University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	14-15-09
Title:	UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty
Presenter:	Devin Ellis, Chair, Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 9, 2015
Date of Senate Review:	April 23, 2015
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	In April 2014, the Senate and President approved the Faculty Affairs Committee's report on a new unified framework for PTK faculty appointments. In its work, the FAC recognized that units and Colleges would need to develop mechanisms to implement the new title framework, and many would need to initiate processes for professional track faculty evaluations and promotions. The FAC recommended that the Office of Faculty Affairs should develop general principles, so that departments and Colleges would have guidance for developing their own policies and procedures for evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty. The FAC asked that these guidelines be submitted to the Senate for review. In fall 2014, the Office of Faculty Affairs presented draft guidelines to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). In October 2014, the SEC voted to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee with consideration of the draft guidelines, and asked that the FAC work with the Office to develop final guidelines to assist units and Colleges in developing their own policies and procedures.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	II-1.00(A) University Of Maryland, College Park Policy on Appointment, Promotion, And Tenure Of Faculty http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii-100a.html

Recommendation:	The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the attached guidelines entitled "UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty" be adopted as official University of Maryland guidelines and be distributed to Colleges and departments to assist in the development of specific policies and procedures in each unit.
Committee Work:	The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) began considering its charge in November 2014. The FAC worked very closely with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Director of Faculty Initiatives from the Office of Faculty Affairs during its review, and consulted with the Office of General Counsel during the spring of 2015. The FAC began its work in agreement that meritorious performance of PTK faculty over extended periods of time should be recognized through opportunities for promotion and longer contracts. The FAC considered many detailed questions and reviewed the administrative and practical implications of each of its decisions as it worked to create a document that could serve as reasonable guidance for all units at the University. The FAC considered many key issues in its review, including what details should be included in appointment contracts; how evaluative criteria for various ranks and disciplines should be determined; whether PTK faculty promotions should include a University-level review; how to acknowledge the differences in roles and career paths of PTK faculty; appropriate time in rank and timelines for review cycles for PTK faculty; promotion of PTK faculty with multiple appointments; and involvement of PTK faculty in unit decision making, both related to policies and procedures for PTK faculty and in broader shared governance processes. After a thorough review, the FAC voted to approve the revised guidelines in April 2015.
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed guidelines. However, the University would lose the opportunity to develop consistent expectations for reviews and promotions of PTK faculty.
Risks:	There are no associated risks.
Financial Implications:	Financial resources may be necessary to implement promotion processes for PTK faculty.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate approval, Presidential approval, Board of Regents approval.

Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Senate Document #14-15-09

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

April 2015

BACKGROUND

Since the 2013-2014 academic year, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has been considering extensive changes to policies and procedures that impact professional track faculty. In one of many related charges, the committee developed a new framework for professional track faculty titles (Senate Document #12-13-55) to be implemented at UMD. The Senate approved the committee's recommendations in April 2014, and the proposed changes to University policy were approved by the Chancellor of the University System of Maryland in October 2014. In its work, the committee recognized that units and Colleges would need to develop mechanisms to implement the new title framework, and many would need to initiate processes for professional track faculty evaluations and promotions. To assist in this effort, the committee recommended that the Office of Faculty Affairs should develop general principles related to the evaluation and promotion of professional track faculty at UMD, so that departments and Colleges could develop their own policies and procedures based on these principles. The committee asked that these guidelines be submitted to the Senate for review.

In the fall of 2014, the Office of Faculty Affairs presented a set of draft guidelines on evaluation and promotion of professional track faculty to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). In October 2014, the SEC voted to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee with consideration of the draft guidelines, and asked that the committee work with the Office to develop final guidelines to assist units and Colleges in developing their own policies and procedures (Appendix 2).

COMMITTEE WORK

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) began considering its charge and the draft guidelines for professional track (PTK) faculty in November 2014. The FAC worked very closely with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Director of Faculty Initiatives from the Office of Faculty Affairs during its review, and consulted with the Office of General Counsel during the spring of 2015.

During its review, the FAC considered examples of existing policies from departments and Colleges at the University that have been conducting evaluations and promoting PTK faculty in recent years. The FAC considered whether best practices have already been implemented in some units across campus. The FAC also solicited feedback on various drafts of the guidelines from a group of PTK faculty involved in the ADVANCE Program, and the chair of the committee met with the Academic Leadership Forum in March 2015 to seek input on the guidelines from the Provost, deans, and department chairs.

