation of procedural due process arises when the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the APT review: (1) to take a procedural step or (2) to fulfill a procedural requirement established in APT Policy or review procedures of a department or college. Violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal. (APT Policy 1232-1241)

2. The Appeals Process (APT Policy 1200-1340)

A request for an appeal must be made in writing to the President within 60 calendar days of notification of the decision not to grant tenure, promotion, reappointment, or emeriti status. (APT Policy 1205-1209) The request must detail the basis for the appeal and evidence to support the claims. **The grounds for the appeal must be within the purview of those identified in the University APT Policy. (APT Policy 1222-1250)** Faculty members with questions regarding this process should contact the Office

of Faculty Affairs. The President will determine whether to grant the request for an appeal based on the criteria stated above.

If an appeal request is granted, **an Appeals Committee is formed. (APT Policy 1179-1196)** The appellant has an additional 60 days in which to submit materials related to the case to the Office of Faculty Affairs. **The appellant should be aware that these materials will be shared with the Appeals Committee, and with parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee. (APT Policy 1213-1221)**

The Committee will meet with the Appellant, and other parties, and investigate the case, as it deems appropriate. (APT Policy 1258-1271) The Committee may not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review.

The Committee makes a recommendation to the President who makes the final decision. (APT Policy 1272-1288) When the President supports the grounds for an appeal, the Provost has the responsibility for oversight of the implementation of the corrective action the president requires to be taken. **(APT Policy 1290-1293)**

V. APPENDICES

This section includes reference materials and examples for:

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

Appendix A: Tables and Forms

Table #1. Transmittal Form 2012-2013

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

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

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

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

ORDER OF ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ELECTRONIC DOSSIER

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

Table #2. Letter Log

Evaluator	Affiliation	Initial Contact	Date Materials Sent	Date Response Received
Candidate's Choice				
Jane Doe	Stanford	9-1-12		9-10-12/Declined
James Smith	Brown	9-1-12	9-10-12	9-15-12
Unit's Choice				
John Brown	Harvard	9-1-12	9-10-12	9-28-12

Table #3. Steps in the Review of Faculty

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table #5. New Faculty Appointment Information

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

Table #6. CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION OF APT DECISION

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

Appendix B: CV Format

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

1. Personal Information.

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

2. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities.

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

a. Books⁴

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

b. Articles in Referred Journals.

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

c. Monographs, Reports and Extension Publications.

d. Book Reviews, Other Articles, Notes.

e. Talks, Abstracts and Other Professional Papers Presented.

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

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

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

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

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

END OF *CV* FORMAT

Appendix C: Sample Letters

Sample Letter to External Evaluator

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

Sample Language for Letters in Cases of Denial of Promotion

The eligible voting members of the department met on October 25, 2012 to consider your case for promotion. The vote to endorse your promotion was X yes and Y no with Z mandatory abstentions. This vote, to deny your promotion, reflected concerns about your low scholarly productivity and failure to obtain external funding. Regrettably, I concur with the decision. I am forwarding your dossier to the Dean for review of the evaluative procedures.

Sample Language for Letters of Review for Adherence to Due Process

Dear.....:

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

For letters to Associate Professors:

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

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

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

Please accept my best wishes in your future endeavors.

*Sincerely,
Dean*

APPENDIX D: Sample Teaching Evaluation Chart

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

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

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

The standards the instructor set for students were...			
	Too Low	Appropriate	Too High
F 11	0%	89%	11%
S 12	5%	85%	10%
How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?			
	CORE Requirement	Major/Certificate/Minor/Program Requirement	Elective
F 11	32%	58%	11%
S 12	29%	61%	10%

APPENDIX E: University APT Policy

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

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

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

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

14 Terminological Note

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

21 usually replaced by “first-level unit.” First-level units thus comprise departments, non-
22 departmentalized schools, and non-departmentalized colleges. Higher levels of review are
23 referred to as “second-level” and “third-level.”

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

27 Purpose of this Policy

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

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

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

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

52 A. Faculty with Duties in Teaching and Research

53 1. Instructor¹

54 An appointee to the rank of Instructor ordinarily shall hold the highest
55 earned degree in his or her field of specialization. There shall be evidence

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

56 also of potential for excellence in teaching and for a successful academic
57 career. The rank does not carry tenure.

58 2. Assistant Professor

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

72 3. Associate Professor

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

83 4. Professor

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

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

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

- 93 1. Faculty Research Assistant
- 94 The appointee shall be capable of assisting in research under the direction
95 of the head of a research project and shall have ability and training
96 adequate to the carrying out of the particular techniques required, the
97 assembling of data, and the use and care of any specialized apparatus. A
98 baccalaureate degree shall be the minimum requirement.
- 99 2. Research Associate
- 100 The appointee shall be trained in research procedures, shall be capable of
101 carrying out individual research or collaborating in group research at the
102 advanced level, and shall have had the experience and specialized training
103 necessary for success in such research projects as may be undertaken. An
104 earned doctorate shall normally be a minimum requirement.
- 105 3. Research Assistant Professor; Assistant Research Scientist; Assistant
106 Research Scholar; Assistant Research Engineer
- 107 These ranks are generally parallel to Assistant Professor. In addition to
108 the qualifications of a Research Associate, appointees to these ranks shall
109 have demonstrated superior research ability. Appointees should be
110 qualified and competent to direct the work of others (such as technicians,
111 graduate students, other senior research personnel). The doctoral degree
112 will be a normal requirement for appointment at these ranks. Appointment
113 to these ranks may be made for a period of up to three years.
- 114 4. Research Associate Professor; Associate Research Scientist; Associate
115 Research Scholar; Associate Research Engineer
- 116 These ranks are generally parallel to Associate Professor. In addition to
117 the qualifications required of the assistant ranks, appointees to these ranks
118 should have extensive successful experience in scholarly or creative
119 endeavors, and the ability to propose, develop, and manage major research
120 projects. Appointment to these ranks may be made for a period of up to
121 three years.
- 122 5. Research Professor; Senior Research Scientist; Senior Research Scholar;
123 Senior Research Engineer
- 124 These ranks are generally parallel to Professor. In addition to the
125 qualifications required of the associate ranks, appointees to these ranks
126 should have demonstrated a degree of proficiency sufficient to establish an
127 excellent reputation among regional and national colleagues. Appointees

128 should provide tangible evidence of sound scholarly production in
129 research, publications, professional achievements or other distinguished
130 and creative activity. Appointment to these ranks may be made for a
131 period of up to five years.

