MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 18, 2015

TO: University Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Campus APT Committee and
              Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

SUBJECT: 2014-2015 APT Committee Annual Report

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

TENURE COMMITTEE	PROMOTION COMMITTEE
John Bertot, College of Information Studies	Bradley Boekeloo, Behavioral and Community Health
Robert De Keyser, Languages, Literatures and Cultures	Theresa M. Coletti, English
Don L. DeVoe, Mechanical Engineering	Sarah Eno, Physics
David Jacobs, Computer Science	Bruce Golden, Smith School of Business
Frances Lee, Government and Politics	Gregory Hancock, Human Development & Quantitative Methodology
Hui Liao, Smith School of Business	Clara Hill, Psychology
Martin C. Rabenhorst, Environmental Science and Technology	Isaak Mayergoyz, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Stephen B. Thomas, Health Service Administration	Jianghong Meng, Nutrition and Food Science
Kathryn R. Wentzel, Human Development & Quantitative Methodology	Sarah Oates, Philip Merrill College of Journalism

	Promotion w/ Tenure	Promotion to Professor / Principal Agent	New Appointment / Associate	New Appointment / Professor	Total
YES	29	44	2	3	78
NO	4				4
WITHDRAWN	10	9			19
TOTAL	43	53	2	3	101

Comments on the APT Results (up to 6/30/2015)

Denials in 2014-2015 at the level of promotion with tenure are at 9%, a percentage similar to the 9.5% rate in the period 2010-2014, as compared to the overall 6% rate since 2000. Denials at the **level of promotion to Professor/Principal-Agent level continue to be at 0% this year,** as they were the last two years – even though they were at 3% from 2000 through 2012. As usual, these data must be qualified by withdrawals (i.e., those who dropped from the APT process for academic reasons – not a better offer elsewhere), a type of information that has been kept only recently. **For 2014-2015, withdrawals are at 23% of cases originally expected for Associate Professors** (as compared to 12.7% in 2013-2014, 19% in 2012-2013, 16% in 2010-2011, 8% in 2011-2012 – combined average of 14%) and at **17% for Professors/Principal Agents** (in comparison, in 2013-2014 withdrawals were at 13% for promotions at this higher level, at 19% in 2012-2013, 21% in 2011-2012, 33% in 2010-2011 – combined average of 21.5%). Therefore, the combined rate of unsuccessful cases is approximately 33% for the tenure level and 17% for the professorial level. While for promotion to professor **these numbers are not significantly different from those last year or the previous year**, there is **a slightly significant increase in unsuccessful cases at the tenure level** (33% this year vs. 29% last year). The main reason for this increase is not in the denials (which remained constant) but in the withdrawals (which are nine percentage points above the average of the last five years). The Appendix has a brief discussion of associated demographic data, which are clearly **worrisome when it comes to underrepresented minorities.**

SUBSTANTIVE POLICY CHANGES

A Provost/Senate joint Task Force suggested major changes in policies and procedures related to the APT process in 2013, with substantive tasks related to the APT Process. Their recommendations were formally discussed in the Senate during 2014 and became official

policy after the Board of Regents approved the changes in the Spring of 2015. The following is a summary with the highlights.

APT CHANGES BY CONSTITUENCY
Campus-Wide

- Broader definition of scholarship as the discovery, integration, engagement and transmission of knowledge. Quality of scholarship still assessed through peer review, impact, and significance. Onus remains on candidate to present documentation that his/her work meets unit criteria.
- Entrepreneurial activities that enhance one or more of the three categories of teaching, service, and scholarship should be recognized for consideration in tenure and/or promotion reviews.