The foundation for the FAC's work was grounded in the principles set forth in previous reports on the revised framework for PTK faculty appointments, the overall title for PTK faculty, and emeritus status for PTK faculty. The FAC operated under the premise that meritorious performance of PTK faculty over extended periods of time should be recognized through opportunities for promotion and longer contracts.

The FAC considered many detailed questions and reviewed the administrative and practical implications of each of its decisions as it worked to create a document that could serve as reasonable guidance for all units at the University.

ISSUES ADDRESSED IN PROPOSED GUIDELINES

As the committee worked to draft the guidelines, it discussed many key issues identified by the committee in its previous work. Where possible, the FAC considered feedback from PTK faculty and administrators, and the FAC discussed concerns with the Office of General Counsel as it worked on finalizing its proposed language in the spring of 2015.

❖ Appointment Contracts

As it developed the new framework for PTK faculty titles, the FAC learned that current practices related to appointment contracts vary widely among PTK faculty on campus. Currently, some PTK faculty have no contracts; others have contracts that do not adequately reflect their duties and responsibilities; and many have contracts that are not updated to reflect new duties over the course of their appointment or when appointments are renewed. The FAC encourages consistent expectations and long-term contracts for PTK faculty, and acknowledged the importance of contracts both upon appointment and throughout a career at UMD.

The FAC agreed that PTK faculty should be given a contract before beginning an assignment at the institution. All contracts should include details related to the term of the appointment, the salary rate, and the faculty rank for the appointment. The contract should clearly articulate duties and responsibilities associated with the appointment. Members noted that PTK faculty duties can be very different than tenured or tenure track (T/TT) faculty duties, since PTK faculty are typically only expected to be active in teaching, research, or service, and for purposes of conducting fair evaluations based on a clear set of standards, it is important to be clear on expectations from the beginning of the appointment. In addition, the FAC agreed that the duties in the contract should reasonably relate to the title given for the appointment; for instance, instructional faculty should be given a title that would be reasonable for an instructional faculty member in the discipline, and the faculty member's contract should specify duties related to instruction.

❖ Evaluative Criteria and Evaluation Process

In creating a system for evaluations of PTK faculty, the FAC acknowledged that evaluations could not use the same criteria as is used in the APT process, and appropriate criteria would need to be developed. The FAC also noted that criteria should typically be different for those in research, instructional, and clinical ranks. Since criteria could vary in each discipline and department, the FAC determined that the specific evaluation criteria should be the responsibility of the unit. However, in general, the FAC agreed that ranks and levels in rank should be associated with specific standards and expectations. These established expectations, as stipulated in the unit's policies and procedure, should be the basis for evaluations for promotion, and as such, should be reasonably articulated in the contract. Evaluations should compare the performance of PTK faculty with the expectations for the rank and with the provisions of the contract.

In addition, the FAC was charged to consider whether a University-level review would be appropriate for evaluations of PTK faculty. The FAC recognized that a University-level review would parallel the APT process and ensure appropriate engagement from the University administration in the evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty. However, the FAC also recognized that while some PTK faculty will seek advancement through the ranks in a manner similar to T/TT faculty, other PTK faculty may choose not to seek promotions, and the guidelines need to ensure appropriate evaluation procedures for these faculty as well. The FAC worked with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs to develop appropriate language to

institute a University-level review for PTK faculty promotions above the Associate or Senior level, and incorporated language into the guidelines to make it clear that PTK faculty with different roles or career paths may have different promotion expectations. In addition, as discussed in previous work by the committee, the guidelines state that negative decisions for promotion for PTK faculty appointments that do not have maximum terms do not constitute automatically preclude renewal of the contract, since promotion for PTK faculty is not an "up or out" system.