132 6. Assistant Artist-in-Residence; Associate Artist-in-Residence; Senior
133 Artist-in-Residence

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

144 C. Field Faculty

145 1. Associate Agent

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

152 2. Faculty Extension Assistant

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

157 3. Faculty Extension Associate

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

- 164 4. Agent (parallel to the rank of Assistant Professor)
- 165 The appointee must hold a master's degree in an appropriate discipline
166 and show evidence of academic ability and leadership skills. The
167 appointee shall have an educational background related to the specific
168 position.
- 169 5. Senior Agent (parallel to the rank of Associate Professor)
- 170 In addition to the qualifications of an Agent, the appointee must have
171 demonstrated achievement in program development and must have shown
172 originality and creative ability in designing new programs, teaching
173 effectiveness, and evidence of service to the community, institution, and
174 profession. Appointment to this rank may carry tenure.
- 175 6. Principal Agent (parallel to the rank of Professor)
- 176 In addition to the qualifications of a Senior Agent, the appointee must
177 have demonstrated leadership ability and evidence of service to the
178 community, institution, and profession. The appointee must also have
179 received recognition for contributions to the Cooperative Extension
180 Service sufficient to establish a reputation among State, regional and/or
181 national colleagues, and should have demonstrated evidence of
182 distinguished achievement in creative program development.
183 Appointment to this rank carried tenure.
- 184 D. Faculty Engaged Exclusively Or Primarily in Clinical Teaching
- 185 All appointments in the following titles are renewable. Appointments with these
186 faculty titles do not carry tenure.
- 187 1. Clinical Assistant Professor
- 188 The appointee shall hold, as a minimum, the terminal professional degree
189 in the field, with training and experience in an area of specialization.
190 There must be clear evidence of a high level of ability in clinical practice
191 and teaching in the departmental field, and the potential for clinical and
192 teaching excellence in a subdivision of this field. The appointee should
193 also have demonstrated scholarly and/or administrative ability.
- 194 2. Clinical Associate Professor
- 195 In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Assistant Professor,
196 the appointee should ordinarily have had extensive successful experience

197 in clinical or professional practice in a field of specialization, or in a
198 subdivision of the departmental field, and in working with and/or directing
199 others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate students, fellows,
200 and residents or interns) in clinical activities in the field. The appointee
201 must also have demonstrated superior teaching ability and scholarly or
202 administrative accomplishments.

203 3. Clinical Professor

204 In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Associate Professor,
205 the appointee shall have demonstrated a degree of excellence in clinical
206 practice and teaching sufficient to establish an outstanding regional and
207 national reputation among colleagues. The appointee shall also have
208 demonstrated extraordinary scholarly competence and leadership in the
209 profession.

210 E. Faculty Engaged Exclusively or Primarily in Library Services

211 Library faculty hold the ranks of Librarian I-IV. Each rank requires a master's
212 degree from an American Library Association accredited program or a graduate
213 degree in another field where appropriate. The master's degree is considered the
214 terminal degree. Appointments to these ranks are for 12 months with leave and
215 other benefits provided to twelve-month tenured/tenure track faculty members
216 with the exception of terminal leave, sabbatical leave, and non-creditable sick
217 leave (collegially supported).

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

227 1. Librarian I

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

231 2. Librarian II

232 Librarians at this rank have demonstrated professional development

233 evidenced by achievement of a specialization in a subject, service,
234 technical, administrative, or other area of value to the library. This rank
235 does not carry permanent status.

236 3. Librarian III

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

247 4. Librarian IV

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

255 F. Additional Faculty Ranks

256 1. Assistant Instructor

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

261 2. Lecturer

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

265 3. Senior Lecturer

266 In addition to having the qualifications of a lecturer, the appointee

267 normally shall have established over the course of six years a record of
268 teaching excellence and service. Appointment to this rank requires the
269 approval of the departmental faculty. The appointment is made for a term
270 not to exceed five years and is renewable. This rank does not carry tenure.

271 4. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct
272 Professor

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

287 5. Affiliate Assistant Professor, Affiliate Associate Professor, Affiliate
288 Professor, Affiliate Librarian II, Affiliate Librarian III, and Affiliate
289 Librarian IV

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

298 6. Visiting Appointments

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

301 7. Emerita, Emeritus

302 The word emerita or emeritus after an academic title shall designate a
303 faculty member who has retired from full-time employment in the

304 University of Maryland at College Park after meritorious service to the
305 University in the areas of teaching, research, or service. Emerita or
306 emeritus status may be conferred on Associate Professors, Professors,
307 Distinguished University Professors, Research Associate Professors,
308 Research Professors, Senior Agents, Principal Agents, Librarians III, and
309 Librarians IV.

310 8. Distinguished University Professor

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

322 9. Professor of the Practice

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

336 10. College Park Professor

337 This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative or
338 performing artists, or researchers who would qualify for appointment at
339 the University of Maryland at College Park at the level of professor but
340 who normally hold full-time positions outside the University. Holders of
341 this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal
342 investigators, and participate in departmental and college shared

343 governance. Initial appointment is for three years and is renewable
344 annually upon recommendation to the Provost by the unit head and dean.
345 Appointment as a College Park Professor does not carry tenure or
346 expectation of salary.

347 11 Other Titles

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

351 II. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

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

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

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

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

375 Each college, school, and department shall develop brief, general, written Criteria for
376 Tenure and/or Promotion. The criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions
377 fall into three general categories: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of
378 students; (2) performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity; (3) performance
379 of professional service to the university, the profession, or the community. The relative

380 importance of these criteria may vary among different academic units, but each of the
381 categories shall be considered in every decision. The criteria for appointment to a faculty
382 rank or tenure shall be the same as for promotion to that rank (or for tenuring at the rank
383 of associate professor), whether or not the individual is being considered for an
384 administrative appointment. An academic unit's general Criteria for Tenure and/or
385 Promotion must receive the approval of the next level administrator. Any exceptional or
386 unusual arrangements relating to criteria for tenure and/or promotion shall be specified in
387 writing at the time of appointment and shall be approved by the faculty and administrator
388 of the first-level unit, by the dean of the school or college, and by the Provost.

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

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

406 A. Teaching and Advisement

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

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

418 B. Research, Scholarship, and Artistic Creativity

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

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

427 C. Service

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

438 III. APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY

439 A. Search Process

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

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

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

453 B. Offers of Appointment

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

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

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

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

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

478 2. Subject to any special conditions specified in the letter of appointment,
479 full-time appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor shall be for an
480 initial term of one to three years. The first year of the initial appointment
481 shall be a probationary year, and the appointment may be terminated at the
482 end of that fiscal year if the appointee is so notified by March 1. In the
483 event that the initial appointment is for two years, the appointment may be
484 terminated if the appointee is so notified by December 15 of the second
485 year. After the second year of the initial appointment, the appointee shall
486 be given one full year's notice if it is the intention of the University not to
487 renew the appointment. If the appointee does not receive timely
488 notification of nonrenewal, the initial appointment shall be extended for
489 one additional year. An initial appointment may be renewed for an
490 additional one, two, or three years. Except as set forth in paragraph III.C.3
491 below, an appointment to any term beyond the initial appointment shall

492 terminate at the conclusion of that additional term unless the appointee is
493 notified in writing that it is to be renewed for another term allowable
494 under University System policies or the appointee is granted tenure. Such
495 appointments may be terminated at any time in accordance with
496 paragraphs III.C.5-11.