Unit Heads

- Communicate requirements for teaching portfolios to candidates, and other APT changes.
- If applicable, inform APT Review Committee Chair of any agreement of modified criteria and/or occurrence of tenure delay for candidates, to be referenced in dossier and letter requests.
- Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs encouraged to formally charge individual Department APT Review Committees prior to the review process, joined by the College Diversity Officers.
- Oversee development and implementation of unit standards for teaching portfolio and systematic peer reviews of teaching, as both are now mandatory dossier elements. For further guidance on the portfolio and peer reviews (including rubrics), please see the Faculty Affairs website.
- Faculty may request an agreement specifying modified criteria for tenure or promotion (e.g., if engaged in scholarship in multiple fields or that crosses boundaries of traditional disciplines). Agreement must be approved by the faculty and Chair of the first-level unit, the Dean, and the Provost.
- In cases of agreements of modified criteria, assist APT Review Committee with locating an outside faculty member knowledgeable in other applicable discipline(s) to serve in an advisory capacity.
- Oversee development and implementation of unit's mentoring plan, to be filed with the Office Faculty Affairs. There is more information on mentoring plans on the Faculty Affairs Website.
- Assign at least one mentor to tenure-track faculty; encourage faculty member to seek out additional mentors.
- Hold annual meetings with tenure-track faculty to review progress and development; provide written feedback after each such meeting.
- Provide for the mentoring of each Associate Professor, if desired by the faculty member.

- Notify all candidates for tenure (internal or external), in writing, of department action on the case. For internal candidates, the letter must include the department vote; for external candidates, the vote need not be included in the letter.
- Annual letter from University Administration reminding those involved in the APT review process the importance of conducting a fair, unbiased, and impartial evaluation.
- APT Chairs at all levels and unit heads tasked with ensuring that discussion and evaluation of candidates are fair and unbiased. Procedures to report perceptions of inappropriate discussions.
- There is a streamlined process for new appointments deemed to be highly competitive, thus warranting an expedited review.

Candidates

- Candidate may nominate collaborators as possible external evaluators, but should provide justification.
- Candidate may indicate if there are specific individuals in the field who might not be expected to give objective reviews as external evaluators.
- Candidates must submit a teaching portfolio including items such as course syllabi, reflective assessments, mentoring and advisement. Further guidance on teaching portfolios is on the Faculty Affairs website.
- Faculty may request an agreement specifying modified criteria for tenure or promotion (e.g., if engaged in scholarship in multiple fields or that crosses boundaries of traditional disciplines). Agreement must be approved by the faculty and Chair of the first-level unit, the Dean, and the Provost.
- Faculty will be assigned at least one mentor but are encouraged to seek out multiple mentors.
- Meet annually with chair to review progress and development; chair should provide written feedback after each such meeting.
- Candidate must review and sign/date the following documents at least two weeks prior to departmental deliberation on the APT case:
    - Summary statement of professional achievement
    - Reputation of publication outlets
    - Summary of student evaluations
    - Record of mentoring/advising/research supervision
    - Unit promotion criteria and agreement of modified criteria for promotion or tenure (if applicable)
    - Sample letter requesting external evaluation
    - Reports of peer evaluation of teaching
- Mentoring should be ongoing after tenure; unit heads should provide for the mentoring of each Associate Professor, if desired by the faculty member.

