

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

APT Guidelines and Manual

AY 2026-2027

March 2, 2026

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Publication of this Document..... | 1 |
| Kinds of Information | 1 |
| Promotion and Tenure Criteria..... | 1 |
| Overview of APT Process | 2 |
| The Structure of Reviews..... | 2 |
| Equity and Fairness in the Review Process..... | 3 |
| Proactive Procedure | 3 |
| Procedures to Follow When There are Observed Actions of Concern | 4 |
| Promotion and Tenure Deliberations: Memo from Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs | 5 |
| Useful Definitions | 9 |
| APT Review Committee | 9 |
| Advisory Subcommittee..... | 9 |
| Joint Appointment..... | 9 |
| Quorum | 9 |
| Votes possible for consideration of appointment, promotion or tenure based on criteria | 9 |
| Voting at the Unit (First Level) Level | 10 |
| Voting by faculty with joint appointments | 11 |
| Timeline for the APT Process..... | 11 |
| Information for the Candidate | 13 |
| The Review Process | 14 |
| Third-Year Review..... | 14 |
| Review for Tenure and/ or Promotion | 14 |
| Withdrawal from Consideration | 16 |
| Denial | 16 |
| The Candidate's Responsibilities | 16 |
| The Curriculum Vitae | 17 |
| Addenda to the CV..... | 18 |
| The Personal Statement | 18 |
| Addressing Disruptions to Faculty Work | 18 |
| Personal Statement..... | 19 |
| CV Annotation | 19 |
| Notice(s) from Granting / Contracting Agencies | 19 |
| Teaching Portfolio | 19 |
| Supplemental Materials | 20 |
| Information for Faculty Administrators..... | 21 |
| Appointment Considerations | 21 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Modified Tenure Criteria and Agreements | 21 |
| Information about Joint Appointments | 22 |
| Appointment split between two independent tenure granting Units (Departments, Schools, Colleges) | 22 |
| Appointment split between tenure home and a “permanent” (non-affiliate) appointment in a secondary Unit. | 24 |
| Appointment split between tenure home and a temporary (affiliate) appointment in a secondary Unit..... | 24 |
| Appointments to senior faculty ranks..... | 24 |
| Expedited Appointments | 25 |
| Steps in the Review of Faculty..... | 26 |
| Promotion or New Appointment with Tenure..... | 26 |
| Emerita / Emeritus | 26 |
| Reappointment to College Park Professor | 26 |
| New Appointment to Professor of the Practice | 27 |
| Reappointment to Professor of the Practice | 27 |
| Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee Members | 27 |
| External Evaluators | 27 |
| Sample Letter to External Evaluators | 30 |
| Reputation of Publication Outlets..... | 31 |
| Peer Evaluation of the Candidate’s Teaching..... | 31 |
| Summary Statement of Professional Achievements..... | 32 |
| Candidate Review of Non-Evaluative Materials | 33 |
| Report of the Department (First Level) APT Review Committee | 34 |
| The Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee’s Responsibilities:..... | 36 |
| Unit Chair (or Dean in Non-Departmentalized Colleges)..... | 37 |
| Peer Evaluation of Teaching..... | 38 |
| Chair’s Letter | 38 |
| Denial at the Department (First Level) Review..... | 39 |
| The Chair’s Responsibilities..... | 40 |
| College APT Review Committee Members..... | 41 |
| The College (Second Level) APT CHAIR and Review Committee’s Responsibilities | 42 |
| Dean..... | 42 |
| Dean’s Letter | 42 |
| Dean’s Notification to Candidate | 43 |
| The Dean’s Responsibilities | 43 |
| The Campus (Third Level) APT Review Committee’s Responsibilities | 44 |
| New Appointments and Reappointments..... | 46 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Professor of the Practice | 46 |
| Emerita / Emeritus Status | 46 |
| College Park Professor | 47 |
| University of Maryland Professor | 47 |
| Appointing UMB Faculty as University of Maryland Professors | 47 |
| Final Decisions, Concerns that Arise, and Appeals | 50 |
| Denial at the Unit (First Level) Review | 50 |
| Moving Through Higher Levels of Review | 50 |
| When Issues Arise During the Review Process..... | 51 |
| Appeals Process for Denial of Promotion | 51 |
| Grounds for Appeals | 51 |
| The Appeals Process | 52 |
| Information for Staff | 53 |
| Overview | 53 |
| Gathering Materials for the Dossier | 53 |
| Creating the Dossier | 54 |
| Bookmarks | 54 |
| Password Protection | 55 |
| Searchable Text | 55 |
| Candidate Verification Page | 55 |
| Elements of the Dossier | 56 |
| Transmittal Form | 57 |
| Candidate Verification Page | 57 |
| Curriculum Vitae (REQUIRED TEMPLATE) | 57 |
| Reputation of Publication Outlets..... | 58 |
| Personal Statement..... | 58 |
| Disruptions to Faculty Work | 58 |
| Summary Statement of Professional Achievements..... | 58 |
| Optional Rejoinder from Candidate | 59 |
| Promotion Criteria | 59 |
| Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria (if applicable)..... | 59 |
| Department APT Report..... | 59 |
| Optional Minority APT Report..... | 59 |
| Department Chair’s Letter | 59 |
| College APT Report | 59 |
| Dean’s Letter | 60 |
| Optional Teaching Statement | 60 |
| Student Feedback on Course Experiences Data (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)..... | 60 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Peer Teaching Evaluations / Information | 61 |
| Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision | 61 |
| Credentials of External Evaluators..... | 61 |
| Responses of External Evaluators..... | 61 |
| Candidate Notification from Chair | 61 |
| Candidate Notification from Dean..... | 62 |
| Letter Log of Evaluation Requests (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)..... | 62 |
| Sample Message Formally Requesting Evaluation (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)..... | 62 |
| Sample Message Requesting Availability (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)..... | 62 |
| Declines from Evaluators | 62 |
| Creating the Teaching Portfolio | 63 |
| Creating the Supplemental Materials File | 63 |
| Uploading the Dossier and Other Files | 63 |
| Appendix..... | 64 |
| CV Template..... | 64 |
| Letter Log | 64 |
| New Faculty Appointment Information..... | 64 |
| Candidate Notification of APT Decision | 65 |
| Transmittal Form | 66 |
| Candidate Verification Form..... | 67 |
| What's in the Dossier for Different Cases? | 68 |
| Sample Message Requesting Availability..... | 68 |
| Sample Letter to External Evaluator (Tenure and Promotion)..... | 69 |
| Sample Letter to External Evaluator (Promotion to Full Professor)..... | 71 |
| Sample Language for Cases of Denial of Promotion | 72 |
| Sample Language for Letters of Review for Adherence to Due Process..... | 72 |
| For letters to Associate Professors:..... | 73 |
| For letters to Assistant Professors and untenured Associate Professors undergoing mandatory review: | 73 |
| Template for Student Feedback on Course Experiences | 73 |
| Addressing Disruptions to Faculty Work | 74 |
| Personal Statement..... | 74 |
| CV Annotation | 74 |
| Notice(s) from Granting / Contracting Agencies | 74 |

Introduction

PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

The APT Manual and Guidelines are updated on an as-needed basis, with a date at the end of each section to indicate when that section was last updated. In order to be sure that you are using the most up-to-date copy of the Guidelines, please refer directly to the Faculty Affairs website (<http://faculty.umd.edu/apt-manual>).

If you are using a PDF copy of the APT Manual and Guidelines, please download an updated version. If you use the PDF version, you can download all the online material from <http://faculty.umd.edu/guidelines-links>.

This document was last updated on March 2, 2026.

KINDS OF INFORMATION

This manual contains three kinds of information and adheres to the following presentation styles: 1) Discussion of the **APT Policy, marked in bold, will be cited by section number (e.g., APT Policy Section III.B.1)**; 2) Mandatory procedures for dossier preparation are in this default font; and 3) *Useful suggestions for the content of the dossier and review process are printed in italics*. When there is a link to other information, it will be active.

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

As articulated in the University's **APT Policy (Section II)**:

Each college, school, and unit shall develop brief, general, written Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. The criteria should be reviewed periodically by the Unit, as deemed necessary, but no less frequently than once every five (5) years

The Unit criteria must establish expectations for faculty members in three broad areas: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of students; (2) performance in research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; (3) performance of professional service to the university, the profession, or the community.

