



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	February 1, 2013
To:	Brad Hatfield Chair, Joint Provost/Senate APT Guidelines Task Force
From:	Mary Ann Rankin Senior Vice President & Provost Martha Nell Smith Chair, University Senate
Subject:	APT Guidelines
Senate Document #:	12-13-24
Deadline:	December 15, 2013

Provost Rankin and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) request that the APT Guidelines Task Force conduct a broad review of the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT).

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed a proposal entitled, Reform of the University APT Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-03). Following an extensive review of the proposal and the current review process, the committee concluded that a broader review of the APT Procedures should be conducted and that a formal cycle be established to review the yearly updates recommended by the Council of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs (CADFA). Specifically, the Task force is being asked to address the following:

1. Review the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/>).
2. Review the University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty II-1.00(A) as it relates to the APT Guidelines.
3. Consult with the Office of Faculty Affairs and representatives from CADFA to understand the current review/update process.
4. Review the standards used to select external evaluators.
5. Consider the elements and approaches used to evaluate candidates including: (a) the current process for requesting letters and evaluating letters and “non-responses” from external evaluators, plus (b) the evaluation of teaching and whether a teaching dossier is appropriate. The candidate notification process should be reviewed as well.

6. Consider how varying facets of scholarly activity such as innovation and entrepreneurship (including social entrepreneurship), application of intellectual property through technology transfer, interdisciplinary/collaborative research, and the application of research to solve existing problems in society, should be evaluated as part of the APT review process.
7. Consider the impact of new work-life balance policies and tenure delay on the APT review process, including ways in which presence of relevant practices should be deemed automatic.
8. Develop a regular review cycle and a process for subsequent reviews of the APT procedures and the APT Policy.
9. Review the APT Procedures used at our peer institutions including the construction of dossiers.
10. Consider developing a standard dossier format based on best practices at our peer institutions.
11. Consider how issues of diversity impact the equity of the APT process, for example, how faculty research on diversity issues or underserved populations can be evaluated fairly.
12. Consider methods for streamlining the entire APT process, but particularly so in the appointment of “star” senior appointments.
13. Consider how the APT Guidelines can be modified to encourage stronger, consistent, and more effective mentoring of junior faculty.
14. Please consult with the Office of Legal Affairs in developing your recommendations.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than December 15, 2013. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.