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

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

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

531 6. a. The President may terminate the appointment of a tenured or
532 tenure-track appointee for moral turpitude, professional or

533 scholarly misconduct, incompetence, or willful neglect of duty,
534 provided that the charges be stated in writing, that the appointee be
535 furnished a copy thereof, and that the appointee be given an
536 opportunity prior to such termination to request a hearing by an
537 impartial hearing officer appointed by the President or a duly
538 appointed faculty board of review. With the consent of the
539 President, the appointee may elect a hearing by the President rather
540 than by a hearing officer or a faculty board of review. Upon
541 receipt of notice of termination, the appointee shall have thirty (30)
542 calendar days to request a hearing. The hearing shall be held no
543 sooner than thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of such a
544 request. The date of the hearing shall be set by mutual agreement
545 of the appointee and the hearing officer or faculty board of
546 review. If a hearing officer or a faculty board of review is
547 appointed, the hearing officer or board shall make a
548 recommendation to the President for action to be taken. The
549 recommendation shall be based only on the evidence of record in
550 the proceeding. Either party to the hearing may request an
551 opportunity for oral argument before the President prior to action
552 on the recommendation. If the President does not accept the
553 recommendation of the hearing officer or board of review, the
554 reasons shall be communicated promptly in writing to the
555 appointee and the hearing officer or board. In the event that the
556 President elects to terminate the appointment, the appointee may
557 appeal to the Board of Regents, which shall render a final decision.

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

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

568 7. If an appointment is terminated in the manner prescribed in paragraph
569 III.C.6, the President may, at his or her discretion, relieve the
570 appointee of assigned duties immediately or allow the appointee to
571 continue in the position for a specified period of time. The appointee's
572 compensation shall continue for a period of one year commencing on the
573 date on which the appointee receives notice of termination. A faculty
574 member whose appointment is terminated for cause involving moral

575 turpitude or professional or scholarly misconduct shall receive no notice or
576 further compensation beyond the date of final action by the President or
577 Board of Regents.

578 8. The University may terminate any appointment because of the
579 discontinuance of the department, program, school or unit in which the
580 appointment was made; or because of the lack of appropriations
581 or other funds with which to support the appointment. Such decisions
582 must be made in accordance with written University policies. The
583 President shall give a full-time appointee holding tenure notice of such
584 termination at least one year before the date on which the appointment is
585 terminated.

586 9. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, the appointment of any
587 untenured faculty member, fifty percent or more of whose compensation is
588 derived from research contracts, service contracts, gifts or grants, shall be
589 subject to termination upon expiration of the research funds, service
590 contract income, gifts or grants from which the compensation is payable.

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

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

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

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

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

614 D. Provisions Relating to Formal Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- 615 1. Reviews for promotion and tenure shall be conducted according to the
616 duly adopted written policies and procedures of the University. These
617 procedures shall be published in the Faculty Handbook.
- 618 2. Faculty review committees are a part of the review process at each level.
- 619 3. Each review by a faculty committee and each review by the administrator
620 of an academic unit (chair or dean) shall be focused on the evaluation of
621 the candidate using the Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion of that unit.
622 Each review shall be based on materials that must include the candidate's
623 *CV*, the candidate's Personal Statement, the Summary Statement of
624 Professional Achievements, the Candidate's Response to the Summary
625 Statement of Professional Achievements (if one is written), the letters
626 from external evaluators, and the other prescribed elements in the
627 University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual. At
628 the second and third levels of review, these promotion materials include
629 the promotion committee reports and the letters from academic unit
630 administrators.
- 631 4. A faculty member eligible to vote on the promotion recommendation on a
632 candidate of an academic unit may not participate in a review of that
633 candidate or vote on that candidate at a higher level of review. Because
634 they provide an independent evaluation, department chairs, academic
635 deans, and the Provost are ineligible to vote at any level.
- 636 5. Candidates shall have the right to appeal negative promotion and tenure
637 decisions on grounds specified in the policies and procedures of paragraph
638 V.B.

639 IV. PROMOTION, TENURE, AND EMERITUS REVIEW

640 The Provost shall develop detailed written procedures, implementing the University and
641 the System policies on appointment, promotion, and tenure. This set of procedures shall
642 be known as the University's Implementation of the University Appointment, Promotion
643 and Tenure Policy and these procedures shall govern the University's decision-making.
644 The procedures developed shall be subject to review and approval by the University
645 Senate. The Provost shall also develop useful guidelines, suggestions, and advice for
646 candidates for tenure and/or promotion and for academic units responsible for carrying
647 out reviews of candidates. Each year the Provost shall publish the University
648 Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual. This manual shall contain the
649 entire text of the University's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy, the

650 University's implementation of this policy, and the guidelines, suggestions, and advice
651 for candidates and for academic units. The University's Implementation should contain
652 the University's required procedures clearly identified as such. All guidelines,
653 suggestions, and advice in the Manual must be so labeled and distinguished from the
654 required procedures.

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

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

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

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

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

682 Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are responsible for providing their academic unit
683 with an accurate *curriculum vitae* detailing their academic and professional
684 achievements. Candidates holding faculty rank at the University shall also make a
685 written Personal Statement advocating their case for tenure and/or promotion based on
686 the facts in their *CV*, on the applicable Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion, and on their
687 perspective of those achievements in the context of their discipline. Both the *CV* and the
688 Personal Statement shall be presented in the form required by the University
689 Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual at the beginning of the

690 academic year in which a formal review for tenure and/or promotion will occur. These
691 two documents shall be included with each request for external evaluation and shall be
692 included in the promotion dossier reviewed at each level within the University. Within
693 the University review system, units and administrators may express their judgments on
694 the contents and on the significance of elements in either of the candidate's documents.
695 Units may only ask in neutral language for external evaluators to comment on elements
696 of these documents as part of their review but not suggest conclusions.

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

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

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

715 A. First-level Review

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

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

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

746 Advisory Subcommittee: The first-level unit review committee may
747 establish an advisory subcommittee to gather material and make
748 recommendations, but the vote of the entire eligible faculty of the first-
749 level unit shall be considered the faculty recommendation of the first-level
750 unit.

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

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

764 Joint Appointments: Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a
765 primary appointment (in their tenure home) and one or more secondary
766 appointments (in the unit or units that are not their tenure home). When a
767 joint appointment candidate is reviewed for appointment, promotion
768 and/or tenure, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the

769 recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or
770 more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary
771 unit(s) will be as follows:

- 772 • If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary
773 unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary unit shall
774 consist solely of a written recommendation by the chair or director
775 of the secondary unit.
- 776 • If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit
777 that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized
778 school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by
779 advice from the faculty in the unit who are at or above the rank to
780 which the candidate aspires. That advice shall be in a format
781 consistent with the unit's plan of organization. If the plan of
782 organization includes a vote, the vote may not include those
783 eligible to vote elsewhere on the candidate.
- 784 • If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit
785 that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized
786 school, then there shall be both a vote of the faculty in the unit
787 who are at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires and a
788 written recommendation by the head of that unit. The restriction
789 on multiple faculty votes continues to apply in this instance.
790 The secondary unit's review of the candidate shall be provided to the
791 first-level unit review committee and the first-level administrator. If
792 the chair/director of the secondary unit is also a member of the
793 candidate's primary unit, the chair/director may participate in the
794 deliberations of the primary unit, but may not vote on the candidate's
795 promotion in that unit.