Should Units modify their criteria during a candidate's pre-tenure and/or promotion period, the candidate may choose which set of criteria to use for consideration of tenure and/or promotion. Candidates must inform the Unit head and Unit APT committee chair in writing prior to the commencement of the review process regarding their choice of criteria.

Overview of APT Process

THE STRUCTURE OF REVIEWS

Faculty members must have their tenure homes in tenure granting units. While faculty members may have partial percentage appointments within secondary units, every tenure track faculty member must have a designated tenure home unit which serves as the primary unit for the tenure review process. The University has three organizational structures that determine the tenure review process:

1. Departmental. The tenure granting unit is structured as a Department, and Departments are combined into Colleges. There are three levels of review: Department, College, and University (which includes the University APT Faculty Review Committee, Provost, and President).
2. Schools within Colleges. The tenure granting unit is structured as a School, and Schools reside within Colleges (e.g., the School of Music; the School of Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies; the School of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures). There are three levels of review: School (equivalent of a Department), College, and University (which includes the University APT Faculty Review Committee, Provost, and President).
3. Non-Departmentalized Colleges. Non-departmentalized Colleges (the College of Information; School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; the School of Public Policy; the Philip Merrill College of Journalism; and the Robert H. Smith School of Business) have two levels of review: School/College and University (which includes the University APT Faculty Review Committee, Provost, and President).

Actions at the unit/College and University levels are governed by campus-wide policies. In accordance with Board of Regents Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure, II-1.00, an award of tenure and promotion can only be granted by an affirmative decision by the President based upon a formal review. Board of Regents Policy dictates that each institution have written procedures governing the promotion and tenure process. This institution's written procedures are set forth in the [University of Maryland Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures II-1.00\(A\)](#). A decision by the President to award tenure follows advice and recommendations from both administrators and a faculty APT Review Committee at each of three levels, as appropriate to their organizational structure: Department (or School), College and University.

Reviews are conducted as follows: (1) at the first level by (a) the unit Faculty APT Review Committee and (b) unit head; (2) at the second level by (a) the College Faculty APT Review Committee and (b) the Dean; and (3) at the third level by (a) the University Faculty APT Review Committee and (b) the Provost. In Colleges and Schools that are not departmentalized, there

are only two levels of review and recommendations prior to a final decision by the President; the College/School Faculty APT Review Committee and Dean function as the first level of review.

In this University APT Manual containing both the required procedures, implementation and recommended guidelines, suggestions and advice for tenure and promotion review, the terms “Department” and “Chair” are equivalent to the “first-level Unit” and “Unit head” (in the case of non-departmentalized Colleges and Schools, this refers to College/School and Dean).

EQUITY AND FAIRNESS IN THE REVIEW PROCESS

PROACTIVE PROCEDURE

To encourage a fair and equitable review process for the candidate that adheres to University policy and procedures, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs sends out a memo annually to all faculty review committees and administrators at each level reminding them of the importance of conducting a fair and unbiased evaluation (a copy of the memo follows this section) that comports with University policies, procedures, and expectations (e.g., confidentiality, mitigating conflicts of interest). This memo will state that reviews and evaluative discussions: 1) should avoid disparaging or prejudicial comments regarding the candidate; 2) cannot base the evaluation of the candidate on factors such as a candidate’s gender, race, sexual orientation or other protected personal characteristics; 3) cannot consider a candidate’s part-time status or any extension of the mandatory tenure review year authorized pursuant to policy, and that such candidates shall be evaluated according to the same criteria applicable to other candidates; and 5) must adhere to University confidentiality and conflict of interest mitigation requirements.

Chairs of the Unit-level APT review committees are to distribute the letter to the voting faculty at the inception of the review process. This letter shall be referenced prior to the evaluative meeting and when inappropriate discussions arise. In departmentalized Colleges, Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs and College Diversity Officers are encouraged to formally charge individual unit-level APT Review Committees prior to the review process, paying specific attention to equity-related issues. Additionally, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion will arrange to formally charge College APT Review Committees.

APT Review Committee members shall be informed when a candidate stopped the tenure clock, and informed that these are university-supported policies. The focus of discussion and decision-making in APT Review Committees should be on the candidate’s performance in meeting criteria set forth by the unit, College, and University, and not how long (i.e., an extra

year) it took to meet those criteria. This recommendation applies to faculty being evaluated for tenure, as well as those with tenure being evaluated for promotion.

Each candidate for tenure and/or promotion is to be evaluated independently vis-a-vis the unit criteria (or modified criteria, if applicable) based on the materials contained within the dossier at the time of the review.

PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW WHEN THERE ARE OBSERVED ACTIONS OF CONCERN

Should members of the APT Review Committee (as witnesses) believe that inappropriate comments have been made, or confidentiality has been breached (e.g., by APT committee members, candidates, or others outside the review process), or conflicts of interest require mitigation, they are encouraged to raise their concern during the meeting, citing the Associate Provost's letter. Units should determine what may constitute a conflict of interest based on University policy and expectations, as well as field/disciplinary norms prior to the commencement of APT deliberations. Conflict of Interest matters should be discussed with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, who will make a final determination in the matter, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs if necessary.

Individuals may also discuss the issue confidentially with the APT Review Committee Chair, or with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. Based on the issue(s) brought forward, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs may elect to take corrective action to ensure the integrity of the review process. The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will consult with the Senior Vice President and Provost, and any other necessary University offices, regarding possible corrective action(s). If deemed appropriate, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs may refer the matter of concern to another University office for further investigation and/or review before rendering a final decision. The decision of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs regarding any corrective action(s) is final.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 19, 2026
TO: Deans, Associate Deans for Faculty, Chairs, and Directors
FROM: John Bertot
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
SUBJECT: Promotion and Tenure (APT) Considerations and
Deliberations



As we begin the AY2026-2027 review cycle, it is useful to remind those involved in the APT process of our collective responsibilities to candidates, the University, and to the State of Maryland regarding the conduct of APT reviews. **Please share this memo with your College APT Committee Chairs, Department APT Committee Chairs, and faculty members serving on APT Review Committees.**

Chairs of first-level APT Review Committees are responsible for ensuring that eligible voting faculty members are aware of the contents of this memo, University APT policy, University procedures and guidelines, and the unit's approved guidelines and criteria for promotion and tenure. Please review pages two and three of this memorandum in particular, which discuss the conduct of APT reviews more specifically.

The deliberation and decision on promotion and tenure cases is important to the individual faculty member and vital to the University's pursuit of excellence. The overriding criterion for decisions about promotion and tenure is whether the decision is in the best interest of the University, the University System of Maryland, and the state of Maryland and, as such, is not about the attainment of a minimum threshold by candidates, but rather is forward-looking and focused on a candidate's capacity for continued and sustained excellence.

In the case of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the University assesses whether candidates have demonstrated the potential to become leaders in their field, in their unit, at the University, and in the community. In weighing the promotion to Full Professor, the University evaluates whether candidates have fulfilled that potential and will continue to be engaged contributors to the University's mission. Whether reviewing candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure or for promotion to full professor, the University considers the record of candidates as documented in their dossiers at the time of review to assess future promise and makes inferences about what candidates are likely to accomplish in the future based on how candidates have performed in the past.

Please note that, upon review and consultation with community stakeholders, the University is discontinuing the optional COVID-19 pandemic statement. The University recognizes that the current higher education environment is highly variable due to disruptions that faculty members may have experienced (e.g., the cancellation of competitively secured contracts and grants, criticisms of certain types or kinds of research/scholarship/creative works, changes in laws/regulations, supply chain issues, travel restrictions or bans, COVID-19, other). As noted in the [guidance](#) issued by the Office of Faculty Affairs in December 2025, candidates may discuss the disruptions they have encountered in their personal statements. As a reminder, the optional [COVID tenure delay](#) remains in effect until June 1, 2026.