APT Review Committee Chairs / Advisory Subcommittees

- Annual letter from University Administration reminding those involved in the APT review process the importance of conducting a fair, unbiased, and impartial evaluation.
- Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs encouraged to formally charge individual Department APT Review Committees prior to the review process, joined by the College Diversity Officers.
- Invite candidate to submit list of specific individuals in the field who might not be expected to give objective reviews as external evaluators.
- Letters from candidate's collaborators may be included but must be justified.
- Evaluators should be leaders in the field regardless of institution.
- Initial email contact to establish evaluator's availability required. Examples of the email are in the Manual.
- Reference request asks for evaluation based on UM unit's criteria, not the evaluator's institution.
- Tenure delay text will be included in reference letter request and Summary Statement of Professional Achievements, stating that the faculty member shall not be disadvantaged because of the delay with an explicit statement to evaluate the candidate's dossier as if it were completed in the ordinary period of review. An example of the letter request is in the Manual.
- APT Chairs at all levels and unit heads tasked with ensuring that discussion and evaluation of candidates are fair and unbiased. Procedures to report perceptions of inappropriate discussions.
- APT reviews of cases with modified unit criteria should include a faculty member knowledgeable in other applicable discipline(s) to serve in an advisory capacity to the subcommittee and the Department APT committee.
- If applicable, candidate's approved agreement for modified unit criteria will be included in dossier in addition to standard unit criteria.
- Letter log will include date of response to emailed availability requests, and declines to evaluate still must be logged and included. A letter log template is in the Manual.
- In addition to Summary Statement of Professional Achievements, provide following documents to the candidate at least two weeks prior to departmental deliberation, for review and certification (signature/date):
    - Reputation of publication outlets
    - Summary of student evaluations
    - Record of mentoring/advising/research supervision
    - Unit promotion criteria and agreement of modified criteria for promotion or tenure (if applicable)
    - Sample letter requesting external evaluation
    - Reports of peer evaluation of teaching
- New campus guidelines on ordering of dossier elements to reduce duplication and place primary emphasis on the candidate's record and first-level review materials.
- APT voting faculty to be informed if a candidate took parental leave, stopped the tenure clock, or was on part-time appointment, and reminded that these are university-supported policies.

Voting Faculty

- Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs encouraged to formally charge individual Department APT Review Committees prior to the review process, joined by the College Diversity Officers.
- Importance of conducting a fair, unbiased, and impartial evaluation emphasized at outset of Unit APT meetings.
- APT voting faculty informed if a candidate took parental leave, stopped the tenure clock, or was on part-time appointment, and reminded that these are university-supported policies.

Staff

- Maintain records and inform Unit head and APT Chair if there is 1) an agreement for modified criteria, and/or 2) a delay of tenure for candidates.
- Candidate's approved agreement for modified unit criteria must be included in dossier, as well as standard unit criteria.
- Letter log includes answers to emailed availability requests; declines to evaluate still logged and included. A letter log template is in the Manual.
- Attention to new campus guidelines on ordering of dossier elements. A transmittal form template is in the Manual.

- Letter from University Administration reminding those involved in APT process the importance of fair, unbiased, and impartial evaluation.
- Procedures for reporting perceptions of inappropriate discussions.
- APT Chairs at all levels and unit heads tasked with ensuring discussion and evaluation of candidates is fair and unbiased.
- Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs encouraged to formally charge individual Department APT Review Committees prior to the review process.

TEACHING AND MENTORING

Since the Teaching Portfolio is a key element in these changes, it is important to reflect on what it should contain. Much like the promotion dossier itself, the Teaching Portfolio serves as a summary of a faculty member's teaching activities, with a personal teaching statement as the leading element. The statement should reflect on the faculty's activities, philosophy, development, and goals as a teacher, with the remaining components of the portfolio serving to provide details to the statement. As such, the portfolio is not fully comprehensive, but rather draws from key components of the instructor's teaching activities. While syllabi and student course evaluations are normally included, the portfolio should also include information about peer evaluation of teaching, evidence of student learning, engaging and innovative classroom activities, and a description of professional

development and growth as a teacher. As professional educators, we all can improve our craft and this goal of continual growth and improvement should be clearly represented in the final portfolio.

The following list of possible portfolio elements is not meant to be dogmatic or exhaustive, but simply provides examples and ideas of what may be included.

Personal Teaching Statement (2-3 pp.)

Description of teaching activities, teaching philosophy, growth as a teacher, attention to diversity and inclusion in teaching

Course-Related Materials

- Syllabi; course descriptions
- Enrollment and/or nature of students in classes
- Descriptions or examples of innovative assignments, activities, projects, portfolios, etc.
- If author of a textbook, record of its use at this and other institutions

Assessments

- Observations of teaching from colleagues or teaching programs (other than formal peer reviews of teaching)
- Self-evaluations from courses and changes made to subsequent courses
- Statements about teaching achievements from administrators
- Student comments or letters, including those from course evaluations; alumni ratings
- Learning outcomes assessments, including those at the unit level
- Placement of former students and advisees, in both academic and professional roles
- Responses to student or peer evaluations of teaching