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

801 3. Each first-level unit shall provide for the mentoring of each assistant
802 professor and of each untenured associate professor by one or more
803 members of the senior faculty other than the chair or dean of the unit.
804 Mentors should encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and
805 be available for consultation on matters of professional development.
806 Mentors also need to be frank and honest about the progress toward
807 fulfilling the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Following appropriate
808 consultations with members of the unit's faculty, the chair or dean of the
809 unit shall independently provide each assistant professor and each

810 untenured associate professor annually with an informal assessment of his
811 or her progress. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments
812 by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not
813 guarantee a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

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

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

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

847 5. The tenure or promotion case shall go forward to the next level of review
848 if fifty percent of the faculty vote cast is favorable (or such higher
849 percentage as may be established by procedures or guidelines of the first-
850 level unit) or if the recommendation of the administrator of the first-level

851 unit is favorable. If both faculty and unit administrator recommendations
852 are negative, the case shall be reviewed at the next level only by the dean
853 (or, in the case of a non-departmentalized school or college, the Provost).
854 The dean (or Provost) shall review the case to ensure that the candidate
855 has received procedural and substantive due process, as defined in
856 Section V.B.1.b. If the dean (or Provost) believes that the candidate has
857 not received due process, he or she shall direct the unit to reconsider. The
858 candidate may withdraw from his or her review at any time prior to the
859 President's decision.

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

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

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

893 the first-level faculty.

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

903 B. Second-level Review

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

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

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

930 4. When significant questions arise regarding the recommendations from the
931 first-level review or the contents of the dossier, the second-level review

932 committee shall provide an opportunity for the chair of the first-level
933 academic unit and the designated spokesperson of the first-level unit
934 review committee to meet with the second-level committee to discuss their
935 recommendations; the committee shall provide them with a written list of
936 the committee's general concerns about the candidate's case prior to the
937 meeting. The second-level review committee may also request additional
938 information from the first level of review by following the procedures
939 described in Section F1 below.

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

946 C. Third-level Review

947 1. A third- or campus-level review committee shall be established in the
948 following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members
949 holding the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges
950 (Agriculture and Natural Resources; Arts and Humanities; Behavioral
951 and Social Sciences; Business; Computer, Mathematical, and Natural
952 Sciences; Education; Engineering; School of Public Health) and one
953 from among the four small colleges (Architecture, Planning, and
954 Preservation; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy).
955 Since this committee shall make its recommendations on the basis of
956 whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion
957 have been met, members of this committee shall have a track record of
958 outstanding academic judgment along with sufficient intellectual breadth
959 and depth to be capable of comparing and judging candidates from varied
960 disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. No small
961 college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once
962 in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from
963 the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive
964 Committee, and from the faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time
965 administrative position may serve as a voting member of the committee.
966 The Provost shall be a non-voting ex-officio member. A committee
967 member who is entitled to vote in a lower-level review of a candidate shall
968 not be present for the discussion of that candidate and shall not vote on
969 that candidate. Appointments to the third-level review committee from
970 the eight large colleges shall be for three years while the appointment from
971 one of the five small colleges shall be for two years, with the terms
972 staggered so that approximately one-third of the committee is replaced
973 each year. No one may serve two consecutive terms. The third-level

974 review committee shall elect its own chair and alternate chair. The
975 committee members must maintain absolute confidentiality in their
976 consideration of cases. Outside of the committee meetings, members of
977 the third-level review committee shall not discuss specific cases with
978 anyone who is not a member of the third-level review committee. The
979 membership of the committee shall be made public at the time of the
980 committee's appointment. Every member of the campus community must
981 respect the integrity of the appointment, tenure and promotion process and
982 must refrain from attempting to discuss cases with committee members or
983 to lobby them in any way.

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

995 3. The committee shall promptly transmit its recommendation and a written
996 justification through the Provost to the President, along with all materials
997 provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost and the President
998 shall confer about the case, and the Provost shall transmit his or her
999 recommendation and a written justification to the President. If the
1000 Provost's recommendation differs from that of the third-level committee
1001 or from that of the Dean, the Provost will meet with the committee and/or
1002 the dean to discuss the review. After the President has made a decision, a
1003 report on the decisions reached at the third level of review shall be
1004 provided to the second-level administrator and faculty committee chair,
1005 the first-level administrator and faculty chair, and to the candidate.

1006 4. The Third-level Review Committee and the Provost shall conduct an end-
1007 of-the-year review of appointment, promotion, and tenure. The
1008 Committee shall write a public Annual report, the purpose of which
1009 includes improving the understanding of faculty members and of academic
1010 units about appointments, promotion, and tenure. The report should
1011 include any recommendations for improvements in policy, procedures, or
1012 the carrying out of reviews of candidates. The Provost shall write a public
1013 report annually giving statistical information on the appointment,
1014 promotion, and tenure cases considered during the academic year.

1015 D. Notification to Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

1016 Upon completion of the first-level review, the unit administrator at the first level
1017 shall within two weeks of the date of the decision: (1) inform the candidate
1018 whether the recommendations made by the faculty committee and the unit
1019 administrator were positive or negative (including specific information on the
1020 number of faculty who voted for tenure and/or promotion, the number who voted
1021 against, and the number of abstentions), and (2) prepare for the candidate a
1022 letter summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which
1023 those decisions were based. At higher levels of review, summaries shall be
1024 provided to the candidate whenever either or both faculty and administrator
1025 recommendations are negative. The chair of the faculty committee shall review
1026 the summary letter prepared by the unit administrator in order to ensure that it
1027 accurately summarizes the considerations regarded as relevant by the faculty
1028 committee at that level. The chair of the faculty committee at each level shall be
1029 provided access to the unit administrator's letters to the candidate and to the next
1030 level of review in order to ensure that the summary accurately reflects the
1031 recommendation and rationale provided to higher levels of review. In addition,
1032 both letters shall be made available for review in the office of the chair (dean or
1033 Provost) by any member of the faculty committee at that level. In the event that
1034 the chair of the faculty committee and the unit administrator are unable to agree
1035 on the appropriate language and contents of the summary letter, each shall write a
1036 summary letter to the candidate. A copy of all materials provided to the candidate
1037 shall be added to the tenure or promotion file as the case proceeds through higher
1038 levels of review.

1039 E. Presidential Review

1040 Full-time appointments or promotions to the ranks of Associate Professor or
1041 Professor require the written approval of the President, in whom resides final
1042 authority for promotion and granting of tenure to faculty. Final authority for any
1043 appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor cannot
1044 be delegated by the President.

1045 F. General Procedures Governing Promotion and Tenure

1046 1. With the exception of the third-level review committee, in their reviews of
1047 tenure and promotion recommendations from lower levels, upper-level
1048 administrators or review committees may not seek or use additional
1049 information from outside sources concerning a candidate's merits unless:
1050 (1) the materials forwarded from lower levels indicate the presence of a
1051 significant dissenting vote or divided recommendations from a lower
1052 level; (2) representatives from the first-level unit participate in the
1053 selection of additional persons to be consulted; and (3) the assessments
1054 received from these external sources are shared with and considered by the
1055 first-level review committee and by the unit's chair or dean; and (4) the

1056 review committee and the unit's academic administrator have the
1057 opportunity to reconsider their recommendations in the light of the
1058 augmented promotion dossier. The third-level review committee may
1059 seek additional information on any candidate as it chooses, although it
1060 must follow (2), (3) and (4) as described above. In doing so, the
1061 committee should ask the Provost to obtain the additional information
1062 from the Dean, who would then consult with the Department Chair to
1063 obtain faculty input. The evidential basis for upper-level committees and
1064 administrators should be restricted to the materials as assembled and
1065 evaluated by the first-level unit, with the exception of information
1066 obtained in compliance with the procedures just described. Candidates for
1067 tenure or promotion, however, are permitted to bring to the attention of the
1068 university administration any changes in their circumstances which might
1069 have a significant bearing on the tenure or promotion question. In the
1070 event that candidates for tenure or promotion bring information of this sort
1071 to the attention of upper-level committees or administrators after the first-
1072 level review has been concluded, these committees or administrators may
1073 take these changes into account in reaching their decisions and may elect
1074 to send the case back to the first-level for reconsideration.