The University is committed to ensuring a fair and impartial treatment of candidates throughout the promotion and tenure review process. Several key elements contribute to the integrity of the decision-making process, including, but not limited to:

- 1) Following the University's APT Guidelines and Policy, as well as established and approved unit procedures;**
- 2) Ensuring an independent review of each candidate based on unit criteria and the University's expectations for excellence;**
- 3) Maintaining confidentiality with respect to discussions and contents of current and past decision-making meetings;**
- 4) Avoiding conflicts of interest throughout the review process; and,**
- 5) Paying careful attention to evaluative statements and avoiding discussion of topics that may introduce bias into APT considerations.**

Following the University's APT Guidelines and Policy, as well as established and approved unit procedures

Administrators should familiarize themselves with the University's [APT Policy](#), the most recent University [APT Guidelines](#), and the unit criteria *prior to initiating APT cases*. Administrators of the APT process are responsible for ensuring the integrity of unit level APT deliberations and procedures. Administrators must follow the University's APT Policy and Guidelines throughout the entire process, and ensure adherence to approved unit level criteria and guidelines.

Ensuring an independent review of each candidate based on unit criteria and the University's expectations for excellence

Using only the unit's written and approved criteria, or written and approved modified tenure criteria if applicable, tenure and/or promotion reviews for each candidate must be conducted independently based on the materials contained within the dossier.

Maintaining confidentiality with respect to discussions and contents of current and past decision-making meetings

The confidentiality of APT deliberations is essential to the integrity of the review process, and applies to current and past APT deliberations. APT Committee members and/or administrators should not discuss candidate cases outside of scheduled APT meetings, with individuals outside the candidate's tenure and/or promotion review process, or with the candidates under review. More specifically, there should be no sharing of information with candidates under review other than at the prescribed times in the review process (e.g., to provide candidates with the opportunity to review materials such as the summary statement of achievements and reputation of publication outlets as required by University policy and procedures, or the candidate notification letters from the chair or dean). In addition, APT meetings may not be recorded or captured (e.g., photographs, screen captures) in any way. Further, cases that were reviewed previously or that will be reviewed in the future should not be discussed during another candidate's review.

Suspected breaches of confidentiality should be brought to the attention of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs who will conduct an initial review of the allegation(s). Based on the findings of initial review of the allegation(s), the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs may refer the matter to the Office of Integrity and Responsible Conduct for further consideration under the University's Policy on Faculty Professional Conduct ([II-10.00\(A\)](#)).

Avoiding conflicts of interest throughout the review process

APT Committee members should take precautions to avoid any conflicts of interest with candidates under review. Conflicts of interest can include, but are not limited to, personal relationships with a candidate (e.g., family member, spouse, or partner either within or outside the unit conducting the review), having served as the candidate's doctoral or post-doctoral advisor, and/or having significant collaborations with the candidate (e.g., co-authorship on multiple recent publications, PI/co-PI on current or recent grants). When such conflicts arise, eligible voting faculty members must recuse themselves from the review process and their votes recorded as mandatory abstentions. Units and/or eligible voting members should discuss what may constitute a conflict of interest with their Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs prior to the commencement of the review process, who will make a final determination in the matter. If necessary, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs may consult with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs in the matter.

Paying careful attention to evaluative statements and avoiding discussion of topics that may introduce bias into APT considerations

Evaluation of candidates may not be based on identity factors such as gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, or other protected personal characteristics. In addition, neither a candidate's part-time status nor any extension of the mandatory tenure review year authorized pursuant to University policy may be held against the candidate. Candidates who have availed themselves of such policies shall be evaluated according to the same criteria applicable to other candidates.

As a reminder, our tenure process is an “up or out” process. Candidates who elect to seek a tenure review prior to their mandatory review year are not eligible to seek a second tenure review should tenure be denied, unless they elect to withdraw during the review and prior to a final decision on tenure.

Eligible voting faculty members involved in APT deliberations have two pathways to raise objections if they perceive that the deliberations about candidates for promotion have been conducted inequitably or contained procedural violations: (1) within the decision meeting itself, or (2) through confidential discussions with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, who will review the matter and, if appropriate, make a final determination in accordance with University APT policy and procedures. Such discussions with the Associate Provost do not constitute a violation of the confidentiality of the review meeting and are authorized by the University Policy. Violations of APT policies and procedures during the review process may result in the need for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs to refer the matter to other appropriate University offices (e.g., the Office of Civil Rights and Sexual Misconduct, the Office of Integrity and Responsible Conduct) for further review in accordance with University policies and procedures. The violations may also necessitate corrective action by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, who will consult with the Senior Vice President and Provost, to ensure the integrity of the promotion and tenure process and fairness to the candidate(s) under review.

The Office of Faculty Affairs is available to consult with eligible voting faculty members and administrators throughout the APT process when questions or concerns arise.

USEFUL DEFINITIONS

APT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Group of voting faculty members at or above the rank sought by the candidate who deliberate and vote on whether to award appointment, promotion, or tenure. There are three levels of APT Review Committees: Department (First Level), College (Second Level), and Campus (Third Level). In the case of non-departmentalized colleges, there are two levels of APT Review Committees: College (First Level) and Campus (Second Level).

ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

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. This is sometimes referred to as a Records Preparation Committee.

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. Joint appointments can include appointments between tenure granting (i.e., two Departments) and non-tenure granting (i.e., a Department and an Institute) Units. All tenured and tenure track faculty must have a designated tenure home.

QUORUM

Number of eligible voting members needed to conduct a valid vote on whether to award appointment, promotion, or tenure based on codified Department methods of operation. Quorum is calculated based on the Department or College plan of organization, which should also include information on how absences affect the quorum. Quorum at the Campus level is set each year by the Campus APT Committee.

VOTES POSSIBLE FOR CONSIDERATION OF 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, doctoral or post-doctoral advisor, significant collaborator with 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 remotely (if the latter is allowed by Department or College plan of organization, or adopted Campus APT Committee rules)

The tenure or promotion case shall go forward to the next level of review if 50% of the faculty vote cast is favorable (or such higher percentage as may be established by procedures or guidelines of the Unit/level). (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**). Voluntary abstentions are a non-positive vote.

VOTING AT THE UNIT (FIRST LEVEL) LEVEL

Mandatory abstentions often arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice, e.g., at the College and unit 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 his or her tenure home and must abstain from voting in the second Unit (**APT Policy Section III.D.4; Section IV.B.1; Section IV.C.1**). A mandatory abstention may arise for other reasons, such as personal relationships with a candidate (e.g., family member, spouse, or partner either within or outside the unit conducting the review), having served as the candidate's doctoral or post-doctoral advisor, and/or having significant collaborations with the candidate (e.g., co-authorship on recent publications, PI/co-PI on current or recent grants). Units should discuss what may constitute a conflict of interest with their Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs prior to the commencement of the review process, who will make a final determination in the matter.

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 Section IV.A.1**).

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.

VOTING BY FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS

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

- Hold a tenured appointment in the University;
- Be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion;
- Hold a regular appointment in the Unit (with a given percentage of time attached);
- May only vote in a single Unit providing the plan of organization permits it, and at only one level of review; and
- 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 Section IV.A.1**).

TIMELINE FOR THE APT PROCESS

This schedule provides an estimated timeline of the APT review process, and it does not include every detail of the process. The review process is roughly one year in duration, and typically begins in the Spring prior to the review year.

| | FACULTY | ADMINISTRATION | STAFF |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| WINTER TERM | Prepare / update CV. Prepare personal statement. Develop list of external evaluators. Choose materials that will be sent to external evaluators. | Begin developing list of faculty who will be reviewed in the fall. Double-check for joint appointments and for non-mandatory reviews. | Finalize this year's dossiers for uploading to Faculty Affairs website. Make dossiers searchable. Add bookmarks, password. Set dossier display. Upload to Faculty Affairs website. Gather preliminary materials (e.g., promotion criteria, reputation of publication outlets) for next year's dossiers. |
| SPRING | Prepare / update teaching portfolio and supplemental dossier materials, such as selected publications. | Choose and prepare materials to be sent to external evaluators. Request external evaluations. | For each candidate, set up transmittal form. Prepare letter log. Prepare student evaluation of teaching summary tables. Prepare citation counts. |

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. These faculty may not vote on the candidate more than once.

| | FACULTY | ADMINISTRATION | STAFF |
|--------|------------------------------|---|--|
| SUMMER | | Schedule committee meetings. Follow up with external evaluators as needed. | Begin dossier for each candidate. Update letter log; add external evaluator letters as they are received. |
| FALL | Create CV addenda as needed. | Committee members prepare Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and provide this, along with other non-evaluative materials for candidate's review/signature. Department and College-level review committee meetings held. Notify candidates. Chairs/Deans write evaluative letters. | Update transmittal forms with meeting dates, votes. Add committee reports and Chairs', Deans' letters to dossier as they become available. |

Information for the Candidate

A candidate's preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. Soon after the candidate arrives, APT policy calls for the Unit Head to:

1. Provide the candidate with a copy of the promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which he or she will be evaluated (**APT Policy Section II, Section IV**), and
2. Appoint one or more senior faculty mentors (**APT Policy Section IV.A.3, Promotion, Tenure, and Emeritus Review, First-level Review, Mentoring**).