- **Review Cycle for Evaluations and Promotion Decisions**

As part of its charge, the FAC was prompted to consider appropriate guidelines for time in rank. The FAC considered setting expectations for how long PTK faculty should stay in rank before applying for promotion to the next rank, but found difficulties, as each unit may have different expectations and since some PTK faculty may choose not to seek promotion. Instead, the FAC decided to allow units to set appropriate expectations for the discipline and to give PTK faculty the agency to determine for themselves, in discussion with their faculty mentor, when they should be reviewed for promotion. The FAC raised concerns that financial considerations may entice units to encourage PTK faculty not to submit review applications at certain times because of budget constraints. The FAC felt this was inappropriate, and determined that PTK faculty should not be prohibited from applying for promotion, just as T/TT cannot be prohibited from applying for review outside of the expected timelines.

The FAC sought guidance on questions related to deadlines for applications and decisions in the review process from the Academic Leadership Forum, which strongly recommended that deadlines for submission of applications be set by each unit. The Academic Leadership Forum and the PTK faculty from the ADVANCE program each raised concerns related to a specific deadline for returning decisions on applications for promotion, since every unit will approach the review cycle in different ways. In some cases, a unit may choose to convene a committee to review all promotion applications at one time and announce decisions on all cases at the same time. In other cases, units or Colleges may choose to align PTK faculty evaluations to the existing APT review process, in which case a unit would be conducting evaluations for T/TT and PTK faculty at the same time and may need more flexibility in the timeline for returning decisions. After much consideration, the FAC determined that it would be best to provide broad guidance that decisions should be made within the academic year and in time for any salary increases from promotion to take effect for the following academic year.

- **Promotion of PTK Faculty with Multiple Appointments**

As it considered special circumstances that might arise for PTK faculty in the promotion and evaluation processes, the FAC acknowledged that there may be cases where PTK faculty have multiple appointments in different units. In considering how to address such cases, the FAC struggled to find an appropriate solution, and sought guidance from the Office of Faculty Affairs and the Office of General Counsel on similar processes for T/TT faculty. Since promotions need to be reviewed by a University-level committee, members could not rationalize asking a PTK faculty member to go through the review process twice in different units in order to be promoted, as this would create an undue burden on the faculty member and duplicate efforts between departments. In the APT process for T/TT faculty, the review of cases with joint appointments has to consider evaluations from both units, and the tenure-home unit is responsible for the final decision on promotion. The FAC agreed to recommend a similar process, by which PTK faculty apply for promotion in the unit where they have a greater percentage of employment, and both or all units must participate in the evaluation. The PTK faculty member's performance in all appointments would be considered, and the unit with the greater percentage of employment would make the final decision.

- **Involvement of Professional Track Faculty in Decision Making Processes**

As it developed guidelines for the evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty, the FAC sought guidance from PTK faculty, who have a better understanding of the day to day impact of any particular provision of

the guidelines. PTK faculty raised important questions not apparent to the committee based on their experiences, which caused the FAC to think more deeply about the issues involved. Throughout its review, the FAC discussed the importance of including PTK faculty in the process of developing and implementing policies and procedures. However, the FAC recognized that in many departments and Colleges, PTK faculty are often not included in decision making processes, including those that determine issues directly related to the careers of PTK faculty. In many instances, PTK faculty are not considered to be part of the department or College faculty, and as such, are kept from attending faculty meetings or serving on committees as faculty.

Through discussions with PTK faculty in the ADVANCE program, the FAC realized that the involvement of PTK faculty is important for multiple reasons. PTK faculty can help departments and Colleges handle the added responsibilities of development of new policies and procedures, as well as with new responsibilities for evaluations. PTK faculty will have a better understanding of the duties and expectations of their peers, and their insight would be invaluable in evaluations. Perhaps more importantly, incorporating PTK faculty into decision making will encourage the engagement of PTK faculty as part of the life of a department or College, and will cause T/TT and PTK faculty to learn from each other and have increased investment in the careers of their colleagues.

Upon approval of the guidelines, departments and Colleges will begin making critical decisions on how to approach evaluations and promotions of PTK faculty, and the FAC felt strongly that these decisions cannot be made without the involvement of PTK faculty. PTK faculty should be involved in the creation and adoption of unit-level policies and procedures, and PTK faculty should serve on review committees so they have an opportunity to participate in the promotion process for their peers. Further, PTK faculty should be understood to be members of the faculty in their unit, and as such, should be allowed to participate in shared governance within the unit.