1075 2. The candidate's application and supporting materials, and the reports and
1076 recommendations of the first-level committee and administrator, shall
1077 be transmitted to the appropriate levels of secondary review no later than a
1078 date set annually by the Provost.

1079 3. If an untenured faculty member requests leave without pay for a year or
1080 more, the dean of the college in which the faculty member will be
1081 considered for tenure shall recommend whether or not the faculty
1082 member's mandatory tenure review will be delayed. A positive
1083 recommendation from the dean to stop the tenure clock shall require
1084 evidence: (1) that the leave of absence will be in the interest of the
1085 University, and (2) that the faculty member's capacity to engage in
1086 continued professional activity will be significantly impaired during the
1087 period of the leave. The dean's recommendation shall be included in the
1088 proposal for leave submitted to the Provost. Delay of the mandatory
1089 tenure review requires the written approval of the Provost.

1090 4. A faculty member who would otherwise receive a formal review for
1091 tenure may waive the review by requesting in writing that he or she not be
1092 considered for tenure. A faculty member who has waived a tenure review
1093 shall receive whatever terminal appointments he or she would have
1094 received if tenure had been denied. A faculty member at any rank who has
1095 been denied tenure and who is ineligible for further consideration shall
1096 receive an additional and terminal one-year appointment in that rank.

1097 5. All recommendations for the appointment of faculty below the rank of
1098 Associate Professor shall be transmitted for approval through the various
1099 levels of review to the President or designee. Final authority for any
1100 appointment that confers tenure or for any appointment or promotion to
1101 the rank of Associate Professor or Professor cannot be delegated by the
1102 President.

1103 6. After a negative decision by the President, candidates for promotion or
1104 tenure shall be notified by certified mail. Determination of the
1105 time limits for the period during which an appeal may be made shall be
1106 based on the date of the candidate's receipt of the President's letter.

1107 G. Procedures Governing the Granting of Emerita/Emeritus Status

1108 1. Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors,
1109 Research Associate Professors, Research Professors, Senior Agents,
1110 Principal Agents, Librarians III, and Librarians IV who have been
1111 members of the faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park for
1112 ten or more years, and who give to their chair or dean proper written
1113 notice of their intention to retire, are eligible for nomination to
1114 emerita/emeritus status (see I.E.7 Emerita, Emeritus). Only in exceptional
1115 circumstances may Professors with fewer than ten years of service to the
1116 institution be recommended for emerita/emeritus status.

1117 2. The decision whether or not to award emeritus standing shall be based
1118 primarily on the candidate's record of significant accomplishment in any
1119 of the three areas of (1) teaching and advisement, (2) research,
1120 scholarship, and creative activity, and (3) service.

1121 3. If a faculty member gives notice of intention to retire before March 15, the
1122 first-level tenured faculty shall vote on emeritus standing within 45 days
1123 of the notice. If notice is given after March 15, the vote shall be taken no
1124 later than the 45th day of the following semester. The result of the vote
1125 shall be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to the administrator of
1126 the unit no later than ten days after the vote is taken. A faculty member
1127 who has not been informed of the decision concerning his or her emeritus
1128 standing within the time limits specified, shall be entitled to appeal the
1129 action as a negative decision in accordance with V.B.2.

1130 4. The review committee of the first-level unit shall consist of all eligible
1131 members of the faculty. Eligible members of the faculty are all full-time
1132 tenured associate and full professors, as appropriate, excluding the chair or
1133 dean. The vote of the entire eligible faculty shall be considered the
1134 recommendation of the faculty. The chair or dean shall submit a

1135 recommendation separately; the recommendation of the chair or dean shall
1136 be considered together with all relevant materials by administrators at
1137 higher levels.

1138 5. An emeritus case shall go forward to the next level of review if the
1139 department chair's recommendation is positive or the faculty vote is at
1140 least fifty percent favorable.

1141 6. The chair of the first-level committee shall prepare a written report, stating
1142 the committee's vote and recommendation on whether or not to award
1143 emeritus standing and explaining the basis for the faculty's
1144 recommendation insofar as that basis has been made known in the
1145 discussions taken place among the members of the committee. This letter
1146 will be forwarded to the chair or dean for his or her information and for
1147 forwarding to higher levels of review. Faculty participating in the unit's
1148 deliberations who wish to express a dissenting view are free to do so, and
1149 any such written statement shall be included in the materials sent forward
1150 to the next level of review.

1151 7. The recommendation of the first-level administrator shall also be in
1152 writing. The administrator's recommendation shall be transmitted to the
1153 second-level of review and a copy shall be made available for review by
1154 any member of the faculty participating in the unit's review deliberations.

1155 8. Second-level review of recommendations of emeritus standing shall be
1156 conducted by the appropriate dean. Second-level reviews of
1157 recommendations from non-departmentalized schools and colleges shall
1158 be conducted by the Provost. The second-level recommendation of the
1159 dean or the Provost, together with all other relevant materials, shall be
1160 transmitted to the President.

1161 9. The President shall make the final decision on the award of emeritus
1162 standing.

1163 10. Faculty members with ten or more years of service to the University who
1164 retired prior to the effective date of this policy and who have not been
1165 granted emeritus standing may apply to their departments for
1166 consideration as in Section IV.G.1.

1167 H. Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause

1168 If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member whose appointment the campus
1169 administration seeks to terminate for cause requests a hearing by a hearing officer,
1170 the hearing officer shall be appointed by the President from a college or school
1171 other than that of the appointee, with the advice and consent of the faculty

1172 members of the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate. If the appointee
1173 requests a hearing by a faculty board of review, members of the board of review
1174 shall be appointed by the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the
1175 Campus Senate from among tenured Professors not involved in administrative
1176 duties.

1177 V. THE APPEALS PROCESS

1178 A. Appeals Committees

1179 1. The President shall appoint an appeals committee. This committee shall
1180 consist of nine faculty members holding the rank of Professor, one from
1181 each from the eight large colleges (Agriculture and Natural Resources;
1182 Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Business;
1183 Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Education; Engineering;
1184 Chemical and Life Sciences) and one from among the five small colleges
1185 (Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Health and Human
1186 Performance; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy). No small
1187 college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once
1188 in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from
1189 the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive
1190 Committee, and from the faculty at large. No one serving in a full-time
1191 administrative position and no one who has participated in the promotion
1192 and tenure review process of the appellant shall serve on the campus
1193 appeals committee. Appointment to the campus appeals committee shall
1194 be for one year, and no one may serve two consecutive terms. Appeals
1195 committees shall elect their own chairs. The committee members must
1196 maintain absolute confidentiality in their consideration of cases.

1197 2. Special appeals committees at the college, school or campus level shall be
1198 appointed by the dean, Provost or President in a manner consistent with
1199 the policies, bylaws, or practice of the respective unit.