While each tenure-track candidate will be assigned at least one mentor, the candidate is encouraged to seek out multiple mentors. Suggestions include senior faculty in the Unit, who can provide valuable information regarding the history and culture of the Unit, as well as recently promoted faculty who can provide recommendations for navigating the promotion and tenure process. Mentoring should not end with an award of tenure, but should be continued if so desired by the candidate. Each Unit will offer mentoring by one or more members of the senior faculty to each Associate Professor, on an ongoing basis to support the professional development of the faculty member. Associate Professors may decline the offer for continued mentoring by formally notifying the Department Chair. Candidates should meet regularly with their mentors in order to seek guidance and obtain constructive feedback on progress toward meeting the Unit's requirements for tenure and promotion. Units should also help faculty members locate mentors in other Units, if desirable.

Review for tenure and promotion is the University's primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university. Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence and accomplishment in three areas: (1) research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service (**APT Policy Section II, Section IV**). The Board of Regents APT Policy also provides that consideration may be given to "creative activities or other activities that result in the generation and application of intellectual property through technology transfer." (**USM Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty, II.B.1**) Recognition in the tenure process will be given to the broad range of entrepreneurial, public engagement, and creative activities in which faculty engage, which Units may define in their criteria for tenure and promotion. These entrepreneurial and/or engaged scholarly activities must enhance one or more of the criteria on which faculty are evaluated (research, scholarship, and artistic creativity, teaching, and service) and should be consistent with the mission of the Unit and scholarly expertise of the candidate. Professional activity may be included in the area of scholarship, research, and creative activity if it meets the evaluative criteria of expertise, peer review, impact, and

significance. Unit criteria should define excellence, impact, and other expectations for tenure and promotion.

Candidates should proactively contact their unit head to seek a copy of the Unit's promotion and tenure guidelines if, for some reason, the Unit Head has not shared them with the candidate within two months of the start of their appointment.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

There will be a formal, intermediate review of the candidate's progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion in the third year of appointment (**APT Policy Section IV.A.3**). This review should include a formal evaluation of the candidate's progress in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and will generally not involve external evaluators. A copy of the third-year review letter will be provided to the candidate and filed in the office of the next-level administrator.

REVIEW FOR TENURE AND/ OR PROMOTION

In general, candidates for promotion and tenure undergo three levels of review:²

1. Department. The first level of review is conducted by the candidate's tenure home, and is typically a Department. If the candidate is seeking promotion and tenure within a non-departmentalized college, the first level review is the college.
2. College. The second level of review is conducted by the college in which the candidate's tenure home department resides. If the candidate is seeking promotion and tenure within a non-departmentalized college, the second level review is the Campus (Campus APT Committee, Provost, President).
3. Campus. The third level of review is conducted by the University (Campus APT Committee, Provost, President).

Candidates for promotion and tenure will be reviewed at the first level (typically a Department) by the first level APT Review Committee, and the case will be voted on by all faculty members who are at or above the rank (e.g., Associate Professor and/or Professor, Senior and/or Principal Agent) the candidate is seeking. If the candidate holds a joint appointment, the dossier may be reviewed by the APT Review Committee of the secondary Unit as well (prior to review in the tenure home). Following the committee review, the Department Chair will evaluate the dossier. Next, the dossier is reviewed by the College level APT Review Committee,

² Non-departmentalized colleges/schools (e.g., the College of Information, the School of Public Policy, the School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation, and the Robert H. Smith School of Business) only have two levels of review, college/school and campus.

by the Dean of the College, and finally, it is sent to the Campus level APT Review Committee, which makes a recommendation about tenure and promotion to the President, through the Provost. These reviews usually take place during the sixth year of the appointment. Some faculty may seek a non-mandatory (i.e., early) tenure review, and others may receive one or more delays of their mandatory tenure review, following campus policy on extension of time for tenure review (**University Policy Section II-1.00(D)**). From start to finish, the APT review process takes about a year, though candidates should be looking ahead to tenure review from the day they begin at the university.

Because the tenure dossier will be reviewed by so many people who may or may not be familiar with the candidate, the candidate's work, or the field in which the candidate's work resides, *the information provided in the dossier must:*

- Adhere to University formatting and presentation requirements, including a CV that conforms to University formatting requirements. If candidates and Units choose to use a curriculum vitae that does not conform to the University formatting requirements as the CV sent to external evaluators, the dossier submitted for University review **must also include a CV in the University format;**
- Include only University permissible elements (required or optional);
- Ensure that the included elements within the dossier adhere to the rules for those elements (e.g., a maximum of five (5) pages for the personal statement); and
- Identify clearly the candidate's contributions to and impact(s) on their field of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities (this is especially important for candidates who engage in collaborative scholarship).

In all cases, the dossier should be complete, well-prepared, and clear. It is the responsibility of mentors, Units, administrators, and coordinators to ensure that dossiers forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs for University-level review are accurate and complete. Dossiers that fail to meet University requirements will delay the review process and impact the University's ability to conduct a timely review, and thus may delay notification to candidates about the outcome of their review. **Dossiers that present multiple deviations from expected format and content may be sent back to the Units for reconsideration.**

The information in the dossier must remain the same as it moves from one review level to the next, other than any necessary addenda to the CV. Following consideration by the college level APT review committee, further addenda to the CV must be forwarded from the dean's office to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

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 Section IV.A.5**) or Dean in the case of non-departmentalized Colleges. Copies of the letter of withdrawal should be forwarded to the Dean, the Chair of the APT Review Committee, 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 terminal one-year appointment at the individual's current rank (**APT Policy Section IV.F.4**). This terminal appointment does not apply for withdrawals by candidates for early tenure or promotion to Professor/Principal Agent. The decision of a candidate to withdraw from the consideration for tenure and/or promotion is final.

DENIAL

If either the Department APT Review Committee or the Chair supports the case, it goes forward (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**).

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 by electronic and certified mail. 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 Section IV.A.5**). Certification from the next level administrator should be forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Providing the curriculum vitae in the required [University approved format](#). The document must be signed and dated by the candidate to indicate that it is a *complete* and *accurate* record of accomplishments as of the date signed and submitted by the candidate.
- Providing a Personal Statement which makes a case for tenure and/or promotion based on the facts in the *curriculum vitae*, on the Department's criteria for Promotion and Tenure, and on the perspective of achievements in the context of the discipline.
- Suggesting the names of at least three or more qualified external evaluators (**APT Policy Section IV.A.2**). These should be widely recognized authorities in the field. *The candidate may not contact evaluators* to determine their willingness to provide information, or to inquire about the contents of the evaluation. The evaluators nominated by the candidate should be familiar with the candidate's work, but should not be collaborators. It is highly recommended that candidates provide up to eight (8) names of potential external evaluators, to nominate more than three, in case one or more of the nominees is not available to serve as an external evaluator. To avoid any potential conflicts,

candidates should disclose any connection (i.e., collaboration) that may influence the objectivity of the evaluator along with the list of names of potential external evaluators.

- Providing a teaching portfolio with documentation (e.g., syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, teaching evaluations).
- Providing publications or other forms of scholarship.
- Selecting samples of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities 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 APT Review Committee (e.g., of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of awards, clarifications regarding CV items, clarification regarding nominated external evaluators).

THE CURRICULUM VITAE

Candidates *must use* the University-formatted CV to record their activities and accomplishments in the areas of Research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; Teaching, advising, and mentoring; Service; and if applicable, Extension. The CV should present an accurate portrait of the candidate's accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible. The CV must be signed and dated when given to the staff member who will create the tenure dossier. This indicates that it is up to date and accurate (**APT Policy Section IV**). The CV will be included in each request for external evaluation.