Awards and Invitations

- Descriptions of honors/awards for teaching from the University, organizations, etc.
- Invitations to teach at other institutions
- Invitations to contribute to teaching literature

Training Taken (i.e., Professional Development) and Given

- Documentation from programs to assess or improve teaching (e.g., TLTC)
- Materials related to membership in organization dedicated to teaching discipline
- Evidence of mentoring given to colleagues on teaching

Instructional Advancements and Innovation

- Description of online forums or blended arrangements
- Curriculum development activities
- Development of learning outcomes assessment for unit or discipline
- Description of teaching outreach programs with K-12 populations or community
- Description of innovations promoting diversity and inclusion in curriculum

CHANGES IN PTK FACULTY

The comprehensive APT policy modifications that took place during the last academic year are not restricted to tenure/tenure-track faculty: fundamental changes occurred, also, for Non-tenure-track faculty, including an amendment in their designation. They are now referred to as Professional-Track (PTK) Faculty.

New Titles

The titles below were revised to provide a consistent set of titles for appointments defined by policy as parallel to the tenure-track titles.

OLD TITLE	NEW TITLE	COMMENTS
Assistant Research Scientist	Assistant Research Scientist	
Associate Research Scientist	Associate Research Scientist	
Senior Research Scientist	Research Scientist	"Senior" denotes level 2 appointment in other title series.
Assistant Research Engineer	Assistant Research Engineer	
Associate Research Engineer	Associate Research Engineer	
Senior Research Engineer	Research Engineer	"Senior" denotes level 2 appointment in other title series.
Assistant Research Scholar	Assistant Research Scholar	
Associate Research Scholar	Associate Research Scholar	
Senior Research Scholar	Research Scholar	"Senior" denotes level 2 appointment in other title series.
Clinical Assistant Professor	Assistant Clinical Professor	Aligns descriptor order with that of the Research Scientist, etc., title series.
Clinical Associate Professor	Associate Clinical Professor	
Clinical Professor	Clinical Professor	
Research Assistant Professor	Assistant Research Professor	Aligns descriptor order with that of the Research Scientist, etc., title series.
Research Associate Professor	Associate Research Professor	
Research Professor	Research Professor	
Assistant Artist in	Assistant Artist in Residence	

OLD TITLE	NEW TITLE	COMMENTS
Residence		
Associate Artist in Residence	Associate Artist in Residence	
Senior Artist in Residence	Artist in Residence	"Senior" denotes level 2 appointment in other title series.

The following titles were revised or created to provide a consistent set of titles for appointments that do not require a terminal degree or equivalent.

OLD TITLE	NEW TITLE	COMMENTS
Lecturer	Lecturer	
Senior Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	
	Principal Lecturer	Adds a third tier to the instructional title series.
Associate Agent	Agent Associate	Aligns "Associate" element with pre-revision Faculty Extension Associate title.
	Senior Agent Associate	Generally, provides 3 levels for PTK faculty in UME.
Faculty Extension Associate	Principal Agent Associate	
	Faculty Specialist	"Specialist" is a new title series created to provide a promotion ladder for faculty who provide specialized services for a unit.
	Senior Faculty Specialist	
	Principal Faculty Specialist	

Finally, there are titles for entry-level appointments that cannot be renewed beyond policy-specified terms.

OLD TITLE	NEW TITLE	COMMENTS
Research Associate	Post-doctoral Associate	6 years max.
Faculty Research Assistant	Faculty Assistant	3 years max.
Faculty Extension Assistant		
	Junior Lecturer	6 years max. Created for graduate students finishing their programs beyond their Graduate Assistantship.

Implementation

The Senate is also working with the Office of Faculty Affairs on an implementation plan to deploy these new titles, as appropriate, to our PTK faculty. It is expected that a detailed plan will be in place by the end of August 2015, and that unit and college procedures be

adjusted so as to accommodate these new titles in a timely manner. While the specifics of that plan cannot be reported in full detail yet, it is clear that it will affect departmental and college plans of organization.