1200 B. Guidelines and Procedures for Appeals

1201 1. Negative Promotion and/or Tenure Decisions

1202 a. Mandatory and Non-Mandatory Reviews

1203 When a candidate for promotion and/or tenure receives notification
1204 from the President, dean or chair that promotion or tenure was
1205 not awarded, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting
1206 that the President submit the matter to the Campus Appeals
1207 Committee for consideration. The request shall be in writing and

1208 be made within sixty (60) days of notification of the negative
1209 decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support
1210 of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not
1211 later than one hundred and twenty (120) days after notification
1212 unless otherwise extended by the President because of
1213 circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In
1214 writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that
1215 these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the
1216 validity of the appeal and that, should the President accept the
1217 request and refer the appeal to the Campus Appeals Committee,
1218 these letters shall be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee
1219 with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other
1220 persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of
1221 the issues.

1222 b. Grounds for Appeal

1223 The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion and tenure
1224 decision shall be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process,
1225 and/or (2) violation of substantive due process.

1226 A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different
1227 review committee, department chair, dean or Provost exercising
1228 sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a
1229 different conclusion. An appeals committee will not substitute its
1230 academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review
1231 process.

1232 Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was
1233 negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for
1234 tenure and/or promotion by those in the review process to take a
1235 procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in
1236 relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department,
1237 school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations
1238 occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal
1239 and are dealt with under the provisions of paragraph 4 of the
1240 introduction to Section IV, Promotion, Tenure, and Emeritus
1241 Review.

1242 Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision
1243 was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible
1244 consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age,
1245 nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's
1246 exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of
1247 speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was
1248 based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of

1249 information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the
1250 supporting materials.

1251 c. Standard of Proof

1252 An appeal shall not be granted unless the alleged grounds for
1253 appeal are demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence.

1254 d. Responsibilities and Powers of the Appeals Committee

1255 1. The appeals committee shall notify the relevant
1256 administrators and APT chairs in writing of the grounds for
1257 the appeal and meet with them to discuss the issues.

1258 2. The appeals committee shall meet with the appellant to
1259 discuss and clarify the issues raised in the appeal.

1260 3. The appeals committee has investigative powers. The
1261 appeals committee may interview persons in the review
1262 process whom it believes to have information relevant to
1263 the appeal. Additionally, the Appeals Committee shall
1264 examine all documents related to the appellant's promotion
1265 or tenure review and may have access to such other
1266 departmental and college materials as it deems relevant to
1267 the case. Whenever the committee believes that a meeting
1268 could lead to a better understanding of the issues in the
1269 appeal, it shall meet with the appropriate party (with the
1270 appellant or with the relevant academic administrator and
1271 APT chair).

1272 4. The Appeals Committee shall prepare a written report for
1273 the President. The report shall be based upon the weight of
1274 evidence before it. It shall include findings with respect to
1275 the grounds alleged on appeal, and, where appropriate,
1276 recommendations for corrective action. Such remedy may
1277 include the return of the matter back to the stage of the
1278 review process at which the error was made and action to
1279 eliminate any harmful effects it may have had on the full
1280 and fair consideration of the case. No recommended
1281 remedy, however, may abrogate the principle of peer
1282 review.

1283 5. The President shall attach great weight to the findings and
1284 recommendations of the committee. The decision of the
1285 President shall be final. The decision and the rationale

1286 shall be transmitted to the appellant, the department chair,
1287 dean, chair(s) of the relevant APT committee(s) and
1288 Provost in writing.

1289 e. Implementation of the President's Decision

1290 1. When the President supports the grounds for an appeal, the
1291 Provost has the responsibility for oversight of the
1292 implementation of the corrective actions the President
1293 requires to be taken. Within 30 days of receipt of the
1294 President's letter, the Provost shall request the
1295 administrator involved to formulate a plan and a timeline
1296 for implementing and monitoring the corrective actions.
1297 Within 30 days after receipt of this letter, the administrator
1298 must supply a written reply. The Provost may require
1299 modification of the plan before approving it.

1300 2. The Provost shall appoint a Provost's Representative to
1301 participate in all stages of the implementation of the
1302 corrective actions specified in the approved plan for the re-
1303 view, including participation in the meeting or meetings
1304 at which the academic unit discusses, reviews, or votes on
1305 its recommendation for tenure and/or promotion for the
1306 appellant. The Provost's Representative shall participate in
1307 these activities but does not have a vote. After the
1308 academic unit completes its review, the Provost's
1309 Representative shall prepare a report on all of the elements
1310 of corrective action specified in the approved plan and this
1311 report will be included with the complete dossier to be
1312 reviewed at higher levels within the University. The
1313 Provost's Representative shall be a senior member of the
1314 faculty with no previous or potential involvement at any
1315 level of review or appeal pertaining to the consideration of
1316 the appellant for tenure and/or promotion except for the
1317 participation as Provost's Representative as defined in this
1318 paragraph.

1319 3. The Provost's request and the administrator's approved
1320 plan of implementation must be included in the dossier
1321 from the inception of the review. Re-reviews begin at the
1322 level of review at which the violation(s) of due process
1323 occurred and evaluate the person's record at the time the
1324 initial review occurred unless otherwise specified by the
1325 President. The administrator at the level at which the errors
1326 occurred, in addition to evaluating the candidate for

1327 promotion, must certify that each of the corrective actions
1328 has been taken and describe how the actions have been
1329 implemented. Re-reviews must proceed through all levels
1330 of evaluation including Presidential review. The Provost's
1331 review of the dossier will include an evaluation of
1332 compliance with the requirements imposed in the
1333 President's decision to grant the appeal. If the Provost
1334 discovers a serious failure by the unit to comply with the
1335 corrective actions required, the Provost shall formulate and
1336 implement a new plan for corrective action with respect to
1337 the appellant. In addition, the Provost shall inform (in
1338 writing) the administrator of the unit where the failure
1339 arose and the Provost shall take appropriate disciplinary
1340 action.

1341 f. Extension of Contract

1342 In the event that the appellant's contract of employment will have
1343 terminated before reconsideration can be completed, the
1344 appellant may request the President to extend the contract for one
1345 additional year beyond the date of its normal termination, with the
1346 understanding that the extension does not in itself produce a claim
1347 to tenure through length of service.

1348 2. Decision Not to Review

1349 If a faculty member requests his or her first level academic unit to
1350 undertake a review for his or her promotion or early recommendation for
1351 tenure, and the academic unit decides not to undertake the review or fails
1352 to transmit a recommendation by the date announced for transmittals, as
1353 specified in IV.F.2, above, the faculty member may appeal to the dean (if
1354 in a department) or to the Provost (if in a non-departmentalized school or
1355 college) requesting the formation of a special appeals committee to
1356 consider the matter. The request shall be made in writing. It shall be
1357 made promptly, and in no case later than thirty (30) days following written
1358 notification of the decision of the first-level academic unit.

1359 If the dean or Provost determines not to form a special appeals committee,
1360 the faculty member may appeal to the Provost (if the decision was the
1361 dean's) or to the President (if the decision was the Provost's) requesting
1362 formation of the special appeals committee. Request shall be made in
1363 writing. It shall be made promptly, and in no case no later than thirty (30)
1364 days following written notification of the decision of the dean or Provost.