The CV may be annotated by the candidate. Examples of annotations may include authorship order notations, student author designations, specific contributions to multi-authored published works, or other notations that serve to contextualize CV activities. The [University formatted CV template](#) is available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website.

*Note: when published 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 or herself (including placement in the total author list). That is, if a candidate named "Candidate" is the 97th author, the citation may be listed as: Smith, Jones, Johnson...Candidate (97th)...Marshall, Dennis, Kemp (total of 189 authors). Candidates may designate the identity of the author with intellectual leadership on jointly authored papers (if this designation can be appropriately ascertained) by using * or placing that name in bold, and identifying which co-authors they mentored as undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, faculty research assistants, and junior faculty. In some Units, the designation with * and bold may be inappropriate for the culture of the area; a Unit with the approval of its college may choose a policy of abstaining from these designations. When the research is published in a foreign language, the translation of the title should be included.*

ADDENDA TO THE CV

If there are subsequent changes to the candidate's CV, such as additional funding or new publications, they may be recorded as an addendum to the CV, which can then be included in the dossier. If the dossier has already been transmitted to the campus level, the addendum must be sent through the dean's office. The addendum must also be signed and dated.

THE PERSONAL STATEMENT

This statement provides candidates with the opportunity to make a case for their promotion based on a demonstrated record of achievement in research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity, teaching and mentoring, and service. The statement ordinarily describes the questions addressed by the candidate, explains their importance to the candidate's field, and indicates progress made in addressing these questions and directions of future creative work (**APT Policy Section IV**). It is incumbent on candidates to show that the work calls upon their academic and/or professional expertise, and to demonstrate the excellence of their work based on the Unit's criteria for excellence, using such evidence as:

- Peer review
- Impact
- Quality
- Significance/Innovation

If the candidate has been involved in collaborative activities, the candidate should clearly explain the extent of participation and type of contribution(s) they have made to the collaborations.

Faculty can elect to include the impact of disruptions on their research/ scholarship/ creative works, teaching and mentoring, and service activities as part of their personal statement. For more information, see *Addressing Disruptions to Faculty Work*, below.

These statements must be no more than five (5) pages, and should avoid the introduction of "protected class" information about the candidate (e.g., gender, race, disability), and be directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate's field. The personal statement must be signed and dated. The statement must be included in each request for external evaluation. The document may not be changed after it is given to the APT Review Committee and sent to external reviewers (**APT Policy Section IV**).

ADDRESSING DISRUPTIONS TO FACULTY WORK

Faculty members may elect to describe the impact of disruptions (external circumstances) on their work as part of the promotion and tenure review process through their Personal

Statements, CV annotations, and documentation (e.g., notification of contract/grant cancellations from funding agencies).

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Faculty can elect to include the impact of disruptions on their research/ scholarship/ creative works, teaching and mentoring, and service activities as part of their personal statement that is included in the dossier and goes out to external letter writers.

Examples of disruptions may include, but are not limited to, grant/contract termination, funders no longer support the a particular domain or type of research/scholarship/creative work, supply chain or procurement challenges that have negatively impacted productivity or ability to conduct research, the discontinuation and/or removal of public data collection activities and datasets.

CV ANNOTATION

Faculty members may elect to annotate their CV that is submitted for tenure and/or promotion reviews. OFA recommends the below annotation for grant/contract cancellations/terminations.

After the normal citation for a grant, contract, or award, include an asterisk (*) by the end date for period of the award, and, following the citation include a note similar to the following example: *Note: This grant/contract/award was terminated on [date of termination] by [name of funding agency terminating the award] due to [reason provided, if any, by the funding agency; if no reason provided, indicate "for unknown reasons."].

NOTICE(S) FROM GRANTING / CONTRACTING AGENCIES

Candidates may elect to include in their review materials, as evidentiary documentation, the official notice(s) received from funding entities cancelling/terminating their grants and/or contracts, or requests for modifications to their grants/contracts. If provided, such notices would remain internal to the University and not shared with external evaluators (e.g., external letter writers). These would be included in the Supplemental Materials dossier.

TEACHING PORTFOLIO

In addition to materials for the tenure and/or promotion dossier, the candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio, according to Department guidelines, which could include the following types of items: course syllabi; a statement of teaching philosophy; a statement about how the candidate addresses diversity and inclusion in teaching; reflective assessments; learning outcomes assessment materials; and mentoring accomplishments, such as placement of advisees in academic and professional positions. Note that the Teaching Portfolio, and its contents, are the responsibility of the candidate to assemble. Candidates are encouraged to review [the guidance](#) from the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC) regarding

teaching portfolios. APT committees should not insert non-candidate content into the portfolios.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

The candidate may wish to include representative pieces of scholarship or descriptions of awards and honors in an optional supplemental dossier. If the materials chosen for inclusion are publicly available on a website not under the candidate's control, the candidate is advised to include a description of the item and a link, rather than copying the full item into the supplemental dossier.

The supplemental materials file is a place for *representative* scholarship and other extraordinary materials. The candidate should choose items for inclusion carefully. The supplemental materials should not exceed 150 pages total.

Note: If a website or other online repository is used to serve as a means to provide candidate supplemental materials, candidates and the first level review APT Committee Chair must ensure that the materials are fixed and cannot be altered by the candidate or others as dossiers move to higher levels of review.

Information for Faculty Administrators

APPOINTMENT CONSIDERATIONS

MODIFIED TENURE CRITERIA AND AGREEMENTS

University policy permits the creation of modified tenure criteria (**APT Policy Section II**). Situations that may necessitate modified tenure criteria include, but are not limited to, candidates who:

- Engage in emerging scholarship that spans more than one discipline, or has a non-traditional approach to an established discipline;
- Work in multiple traditional disciplines; or
- Are involved in scholarship outside that of the dominant model of their tenure homes.

Any exceptional arrangement that requires a modification of criteria for tenure and/or promotion shall be specified in a written agreement from the time of appointment up to the third-year review for untenured candidates, or at any time following the award of tenure, and shall be approved by the faculty and administrator of the first-level Unit, by the Dean of the school or college, and by the Provost (**APT Policy Section II**).

In cases where there is an agreement for modified criteria for tenure and/or promotion, Units should consider identifying alternative venues and forms of dissemination of products of scholarship that would be acceptable alongside more traditional dissemination in their criteria for tenure and promotion. Examples might include:

- Research or scholarly essays published in refereed journals or books, or accepted for publication in journals or books outside one's discipline;
- Peer-reviewed handbooks;
- Cross-disciplinary analysis of extant literature;
- Popularizations or applications of scholarly research and theory in journals; and/or
- Software applications or other media products.

In reviewing candidates with agreements for modified criteria, APT review committees should include a professor knowledgeable in other discipline(s), from on or off campus, to serve in an advisory capacity to both the Advisory Subcommittee and the Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee. The Unit may wish to have this professor present at the APT Review Committee meeting, in a non-voting capacity, in order to provide context for the candidate's work. The Chair of the Advisory Subcommittee for the candidate should ensure that some of the external evaluators are from scholars who conduct research in the other discipline(s), or of a similar nature to that of the candidate. Faculty involved in the third-year review and the Department

(First Level) APT Review Committee should be provided with the agreement as part of their deliberations. Additionally, the executed agreement must be signed and dated by the candidate and included in materials for external evaluators, as well as in the APT Dossier for review at all levels.

If the candidate holds a joint appointment between tenure granting Units, all Units in which the candidate holds appointments must agree upon and use the modified tenure and/or promotion criteria for the review.

INFORMATION ABOUT JOINT APPOINTMENTS

New joint appointments should include a copy of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the two participating Units. This MOU should also be sent to the candidate. Ordinarily, the memo specifies the:

- Tenure home;
- Division of responsibility and workload expectations (e.g., service, teaching) for the line and, where appropriate, arrangements for allocation of DRIF money, lab and office space; and
- 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 Unit (Department or College) is referenced here as primary, usually the Unit with the greatest fraction of the appointment line. It is the prerogative of the primary Unit to grant tenure. However, because the rank held by an individual must be consistent across Units, the primary Unit needs to consider advisory input from the secondary Unit (e.g., an Institute, other academic Unit) as part of the APT review. The tenure home Unit may wish to have a representative from the secondary Unit present at the APT Review Committee meeting, in a non-voting capacity, in order to provide context for the candidate's work. The following scenarios reflect three different kinds of joint appointment.