- **Review Process for Unit and College Policies and Procedures**

Once policies and procedures related to PTK faculty are developed by individual units and Colleges, they must be reviewed at a higher level for compliance with the proposed guidelines and University policy. In its report on the revised framework for PTK faculty titles, the FAC proposed that Colleges and units create clear procedures and criteria for evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty based on the draft guidelines below. Once completed, unit procedures should be reviewed by the College and the Office of Faculty Affairs, to allow for evaluation of consistency across the University. College procedures should be reviewed by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, with the assistance of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs as a member of the committee, for compliance with the guidelines and for consistency. The FAC will approach these reviews in the same manner that it currently reviews the APT sections of each College or School Plan of Organization.

RECOMMENDATION

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the attached guidelines (appearing immediately following this report) entitled "UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty" be adopted as official University of Maryland guidelines and be distributed to Colleges and departments to assist in the development of specific policies and procedures in each unit.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee on UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty

RECOMMENDED UM GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, AND PROMOTION OF PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

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

I. Rationale

In light of the important contributions made by Professional Track (PTK) Faculty 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. The guiding principles assumed in this document are the need for: transparency and accountability of rules, procedures, and processes; fair and equitable treatment of PTK faculty in appointment, evaluation and promotion; and meaningful inclusion of PTK faculty in the development and implementation of unit, College, or School policies and procedures. By adopting these guidelines for appointing, evaluating, and promoting PTK faculty, units will define how excellence in the PTK faculty ranks will be recognized and rewarded, thereby better serving the needs of both PTK faculty and the institution.

II. Implementation

A. The expectations outlined below are intended to guide units in creating policies and procedures without restricting them from implementing particular practices appropriate for the discipline or unit. The following guidelines set minimum requirements.

B. Policies and procedures related to appointment, evaluation, and promotion of PTK faculty may be created as individual policies or may be incorporated into Plans of Organization of departments and Colleges or Schools, depending on the preferences of the unit. Given that amending Plans of Organization can be a lengthy process, if a unit chooses to incorporate policies into its Plan, new policies and procedures shall be developed as soon as possible and implemented prior to formal incorporation into the Plan of Organization.

C. PTK faculty currently employed within the unit shall be provided with a copy of the unit's policies and procedures related to promotion and evaluation once such documents have been approved. PTK faculty hired by the unit after the development of these procedures shall be provided with copies prior to appointment. All unit policies and procedures shall be publicly available online.

D. Each unit will be responsible for determining a transition plan which addresses promotion and related concerns for current PTK faculty within the unit. Plans shall be created by a committee which must include voting representation from current PTK faculty, T/TT faculty, and unit administrators.

E. After they are developed, new unit-level policies and procedures shall be reviewed by the College and the Office of Faculty Affairs for compliance with University policy and with these guidelines. Likewise, new College-level policies and procedures shall be reviewed by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee. Existing policies are subject to the same review protocols. New policies and procedures will go into effect upon approval at the higher level, and the PTK faculty within the unit shall be informed of the new policies and procedures immediately following

approval. The Office of the Provost shall constitute a standing review committee to perform the review function described above .

III. Expectations for Units

A. Unit Plans of Organization shall specifically define faculty to include PTK faculty ranks as defined in the University of Maryland Policy on Professional Track Faculty (II-1.00[G]). Unit Plans of Organization shall address the role PTK faculty serve within the unit as members of the unit faculty.

B. PTK faculty shall be given representation on committees responsible for the creation, adoption, and revision of unit-level policies and procedures related to appointment, evaluation, and promotion of PTK faculty.

C. Policies and procedures addressing the appointment and promotion of PTK faculty shall include PTK faculty in such processes and specify that faculty eligible to vote on appointment and promotion of PTK faculty shall be at the same or higher rank than the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. Policies and procedures shall explicitly address mentoring of junior PTK faculty by senior PTK faculty, as well as mentoring of graduate students by PTK faculty. Policies and procedures should address how PTK faculty who are active in only one or two dimensions of the three dimensions evaluated for promotion, e.g., teaching, research and service, will be evaluated upon application for promotion.

D. Policies on merit pay for PTK faculty shall be incorporated either into the unit's existing merit pay policy, or into the policies and procedures for appointment, promotion, and evaluation of PTK faculty.

