




University Senate CHARGE

Date:	October 27, 2014
To:	Devin Ellis Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
From:	Donald Webster Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty
Senate Document #:	14-15-09
Deadline:	March 27, 2015

The Faculty Affairs Committee's (FAC) framework for professional track faculty appointments has recently been approved by the Chancellor. The next step in this process is to create overarching campus-wide guidelines that will be used as a baseline for departments/units to develop their new appointment and promotion system. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) review the framework and develop guidelines for appointment, evaluation, and promotion of professional track faculty. These guidelines should define minimum requirements but also allow units flexibility to develop specific appointment, evaluation, and promotion criteria relevant to each discipline.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review the University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty (II-1.00(A)).
2. Review the draft guidelines provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs as a starting point for the committee's deliberations.
3. Review appointment protocols, promotion criteria, and/or evaluation procedures for non-tenure track faculty at Big 10 and peer institutions.
4. Develop guidelines for appointment protocols and expectations.
5. Develop guidelines for promotion criteria and processes for each of the professional track faculty ranks.
6. Develop timelines for promotion to the various professional track ranks.

7. Develop guidelines for the review process including whether second or third level professional track faculty should serve on review committees and the specific composition of a University-level committee for these types of reviews.
8. Develop protocols for voting privileges within shared governance bodies at the unit and college level for professional track faculty at each rank level.
9. Consult with a representative from the University's Office of Faculty Affairs on potential promotion criteria.
10. Consult with the University's Office of Legal Affairs on any proposed recommendations.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than March 27, 2015. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

Attachment
DW/rm

UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty

Rationale

In light of the important contributions made by Professional Track Faculty (PTK) at the University of Maryland, the Provost and the University Senate jointly establish the following guidelines in order to formalize and regularize the processes for recognizing excellence among the Professional Track Faculty.

Appointment Contracts

- A. All PTK faculty shall be provided with written contracts, based on templates provided by the Office of Legal Affairs, prior to the beginning of their assignment. A contract shall stipulate the term of the contract, the salary, assignments and expectations, resources made available to the faculty, performance/evaluation policies and procedures, and terms regarding notifications for non-renewal. Information about unit-level resources and unit-level performance/evaluation policies and procedures may be made in the contract by reference to a publically available web site maintained by the appointing unit.
- B. Given that PTK faculty might be active in only one or two of the three dimensions of academic activity, assignments and expectations should establish explicitly the scope of the appointee's efforts in terms of the three dimensions of academic activity, i.e. Teaching, Research, and Service, thereby providing expectations for evaluating faculty performance and applications for promotion.
- C. The title for a given appointment should correspond to the majority of the appointee's effort, as indicated by the statement of assignments and expectations in the contract.
- D. For title series in which professional experience can substitute for a degree requirement, unit plans shall provide baseline standards, based on the discipline, for the types and levels of professional activities that will constitute equivalencies for degree requirements.
- E. In addition to the provisions above, contracts for Instructional Faculty shall include the provisions stipulated in USM and UM Policies II-1.00(F), II-1.05, II-1.06, and II-1.07(A).

Evaluation and Promotion

- A. In order to recognize and reward consistent, high-level contributions from PTK faculty, units will develop and publish, on a publically available web site, evaluation and promotion guidelines for PTK faculty that provide for appropriate connections between advancement in rank and increase in salary.
- B. Except as specified below, details of the evaluation criteria and procedures for promotion are the responsibility of the unit; the application and review process, including the materials to be submitted by the faculty member, should be specified in the unit's evaluation and promotion guidelines. Unit plans shall be posted on a publically available web site. Colleges are responsible for ensuring that units have such plans and that the guidelines and procedures in those plans are followed.

- C. Units shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. Mentors should encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Mentors also need to be frank and honest about the progress toward fulfilling the unit's criteria for promotion. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.
- D. Evaluations of individual PTK faculty shall be based on the expectations stipulated in the faculty member's contracts. Contributions beyond the contractually stipulated expectations can be used in the evaluation process, but should not replace the expectations associated with the appointment.
- E. Appointments and promotions to ranks at or above the Associate level or the Senior level will be reviewed and approved by the college.
- F. Decisions regarding an application for promotion shall be made within 60 days of the application at the unit level, and if approved at the unit level, reviewed by the college within 60 days of the unit level decision. In the event of a negative decision, the faculty member shall be notified in writing by the unit head. The faculty member can appeal a negative decision based on procedural grounds, i.e. aspects of the review appeared to violate the unit's published processes. Appeals will be reviewed at the college level by a committee comprised of members who were not involved in the initial promotion review.
- G. A negative decision regarding an application for promotion does not constitute grounds for non-renewal. Promotion through PTK faculty ranks is not "up or out".