APPOINTMENT SPLIT BETWEEN TWO INDEPENDENT TENURE GRANTING UNITS (DEPARTMENTS, SCHOOLS, COLLEGES)

At the inception of the review, the Chairs (or Directors) of the primary and secondary Units are encouraged to coordinate the timing of the review process to obtain timely input from the secondary Unit. 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,

which then delivers the report to the respective Units for a decision. The below table provides an overview of the process.

Outline of the Joint Appointment / Review Process

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

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.

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. The primary Unit incorporates its input (from faculty and Unit administrator) into the dossier, to forward it to higher levels of review.

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 inform and invite the APT Review Committee Chairs and administrators to discuss the case.

APPOINTMENT SPLIT BETWEEN TENURE HOME AND A "PERMANENT" (NON-AFFILIATE) APPOINTMENT IN A SECONDARY UNIT.

If a candidate holds a permanent appointment (i.e., with an Institute) 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 relevant (at rank) faculty in the Unit. 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.

APPOINTMENT SPLIT BETWEEN TENURE HOME AND A TEMPORARY (AFFILIATE) APPOINTMENT IN A SECONDARY UNIT.

The secondary Unit Chair/Director writes an evaluative letter to the primary Unit Chair, which is available to the primary Unit faculty before they vote. Faculty in the temporary Unit do not vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO SENIOR FACULTY RANKS

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 tenure review by University APT review 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, however, for an Academic Year start date (August 23 for 9-month appointments), dossiers should be submitted to the Office of Faculty

Affairs by no later than June 1.³ All requests for new appointments must be accompanied by a separate memo that provides the information on the New Faculty Appointment Information Form (see Appendix), required for presidential approval of the appointment.

New faculty hires that carry tenure must undergo a misconduct review process prior to the granting of tenure. Units must submit a signed [Authorization to Release Information](#) so that the Office of Faculty Affairs may conduct the review.

Dossiers for new appointments differ slightly from dossiers of candidates being promoted from within. They lack a Summary of Professional Achievements and Personal Statement, and may lack teaching evaluations (peer or student). Additionally, the dossier for a new appointment is not required to include a teaching portfolio, though the creation of a teaching portfolio is recommended. Such dossiers 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.

As there is generally no campus level committee review for a new appointment to Associate Professor or Senior Agent without tenure, this type of dossier includes only letters from the Dean, the Department Chair, and external evaluators, along with the candidate's CV and other supporting documents, if they exist. Based on these documents, the Provost will make a recommendation to the President regarding the appointment.

EXPEDITED APPOINTMENTS

In cases where a Unit has identified a potential faculty hire it has reason to believe is highly competitive/regarded and warrants an expedited review (sometimes referred to as a "target of opportunity" appointment), the review process can be streamlined. It is anticipated that there would be relatively few appointments of this nature. To qualify for this streamlined process, candidates would be nominated by both the Chair and the Dean and approved by the Provost's Office. Such candidates normally would hold tenure and the comparable rank at another institution. The streamlined process could also be used for scholars considered for administrative positions. In requesting an expedited tenure review process, the request should

³ For faculty with 12-month appointments intended to start July 1, dossiers should be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by no later than April 15.

include measures of impact of the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activities as appropriate to their field(s) (e.g., citations, h-index, reviews of performances, etc.).

Appointments at this level for consideration of tenure could substitute three evaluative letters from the search process for the three external reviewers nominated by the candidate, and the candidate's CV submitted in connection with the search may be used, and need not be signed. The review process would proceed as follows: (1) the first-level review would take place per current practice in that Unit; (2) a review by a three-person ad-hoc committee formed by the Dean (composed of current College APT Review Committee members); (3) a review by the College Dean; and (4) a review by the Provost and final decision by the President. For non-departmentalized Colleges, the review at the campus level should include a review by an ad-hoc committee formed by the Provost with a minimum of three persons drawn from members of the current University APT Review Committee.

STEPS IN THE REVIEW OF FACULTY

Different types of faculty appointments undergo different review processes, as articulated below.

PROMOTION OR NEW APPOINTMENT WITH TENURE

Includes promotion or new appointment to associate professor with tenure, professor, senior agent, principal agent, and College Park professor.

1. Department APT Review Committee
2. Department Chair
3. College APT Review Committee
4. Dean
5. Campus APT Review Committee
6. Provost
7. President

EMERITA / EMERITUS

1. Department APT Review Committee
2. Department Chair
3. Dean
4. Provost
5. President

REAPPOINTMENT TO COLLEGE PARK PROFESSOR

1. Department Chair
2. Dean

3. Provost
4. President

NEW APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSOR OF THE PRACTICE

1. Department APT Review Committee
2. Department Chair
3. Dean
4. Committee of Associate Provosts
5. Provost
6. President

REAPPOINTMENT TO PROFESSOR OF THE PRACTICE

1. Department Chair
2. Dean
3. Committee of Associate Provosts
4. Provost
5. President

UNIT (FIRST LEVEL) APT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The First Level APT Review Committee has the key responsibility of preparing and soliciting review materials that form the foundation of the candidate's dossier. Specific responsibilities include:

- Choosing external evaluators, and requesting and securing their evaluations;
- Evaluating the candidate's publications (e.g., quantity, quality, impact, placement) and preparing a report on the reputation of publication outlets in which the candidate has published;
- Gathering reports of peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching and summarizing them;
- Creating the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements; and
- Evaluating the candidate according to the Department Promotion Criteria.

Some Units employ subcommittees (often referred to as a Records Preparation Committee) to develop some of the above materials. If multiple subcommittees are employed to work on concurrent promotion and/or tenure cases, the subcommittees should standardize their processes to ensure uniform and equitable treatment of candidate reviews.

EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

The Review Committee shall solicit letters of evaluation using the University's letter solicitation template (see Appendix) from at least six widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from

a list that shall include individuals nominated by the candidate. The expectation is that the external evaluators will be full professors or equivalent, are able to provide an independent review of the candidate's accomplishments, are able to identify the impact of the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activities (this is especially important for candidates who engage in extensive collaborative work), and are located at peer and/or highly regarded institutions/Units (e.g., Big 10 University, top ranked academic Unit, respected research institute such as CERN). Among the letters requested, at least three and at most one-half must be from persons nominated by the candidate (**APT Policy Section IV.A.2**). The Chair of the Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee should receive suggestions of potential external evaluators from the candidate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to disclose any connection (i.e., collaboration) that may influence the objectivity of the suggested evaluators. The Committee should select evaluators from the candidate's list and must also choose evaluators from their own list. If the candidate has a joint appointment with a tenure granting secondary Unit, the secondary Unit must be consulted on the choice of external evaluators, which is also recommended for faculty who have agreements for modified Unit criteria. Also see the section on **Information about Joint Appointments**.

At a minimum, six letters must be requested from evaluators who are not the candidate's mentors and collaborators. Examples of collaborators include co-authorship⁴ on any published or unpublished peer-reviewed work or work in progress; co-PIs/senior personnel on funded activities; the candidate's advisor or advisee; or the candidate's mentor. The following would not be considered collaborators: an editor of a volume in which the candidate has a chapter, or vice versa; persons who have served on the same committee, taskforce, or council for professional or other organizations; co-organizer of a workshop; member of a former Unit of the candidate with whom there were no co-authored projects or committee memberships.

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 (i.e., four or more years ago) collaboration.

In some fields, it is increasingly common to have large-scale initiatives that yield extensive collaborations (e.g., co-authorship in the tens to hundreds, multiple teams funded by the same grant/sponsor). With appropriate disclosure, justification, and adherence to the

⁴ Units should consult with the Office of Faculty Affairs regarding co-authored works that involve large-scale collaborative work with numerous co-authors.

principle of independence, it is permissible to select individuals from such collaborations as external evaluators.