IMPROVING DATA SYSTEMS FOR FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Such comprehensive changes in the APT policy will have a major impact on data systems pertaining to faculty. For perspective, the amendments to the APT policy regarding PTK faculty require evaluation of those faculty for promotion as appropriate. The population of PTK faculty is considerably larger than that of tenure track faculty. It is impossible to accomplish this goal, or to continue streamlining the APT process more generally so as to achieve fair and clear results in a timely manner, without state-of-the-art data systems for CVs, teaching evaluations, sponsored research, etc. This is the main reason why the Office of Faculty Affairs has procured a software package, *Lyterati*, for improving how the institution records and manages data related to faculty activity and accomplishments. While the system is supposed to maintain all records related to each faculty member's professional accomplishments in a searchable database, it is fair to say that the first year of parsing data from faculty has been challenging.

At the same time, there is no alternative: faculty data have to be managed in a way that this university has not yet seen. Efforts should be made to communicate as efficiently as possibly why this process is needed, and why collaboration from faculty is crucial. The contract with Entigence, the company developing *Lyterati*, is built in such a way that the university could take the database elsewhere if within another year results in the parsing and presentation of data for review purposes do not improve. At the same time serious thought must be given to whether the company is hearing the issues that have been raised and is doing something to remedy the most important problems. A faculty Advisory Board should be put in place to monitor this process, in the hope that it will improve but also with the determination to take drastic actions otherwise. The Advisory Board must also include experts from IT, IRPA, and should report directly to the Provost.

The Advisory Board should advise the Provost on guaranteeing that:

- Contributions that faculty report in Annual Activity Reports are usable in relevant reviews and automatically presented in official CV format.
- Grants data are read into the CV from the Office of Research Administration database.
- Lists of courses taught and student evaluations will be tabulated automatically.
- As the university adopts other recording and reporting systems (e.g. a content management system for teaching portfolios), *Lyterati* is able to pull relevant pieces of that information into APT dossiers.

- Once it is fully deployed, *Lyterati* provides the means to manage all levels of the APT process electronically, including promotion mechanisms for PTK faculty.

MENTORING ISSUES

Many of the problematic issues arising in the APT process appear to relate to the mentoring system, which is required by policy at the university. Changes in APT practice also include recommendations about mentoring:

- Faculty members will be assigned at least one mentor but are encouraged to seek out multiple mentors.
- Each unit must develop a mentoring plan, filed with the Office Faculty Affairs.
- Annual formal mentorship meetings should be held until the tenure review is complete.
- Mentoring should be ongoing after tenure, and Chairs should provide for the mentoring of each Associate Professor, if desirable to the faculty member.

A number of mentoring initiatives and programs have been instituted by ADVANCE and the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, supported by the Office of Faculty Affairs:

- ***Keeping our Faculties*** is a year-long mutual mentoring seminar designed to enhance the professional growth of early-career women faculty. Participants meet once a month with a senior woman professor to build a cross-campus peer support network, obtain information about tenure and promotion process, develop and refine career advancement materials, and discuss key aspects of career success.
- ***Advancing Together*** is a two-day workshop for women associate professors, designed to improve knowledge of promotion process, expand peer support networks, help faculty develop skills to strengthen professional portfolios, and enhance the sense of agency women faculty feel toward career advancement.
- ***Advancing Faculty Diversity*** is a year-long peer network for assistant and associate professors who are faculty of color. The objectives include improving participant knowledge of what matters in the tenure and promotion process, expanding peer support networks, and improving opportunities for collaboration.
- ***ADVANCE Professors*** are full professor women faculty assigned to each college to act as role models and catalysts within their colleges for improving work environments. ADVANCE professors mentor one on one and in small groups. They have been especially focused on career advancement for women assistant and associate professors and providing advice and encouragement to these groups.
- Faculty Affairs has been working with colleges to improve their faculty mentoring.