E. Qualifications required for appointment and promotion shall be explicitly stated. Alternatively, unit policies and procedures may state that the broad qualification requirements as defined in the University's APT policy (II-1.00[A]) apply and state exceptions to those requirements.

F. For title series in which professional experience can substitute for a degree requirement, unit policies and procedures shall provide discipline-specific baseline standards for the types and levels of professional activities that will constitute equivalencies for degree requirements.

IV. Appointment Contracts

A. Prior to the beginning of their assignment, all PTK faculty shall be provided with written appointment contracts created by the unit using the on-line contract management system of the Office of Faculty Affairs. An appointment contract shall stipulate the faculty rank, the term, the type of appointment, e.g., 9 month or 12 month, the annual salary rate, assignments and expectations, benefits, and terms regarding notifications for non-renewal. Information about unit-level resources and unit-level performance/evaluation policies and procedures may be referenced in the contract, and should be made available via 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 shall 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 specific faculty rank for a given appointment shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's effort, as indicated by the assignments and expectations in the contract. The rank shall be appropriate given the unit's criteria for appointments to such rank.

D. In accordance with provisions within University policy (II-1.00[A]), PTK faculty shall be given progressively longer contracts whenever possible, to provide additional stability for the faculty member as well as for the unit.

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).

V. Evaluation, Promotion, and Recognition

A. 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, shall be specified in the unit's evaluation and promotion guidelines. The expectation is that units shall craft guidelines which are appropriate to the specific duties PTK faculty perform, which may be different for those in research, instructional, and clinical ranks.

B. Units shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. Mentors shall 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.

C. PTK faculty cannot be prohibited from applying for promotion because of budget considerations. Units may choose to set expectations related to appropriate time in rank between evaluations for promotion, but such expectations shall not preclude a faculty member from seeking to be reviewed early or from opting not to be reviewed.

D. Evaluations of individual PTK faculty shall be based on the duties and expectations associated with the specific faculty rank and as described in the appointment contract.

E. Membership of review committees shall include PTK faculty.

F. Appointments and promotions to ranks at or above the Associate level or the Senior level will be reviewed and approved by the College. Appointments above the Associate or Senior level will also be reviewed and approved by the Provost, and the Provost may choose to institute additional

university-level review for PTK faculty promotions as deemed necessary to ensure that fair and equitable processes and procedures are being successfully implemented.

G. Units shall set deadlines during the academic year to submit applications for promotion. The expectation shall be that the review process shall be completed within an academic year and in time to permit any expected salary increase to take effect in the following academic year.

H. 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. All appeals shall be handled by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

I. For PTK faculty appointments that do not have maximum terms, as established in Policy II-1.00(A), a negative decision regarding an application for promotion does not automatically preclude renewal of the existing PTK appointment.

J. In cases of positive decisions regarding applications for promotion, the promotion shall be accompanied by an increase in compensation, subject to State budget constraints and directives from USM. Minimum increases in compensation shall be set annually by each College or School, as is done for tenured and tenure track promotions. Every effort shall be made to make salaries professionally appropriate and competitive to the extent allowed by available fiscal resources.

K. Promotions may not be rescinded, and future appointments shall be to the faculty rank granted through the promotion process.

L. A decision regarding the promotion of PTK faculty shall be based on the individual faculty member's performance, evaluated according to the promotion criteria set forth in the unit's published policies and procedures. Promotion decisions shall not be determined in relation to a unit-wide quota.

M. In the event a faculty member holds multiple appointments in different units or departments in the same PTK title series, generally, the PTK faculty member should apply for promotion in the unit in which he or she has the greatest % FTE appointment, e.g., the primary unit. Any decision to grant promotion by the primary unit must consider evaluative input from the other units in which the faculty member holds an appointment, however, the decision to grant promotion lies with the primary unit. Once promoted, the faculty member is entitled to be compensated at the rate of the higher PTK faculty rank in all of the units or departments in which he/she holds an appointment.

N. Departments shall include PTK faculty in awards for faculty. If the requirements for existing awards inherently preclude PTK faculty from being nominated, departments, colleges, and the institution should be encouraged to create appropriate awards for recognizing excellence among PTK faculty in the various domains of academic activity.

APPENDIX 1 - CHARGE FROM THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON UM GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, AND PROMOTION OF PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY

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".