It is recommended that the list of external evaluators and their credentials, as well as justification for including a greater proportion of collaborators be vetted by the Dean's office prior to solicitation of letters. The Committee should solicit letters well in advance of their deadline. Initial contact shall be made via email to establish whether the evaluator is available to provide a letter within the required time frame. The email should include an explicit deadline for reply in order to determine the need for contacting additional evaluators. The goal is to establish a consistent protocol for initiating contact and to minimize the receipt of uninformed comments prior to an external evaluator's assessment of the candidate's complete portfolio. Once the evaluator has agreed, a formal packet of materials should be distributed. A reminder email shall be sent within one week of the deadline if the letter is still outstanding at that time. Example text of such emails is provided in the appendix; all such correspondence shall be recorded in the letter log. **Note:** *per University APT policy, the candidate should be provided a copy of the external evaluator letter template (generic, without any specific external evaluator information) for review. Candidates should receive a copy to review at least two weeks prior to request letters being sent to the selected external evaluators.*

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 formally decline to write. Copies of the review declines must be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted, and Committees should avoid any prejudicial discussion regarding declines or non-answers. 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). A template for the letter log is available on the Faculty Affairs website (copied in the Appendix) providing the appropriate format. 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 are not included in the dossier and cannot be used for evaluative purposes during deliberations.

The expectation is that each dossier will contain at least six external letters, of which no more than half should be from the candidate's list. Though rare, there are times when all six requested letters are not received. Dossiers with no fewer than five letters may come forward, however, Units should detail their efforts to secure the sixth letter in the letter log. In addition, the Unit APT Committee Chair should discuss the matter with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs prior to the Unit's APT Committee scheduled meeting and vote. If it appears that fewer than

five external letters may be received, the Unit APT Committee Chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs should discuss the matter with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs prior to any further action on the case.

The letter log should clearly indicate which evaluators are collaborators with, or mentors of, the candidate. Once the list of external evaluators is finalized, their credentials should be summarized with a paragraph for each evaluator. In the event that an evaluator is a collaborator or mentor of the candidate, an explanation and justification for the choice should be included along with the credentials of that evaluator. CVs of the evaluators should not be included. The order of the credentials paragraphs should mirror the order of letters in the dossier. The credentials of the evaluators should be evaluative in nature, rather than a “cut and paste” bio from an evaluator’s website, for example.

The contents of the letters must be shared with eligible voters at each level of review, however, these letters are highly confidential and must 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. Eligible voters may not discuss the selection of external evaluators, or letters received from external evaluators, with candidates.

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 in time for consideration by the Unit APT Review Committee. ***Letters that arrive after the APT Review Committee has met and voted on the case can neither be considered nor included in the dossier.***
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation. The translation should note the method (e.g., individual, automated tool such as Google Translate) and date of the translation. If translated by an individual, the individual should sign the translation.
- The dossier should indicate clearly whether the evaluator was nominated by the candidate, or by the committee.

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Unit (First Level) Review Committees should use the University’s external evaluator letter template to solicit candidate letters (see Appendix). ***Specific items for evaluation may be added, when appropriate, and after review and approval by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.*** Prior to distribution to external evaluators, a sample of the preliminary email requesting availability and a sample of the letter requesting evaluation should be reviewed by the candidate at least two weeks prior to distribution. The review must be acknowledged with the

candidate's signature and date, or by the candidate's initials and date in the appropriate box on the Candidate Verification Form.

Units (First Level) have the option of sending teaching portfolios, 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, any agreement of modified Unit criteria for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate's CV, 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.

REPUTATION OF PUBLICATION OUTLETS

The Unit (First Level) must provide an appraisal of the reputations of the publication outlets/performance venues (e.g., journals, presses, theaters, exhibits, etc.) for the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative activities. At a minimum, the Reputation of Publication Outlets must include the following, as appropriate to the outlet:

- Whether the publication outlet adheres to standards of peer review;
- Accepted metrics of journal ratings/rankings, if applicable (e.g., impact factor, disciplinary journal rankings, acceptance rates);
- Accepted metrics of conference ratings/rankings (e.g., acceptance rates, conference proceedings citation indexes);
- Assessments of the quality of the press and, if applicable, the series within the press; and/or
- Assessments of the quality of the performance/exhibit venue.

The candidate must sign and date (or initial the applicable box on the signed Candidate Verification Page) the appraisal before it is included in the dossier.

Note: Measures of the quality of publication outlets can vary greatly by discipline, and within specialty areas of disciplines. It is helpful for Units (First Level) to contextualize the publication outlet, and how the quality of those outlets is determined, particularly for reviewers outside the Units (First Level).

PEER EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TEACHING

Units must engage in systematic and periodic peer review of teaching based on classroom visits by tenured faculty colleagues that occur at regular intervals (e.g., annually, once every two years) prior to a promotion and/or tenure review. The peer evaluation process may also include evaluation of the candidate's mentoring and advising. Units should consult the [TLTC peer](#)

[review guidance](#), develop a peer evaluation rubric, and must implement a routine and ongoing peer review process.

Documentation of the candidate's teaching record should begin during the first year of the candidate's initial appointment and should include the outcomes of periodic peer evaluations as well as any response from the candidate to those evaluations. Documentation of the candidate's teaching should continue after tenure for inclusion in promotion dossiers (and post-tenure reviews). The candidate will sign and date the peer evaluations included in the dossier, a single sheet indicating that he or she has reviewed all the peer evaluations included, or initial the applicable box on the signed Candidate Verification Page (see Appendix).

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

The Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (Summary Statement) is a factual statement of the candidate's accomplishments in: research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; service; and Extension, if applicable. The Summary Statement is often written by an Advisory Subcommittee (sometimes referred to as a Records Preparation Committee)—whose members should be identified. The purpose of the Summary Statement is to ensure that committees have correct and complete information about the candidate on which to base their evaluation (**APT Policy Section IV.6**). If a tenure delay has been granted, insert the following language: "Dr. XXX has received an extension of the tenure clock per University of Maryland policy, which states that faculty members shall not be disadvantaged in promotion and tenure proceedings because they have elected to extend the time for tenure review in accordance with this policy." *The Summary Statement must not be sent to external reviewers.*

At a minimum, the Summary Statement should:

- Place the candidate's accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the discipline;
- Summarize the candidate's professional achievements in service and teaching in the context of the responsibilities of the Unit, the College, the University and the community;
- Summarize peer evaluations of teaching, student course evaluations, and other instructional activities (e.g. curriculum and/or course development, mentoring);
- Include measures of impact and/or excellence as appropriate to the field and/or candidate's work (e.g., citation counts, h-index, reviews of performances/exhibits/books, invited talks); and
- Describe entrepreneurial activities (e.g., patents, start-ups, public engagement), if applicable.

The Summary Statement should be a neutral description (non-evaluative) of the candidate's work.

CANDIDATE REVIEW OF NON-EVALUATIVE MATERIALS

The candidate must review and certify review of the following dossier items:

| Dossier Item | Timeline |
|---|---|
| Unit promotion and tenure criteria, or approved agreement of modified tenure criteria | Candidates should have received a copy of the criteria, or modified criteria, upon appointment. If the Unit has updated their criteria since initial appointment, the candidate may elect to use either the old or new criteria, and must inform the APT Committee Chair in writing prior to the commencement of the review process which criteria to use for the review. The candidate must sign the criteria to be used at least two weeks prior to the initiation of the review process. |
| Sample e-mail request for availability to external evaluators (with any evaluators' names redacted) | At least two weeks prior to sending email request to potential evaluators. |
| Sample letter sent to external evaluators (with any evaluators' names redacted) | At least two weeks prior to sending email request to confirmed evaluators. |
| Summary Statement of Professional Achievements | At least two weeks prior to First Level Review APT Committee meeting and vote. The candidate may write a Response to the Summary Statement. |
| Reputation of Publication Outlets | At least two weeks prior to First Level Review APT Committee meeting and vote. |
| Student and Peer Evaluations of Teaching | At least two weeks prior to First Level Review APT Committee meeting and vote. |
| Record of mentoring/advising/research supervision | At least two weeks prior to First Level Review APT Committee meeting and vote. |

In some cases, some of the above elements may be contained in the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements. Candidates must certify in writing that they have seen these document(s) (which may be achieved by signing and dating the individual document(s) or a Candidate Verification Page). The candidate may write a response to the Summary Statement for the Department (First Level) Review Committee's consideration. The Response must be

included in the dossier, and acknowledged in the final Summary Statement (APT Policy Section IV.A.6).