In addition, the Center for Health Equity, supported by the Office of Faculty Affairs, has offered a Master Mentor Training Program, based on a curriculum from the University of Wisconsin, to senior mentors on campus. Future plans include:

- Development of workshops on mentoring for mentors and chairs;
- Significantly strengthening mentoring of associate professors;
- Offering a workshop for newly tenured faculty.

Concluding Remarks

The 2014-15 APT cycle has seen various initiatives turn into actual policies, through the combined efforts of various offices of the Senate, the Administration, and beyond. It is clear that full completion of this agenda (extending it to PTK faculty and streamlining the process) will take years. This report acknowledges the critical nature of cooperation from the campus as a whole, and recognizes that matters as important as these may lead to unresolved tensions (in evolving policies, procedures, or practices). A transparent, rigorous, and fair APT process is key in maintaining the university as an institution of integrative excellence. On a last sobering note, readers are encouraged to carefully examine the ensuing demographic data, which can be summarized as follows: while significant improvements can honestly be seen in the role of women within the professoriate, underrepresented minorities continue to be left to the side. This is clearly unacceptable, and the challenge for the immediate future is how to help address this crucial deficiency.

APPENDIX: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

These demographics are about promotions from within the ranks at UMD and not appointments hired into UMD. Withdrawn cases concentrate on those that renounced the APT process without a better academic offer. As usual, caveats about small numbers apply.

TENURE CASES (2014-15)

	ALL CASES		DENIED CASES		WITHDRAWN CASES		DENIED & WITHDRAWN	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Total	43		4	9%	10	23%	14	33%
Female	20	47%	3	15%	3	15%	6	30%
Male	23	53%	1	4%	7	30%	8	35%
Asian	8	19%			2	25%	2	25%
Black	2	5%	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%
Latino	1	2%			1	100%	1	100%
White	21	49%	3	14%	3	14%	6	29%
Not Reported	11	26%			3	27%	3	27%

Of all cases in the system, 47% were women (last year the percentage was 37%, so an average in between is more realistic). 49% of those are white and 19% Asian. Only 5% of the population entering the tenure process are African American (10% last year) and 2% Latino (3% last year). Given the small numbers, a combination of denied and withdrawn cases (33% of the total population) offers one of the safest statistical representations for the sample size. Overall, 30% of the women had unsuccessful tenure cases – significantly less than men, with unsuccessful rates of 35%. (As was the case last year, within unsuccessful cases the proportion of withdrawn cases, vis-à-vis denied ones, is greater for men than for women, whose unsuccessful cases are mostly withdrawn rather than denied.)

100% percent of underrepresented minority cases were unsuccessful. It is not a matter of faculty of color: the rate of unsuccessful candidates for Asian Americans was 25%, significantly better than their White colleagues (at 29%). So the problem is specifically with underrepresented minorities. These numbers are so dramatic because we are only speaking of three cases. But that is a double embarrassment: *small numbers seeking tenure*, and *all of them being unsuccessful.* This has been a consistent theme for years.

The Office of Faculty Affairs has also kept data on cases that are so straightforward that they do not require a formal discussion at the university level: so-called slam-dunks.

'SLAM DUNK' CASES

	TENURE CASES				PROMOTION CASES			
	Total	% of Total Pop.	% of Total Pop. Type	% of Total Slam Dunks	Total	% of Total Pop.	% of Total Pop. Type	% of Total Slam Dunks
TOTAL	12	28%	28%	100%	27	51%	51%	100%
FEMALE	7	16%	35%	58%	9	17%	39%	33%
MALE	5	12%	22%	42%	18	34%	60%	67%
ASIAN	2	5%	25%	17%	4	8%	44%	15%
BLACK					2	4%	67%	7%
LATINO					1	2%	33%	4%
WHITE	8	19%	38%	67%	18	34%	51%	67%
NOT REPORTED	2	5%	18%	17%	2	4%	67%	7%

28% of the tenure cases were slam-dunks. Of those, the proportion among women (35%) was significantly larger than the comparable proportion of men (22%). This is a significant improvement (last year 41% of the slam-dunks were women, and two years ago, 36%).