1365 The grounds for appeal and the burden of proof shall, in all instances, be

1366 the same as set forth in V.B.1.b and c, above. A committee shall not
1367 substitute its academic judgment for that of the first-level unit. The
1368 responsibility of a special appeals committee shall be to prepare findings
1369 and recommendations. The committee may, for example, recommend that
1370 the dean or Provost extend the deadline for transmitting a recommendation
1371 and instruct the first-level unit to forward supporting documents as
1372 expeditiously as possible. A decision by a dean or the Provost, upon
1373 receiving the findings and recommendations of a special appeals
1374 committee, shall be final. A decision by the President shall be final.

1375 3. Decision Not to Renew

1376 When, prior to the mandatory promotion and tenure decision, an untenured
1377 tenure-track faculty member receives notification that his or her
1378 appointment will not be renewed by the first-level unit, he or she may
1379 appeal the decision in the manner described in V.B.1.a above.

1380 4. Emeritus Standing

1382 An unsuccessful candidate for emeritus standing may appeal the decision
1383 in the manner described in V.B.1. above.

INDEX

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



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-11
Title:	Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection
Presenter:	Francis Alt, Educational Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	May 10, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	Fall 2012
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report 4. For information only
Statement of Issue:	<p>Students at the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) register for classes each semester through Testudo, the University's online course management system. Testudo allows students to review the schedule of classes, course descriptions, final exam schedules, and academic deadlines. Students often use this information along with consultations with advisors to help them select courses. Currently, course syllabi are not available in many instances.</p> <p>In fall 2011, Kaiyi Xie, President of the Student Government Association (SGA), submitted a proposal to the University Senate regarding the student course selection process. This proposal raises concerns about the effectiveness of the current system and suggests that improvements be considered. Specifically, the proposal calls for preliminary course syllabi to be made available by the class registration process and potentially linked through Testudo.</p> <p>The Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) was charged by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with reviewing the proposal on September 28, 2011. The SEC asked that the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) review the proposal and advise on whether the current procedures and timeline for posting syllabi are appropriate.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A

<p>Recommendation:</p>	<p>The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that undergraduate course syllabi for both forthcoming and previous semesters should be available online in a manner that is easily accessible to students.</p> <p>The Committee believes that every effort should be made to implement this recommendation as soon as possible with existing technology such as unit web pages accessible from Testudo or the Digital Repository at the University of Maryland (DRUM). In addition, a concerted effort should be made over time to develop a universal model for the electronic dissemination of course syllabi.</p> <p>The Educational Affairs Committee also suggests that the Graduate Council consider whether a similar process should be implemented for graduate courses.</p>
<p>Committee Work:</p>	<p>The EAC initially reviewed the proposal, an addendum from the Student Government Association (SGA), and current faculty requirements for syllabi. They also discussed the potential benefits of making syllabi available earlier in the registration process. In addition, the Committee considered possible methods of implementation including posting past syllabi for a course.</p> <p>The EAC consulted with the bill's proposer, to discuss his specific concerns with the process. The Committee also met with Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs, to understand the current policies and gain insight on the impact of potential recommendations on faculty. In addition, the EAC met with representatives of the Office of Information Technology (OIT) to learn about the technical aspects of the current course selection system and gain insight into future developments, such as Quali Student. The Committee also met with a representative from the Registrar's Office, who provided insight into the current process for scheduling and adding information within Testudo.</p> <p>The EAC consulted with the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to get input on its work and a potential recommendation. The FAC suggested that EAC limit its review to undergraduate courses until the Graduate Council could be consulted and also consider alternate methods for implementing its recommendation.</p> <p>The EAC also conducted a thorough review of similar processes at peer institutions, other universities, and our own units. They</p>

	<p>found several examples that can be used as a model for our own University.</p> <p>The Committee met on April 23, 2012 and ultimately made an overarching recommendation regarding the availability of syllabi along with several suggestions for the timeline and implementation of that recommendation.</p>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed recommendation and the current procedures would remain.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed changes, it could miss an opportunity to improve the course selection process and provide a better experience for students.
Financial Implications:	Some resources will be required to create a central repository for syllabi.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

Senate Educational Affairs Committee

Senate Document 11-12-11

Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection

April 2012

BACKGROUND:

Students at the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) register for classes each semester through Testudo, the University's online course management system. Testudo allows students to review the schedule of classes, course descriptions, final exam schedules, and academic deadlines. Students often use this information along with consultations with advisors to help them select courses. Currently, course syllabi are not available in many instances.

In fall 2011, Kaiyi Xie, President of the Student Government Association (SGA), submitted a proposal to the University Senate regarding the student course selection process. This proposal raises concerns about the effectiveness of the current system and suggests that improvements be considered. Specifically, the proposal calls for preliminary course syllabi to be made available by the class registration process and potentially linked through Testudo. It also requests that syllabi include a comprehensive list of major topics covered within the class, a rough grading breakdown, and whether +/- grading is used for the course.

CURRENT PRACTICE:

The University's Teaching Policies and Guidelines (Appendix 3) for instructors stipulate the elements that must be included in a course syllabus. It also defines the deadline to distribute course syllabi as the first day of class. Instructors are not required to provide their syllabi to students in advance of the course.

Currently, the course selection process takes place through Testudo. With the help of scheduling officers, department chairs and instructors create listings for each course and section of a course being offered each semester. These listings may include course notes that provide class information, book notes that provide information about the textbook(s) for the course, and embedded links that provide additional information about the course.

The University is currently in the process of developing a new system for course selection called Kuali Student. This new system will eventually replace Testudo. However, developers do not expect this new tool to be ready for another five years.

COMMITTEE WORK:

The Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) was charged (Appendix 1) by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with reviewing the “Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection” on September 28, 2011 (Appendix 2). The SEC asked that the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) review the proposal and advise on whether the current procedures and timeline for posting syllabi are appropriate.

The EAC initially reviewed the proposal, an addendum from the Student Government Association (SGA), and current faculty requirements for syllabi. They also discussed the potential benefits of making syllabi available earlier in the registration process. In addition, the Committee considered possible methods of implementation including posting past syllabi for a course.

The Committee met with Kaiyi Xie, President of the SGA and the bill’s proposer, to discuss his specific concerns about the current process. Xie expressed that the lack of course information and syllabi create a burden for the student. He believes that course descriptions should be expanded to include the demands for a course. He also suggested ways in which the current system could be improved.

The EAC met with Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, to understand the current policies and gain insight on the impact and feasibility of potential recommendations. Uriagereka suggested that the committee note some best practices in its final recommendation and solicit input from the Faculty Affairs Committee. The EAC also consulted with Chris Higgins, Director of Learning Technologies & Environments, and Dan Symonds, Assistant Director of Technology Development to understand the technical aspects of the current course selection system and gain insight into future developments. The Committee learned that the Enterprise Learning Management System (ELMS) would be replaced with a new system that will allow publicly accessible information. The University is developing a new system, Quali Student, which would be available in five years. In this new system, it would be possible to attach documents to courses.

The EAC also met with Jennifer Riggs, Associate Registrar for Scheduling & Data Support. She provided insight into the process for scheduling and adding information within Testudo. The Committee learned about the role of the scheduling officer in course management and discovered that course notes could be added within Testudo with links to departmental or instructor webpages.

After a thorough review, the EAC learned that most of our peer institutions do not have a system in place for archiving past or present syllabi. However, the committee discovered that Stanford University has a good model for creating a universal syllabus repository: <http://www.stanford.edu/group/syllabus/faqs/>. The committee also

investigated the current processes of our own colleges to gain insight into existing best practices and found the Department of Psychology's website for syllabi (http://psychology.umd.edu/ugrad/Undergrad_syllabi.html) to be a good model.

The EAC consulted with the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to get input on its work and a potential recommendation. The FAC advised that the committee limit their review to undergraduate courses until the Graduate Council could be consulted. In addition, the FAC recommended that EAC consider alternate methods for implementing its recommendation.

The EAC met on April 23, 2012, to consider the information collected over the course of its review and propose potential recommendations. The committee ultimately made an overarching recommendation regarding the availability of course syllabi. In addition, the EAC agreed to include several suggestions for the timeline and implementation of that recommendation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that undergraduate course syllabi for both forthcoming and previous semesters should be available online in a manner that is easily accessible to students.

The Committee believes that every effort should be made to implement this recommendation as soon as possible with existing technology such as unit web pages accessible from Testudo or the Digital Repository at the University of Maryland (DRUM). In addition, a concerted effort should be made over time to develop a universal model for the electronic dissemination of course syllabi.

The Educational Affairs Committee also suggests that the Graduate Council consider whether a similar process should be implemented for graduate courses.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, September, 28, 2011

Appendix 2 – Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection

Appendix 3 – Excerpt from "Teaching Policies and Guidelines: A Starting Point"

APPENDIX 1: Charge



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	September 28, 2011
To:	Francis Alt Chair, Educational Affairs Committee
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection
Senate Document #:	11-12-11
Deadline:	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Educational Affairs Committee review the attached, "Proposal to Clarify and Improve Student Class Selection," and make recommendations on whether the current procedures and timeline for posting syllabi are appropriate.

The University's teaching policies and guidelines for instructors stipulate the elements that must be included in a course syllabus and that the deadline to distribute a course syllabus is the first day of class. However, instructors are not required to provide their syllabus to students in advance of the course. The SEC requests that the Educational Affairs Committee review the proposal and advise on whether the current policies and guidelines should be revised to include earlier posting of course syllabi, possibly prior to the course registration process.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Consult with the proposer to discuss his specific concerns about the current process.
2. Review the current University teaching policies and guidelines for instructors.
3. Review similar policies and guidelines at our peer institutions.
4. Consult with the University's Office of Faculty Affairs to review current practices and discuss the advantages and disadvantages to possible changes.
5. If appropriate, recommend how current policies and guidelines can be changed to serve both students and instructors.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



**University Senate
PROPOSAL FORM**

Name:	Kaiyi Xie
Date:	September 16, 2011
Title of Proposal:	Proposal to clarify and improve student class selection
Phone Number:	301.367.5262
Email Address:	SGApresident@umd.edu
Campus Address:	0209J Stamp Student Union
Unit/Department/College:	ENGR, CMNS
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Ex-officio undergraduate
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>Students are currently unable to view class syllabi before classes begin and/or professors distributes them. Indeed, they have little to no opportunity to view the syllabi of the class of previous professors/sections. This raises many potential problems for students, which include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choosing classes that are of an inappropriate difficulty level Unable to tailor a course plan that fits personal/professional interests and/or career goals Fulfilling gen-ed requirements with classes that do not end up meeting students' interests/goals <p>In fact, there is NO mandate on professors to distribute a clear syllabus in the <i>Policies and Procedures</i>. Only in III-5.10 (A), "Policies and Procedures Concerning Academic Assignments on Dates of Religious Observances" is it <i>suggested</i> that professors include a policy on missing assignments during religious holidays in their syllabi. In addition, advising is NOT mandated of all students (under <i>UMCP Policies and Procedures</i> III-2.50 (A)). Only certain departments mandate that students undergo semesterly advising to remove registration blocks prior to class registration. While it is clear that students with doubts about class choices can consult advisors/professors, doing so may not solve this problem for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisors from one academic college often do not know the details of classes in other academic colleges There is no clear way to track past syllabi from past semesters for classes, especially by those taught by new professors, to

	<p>keep subject material consistent and pertinent- if there are such methods within different departments, such materials should be made fully available to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be easier for students to compare classes if the syllabi were available instead of speaking to professors individually • Consulting professors will sometimes not lead to a clear and reasonable solution, and oftentimes, professors are too busy to be able to answer very specific questions from students regarding a course's subject-material <p>Undoubtedly, there is difficulty on the part of the student in asking "the right question" regarding the class to professors or advisors. Most of the time, all the information a student knows about the class is the name, section, and a brief description of the subject covered on Testudo.</p>
<p>Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:</p>	<p>Policy requiring professors to include information in syllabi (including but not limited to a comprehensive list of major topics covered within the class, rough grading breakdown, whether +/- grading is used, etc.), with a hard deadline set for professors to have preliminary syllabi ready for students to be able to review, preferably at the time that class registration beings. Since the web infrastructure of Testudo is quite old, if there is a way to post such syllabi to Testudo (or perhaps uploading to the department's website then including a link to the syllabus on the class description on Testudo), that would be preferable. However, if there is not, then the syllabi should be made available to students upon demand, if the student contacts the professor/academic unit responsible for the class. Exceptions would be if a professor for a class section is not determined yet- however, an old syllabus could be made available for that class.</p>
<p>Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:</p>	<p>As aforementioned, uploading onto Testudo/some other UMD website would be preferable. If not possible, then making it clear to students that they have the right to ask for a preliminary syllabus from the professor or academic unit would be very utile for students.</p>
<p>Additional Information:</p>	<p>None</p>

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to senate-admin@umd.edu or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!

COMMUNICATION WITH STUDENTS

Syllabus

Per University policy, instructors are expected to distribute a course syllabus on the first day of class. This document should contain the following information:

1. Course and section number and title.
2. Name of instructor, office phone number and address, email address; office hours.
3. General description of the course, as well as its meeting location and times.
4. Required textbooks (where used). Include ISBN numbers if available.
5. Course outline.
6. Due dates for papers/projects, as well as exam dates, including the final exam.
7. Expectations of students.
8. Reminders about academic integrity (including Honor Pledge).
9. Grading procedures.
10. Attendance policy, including:
 - a. A specification of the nature of the in-class participation expected and the effects of absences on the student's grade.
 - b. An explanation of how religious holidays, inclement weather, excused absences and make-up exams will be handled. For example syllabus language regarding expectations for medically necessary absences, visit faculty.umd.edu/teach/syllabus.html.
11. Arrangements for students with disabilities.

In addition to the required information listed above, it is strongly recommended that the syllabus include:

1. Methods for communicating with students outside the classroom regarding matters such as class cancellations, meeting times, or room changes.
2. Means by which courses will be continued/completed in case of an emergency that closes the University for an extended period of time.

3. Importance of academic integrity. Provide more detail about what constitutes dishonesty, with perhaps a concrete list of dos and don'ts in the context of the class.
4. Notice that class lectures and other materials are copyrighted and that they may not be reproduced for anything other than personal use without written permission from you.