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT (FIRST LEVEL) APT REVIEW COMMITTEE

(APT Policy Section IV.A.7) This report has two distinct parts, neither of which is shown to the candidate. In addition, the Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee may include an optional Minority Report in cases of major disagreement with the APT Review Committee *report*. All parts of the report are incorporated into the dossier sent by the Chair to higher levels of review.

The first part is the Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee Meeting Report, describing the decision meeting. This report is ordinarily written by the Chair of the APT Review Committee or a designee. The discussions and the exact vote must 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.

The second part is the Evaluative Report. The Unit may form an Advisory Subcommittee, whose members should be identified, to complete this part of the report. The Evaluative Report evaluates the candidate's research or creativity, service, mentoring and teaching contributions, and Extension activities (if applicable) in light of the Unit's standards. Some of the elements of the report will be based on data provided in greater detail in other sections of the dossier. In this instance, bear in mind that the purpose of this report is evaluative, and try to avoid repeating information.

The Evaluative Report should address, minimally, the following questions:

- 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? If the candidate's scholarly activities are primarily or solely collaborative, what are the candidate's specific contributions to the activities?
- Has the candidate met or surpassed the Department's standards and expectations?
- Does the candidate's record demonstrate a trajectory of future contributions and accomplishments?
- What evidence supports the Review Committee's evaluation?

This information is particularly helpful in areas with distinctive expectations for promotion and/or tenure. *It is essential to identify the specific contributions and impact for candidates who work in groups/collaborative projects that lead to large numbers of co-authored works, funded projects with multiple teams/PIs/Co-PIs, or other forms of collaborations.* Keep in mind that the

report will be read by faculty members and administrators outside the Unit who may not have specific domain knowledge.

The following are suggestions for summarizing and evaluating faculty performance:

Research, Scholarly, Extension, Creative and/or Professional Activities

An evaluation supported explicitly by evidence of the quality, impact, and sufficiency of the work should be provided, including a description of the influence of the work in the field. The nature of the scholarly activity often determines the appropriate metrics of impact, quality, and sufficiency, and may include:

- *Citation rates, h-index, impact factors, publications in ranked journal, acceptance rates, downloads, and other quantitative measures;*
- *Published reviews of books and performances;*
- *Outcomes, impact, and reach (i.e., attendances) of programs for extension agents.*

For candidates whose work is mostly or exclusively collaborative, First Level review committees may consider conducting a citation analysis or h-index analysis on a subset of the published works by the candidate -- for example, on the published works on which the candidate served as the lead contributor.

Regardless of the metrics of quality, impact, and sufficiency used by the Unit, it is essential that the evaluative materials identify the specific contributions of the candidate's scholarship, teaching and mentoring, and service.

Teaching, Advising and Mentoring

Dossiers should contain data from the campus-wide standardized course evaluations. An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching, advising and mentoring should be provided. Detailed analyses of the data should be included in the dossier in the Student Evaluation Data section. 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 may have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known.

Teaching, advising, and mentoring may encompass a broad range of activities, including course instruction, guided research, mentoring, advising, curriculum and course design/creation/revision, program direction, program delivery (extension agents), supervision of postdocs, and other activities. In reviewing candidate teaching activities, the First Level Review Committee must take into consideration the candidate's teaching portfolio. Assessments of excellence in teaching can include the:

- *Assessment of instructional materials, the rigor and scope of examinations, incorporation of instructional aids, etc.;*
- *Development of techniques or modes of instruction and the substantial revision of or development of courses;*
- *Feedback of colleagues (peer evaluations);*
- *Feedback of students (student evaluations);*
- *Performance of students on learning outcome assessments;*
- *Receipt of teaching awards or other recognitions;*
- *Number and caliber of students guided in research and their placement in academic positions, postdoctoral labs, graduate programs, etc.;*
- *Development of or participation in bridge or summer programs;*
- *Service on awards and mentoring committees, or as an advisor for student groups or clubs, or as a mentor for other faculty;*
- *Organization of professional seminars for students on article or grant submission, etc.;*
- *Job placement in notable academic positions or professional practice.*

Service

Service contributions should be evaluated, particularly in those areas where service is a major component of a candidate's activities, such as extension appointments. To the extent possible, the report should do more than list committees or activities; it should evaluate the performance of these activities. Evaluation may be sought from supervisors or clients in organizations for which the candidate 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.

The Report of the Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee may also include a minority report. Members of the Unit (First Level) 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 Section IV.A.7). ***A minority APT report is intended to be employed for major disagreements with the presentation of the Committee Report, not for presenting minor variations in wording, airing of departmental disputes, or the introduction of new argumentation or materials regarding a tenure or promotion case.***

THE UNIT (FIRST LEVEL) APT REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Gathering information and documents 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 Section IV.A.6)**
- Requesting at least six external evaluations (with at least three names selected from the candidate's list), using the candidate's input to gather the sample of material for evaluators to evaluate, and providing a brief summary of the qualifications of the evaluators. **(APT Policy Section IV.A.2)**
- Obtaining documentation on teaching, including peer reviews and student evaluations, and information on the candidate's mentorship record.
- Ensuring that the candidate submits a teaching portfolio.
- Obtaining available information on the candidate's service record.
- Evaluating journals, presses, conferences, and other outlets in which candidate's scholarship is disseminated.
- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, mentoring, scholarship and service, and Extension (if applicable) **(APT Policy Section IV)**, 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 IV.A.1)**.
- Ensuring that the discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased (this is a particular responsibility of the APT Review Committee Chair).
- Writing reports on: (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and its justification, and the date of the meeting; and (b) a separate evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions **(APT Policy Section IV.A.7)**. This latter report is often prepared by an advisory committee and is available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.
- Reviewing the Chair's summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy **(APT Policy Section IV.D)**. (Usually done by APT Review Committee Chair)
- Representing the Department APT Review Committee's perspective to higher levels of review, if the need emerges **(APT Policy Section IV.B.4)**.

UNIT CHAIR (OR DEAN IN NON-DEPARTMENTALIZED COLLEGES)

Note: The role of the Chair is assumed by the Dean in a non-departmentalized College or Director of a School within a College structure exists.

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. The APT Policy calls for the administrator of the academic Unit that will become the candidate's tenure home to (a) meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the promotion criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated **(APT Policy Section II; Section IV)**, as well as directing the

candidate to these guidelines (faculty.umd.edu/apt-manual) and (b) appoint one or more senior faculty mentors. (**APT Policy Section IV.A.3**) It is suggested that the mentors be mutually agreed upon between the Chair and the candidate.

Mentoring Assistant and Associate Professors is key to maintaining excellence at the University and is essential to the APT process. Mentors should work systematically and on an ongoing basis with their assigned mentees at least until the tenure review is completed, with supportive and constructive feedback given to the candidate. The Chair should meet at least annually with each tenure-track candidate and provide written feedback to the candidate following the meeting; the Chair should also oversee the Unit's mentoring process to ensure its effectiveness. In addition, the Chair should discuss options for multiple mentors who can provide guidance on different areas of responsibility and for issues related to any particular challenges the candidate may face. Mentoring should not end after an award of tenure, but should be continued if desired by the faculty member, on an ongoing basis to support the professional development of the faculty member. Each Unit will offer mentoring by one or more members of the senior faculty to each Associate Professor. The Chair is responsible for submitting the Unit's mentoring plan to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure the conduct of regular and systematic peer evaluation of teaching for every candidate. It is recommended that peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching be conducted at regular intervals (e.g., annually, every two years) by tenured faculty members. Peer evaluation should proceed according to a rubric established at the Unit level that is common to all candidates for promotion and to all evaluators (see [Peer Evaluation guidance](#) from TLTC). These periodic reports should be made available to the candidate, and any response by candidates should be filed in the Chair's office for inclusion in the APT dossier. Evaluations done only in the months preceding review tend not to be given much credence by higher levels in the review process.

CHAIR'S LETTER

The letter should contain the Chair's independent evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, mentoring, service, and Extension if applicable, and should make a clear recommendation regarding the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate supported by the reasons for it (**APT Policy Section IV.A.1**).

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 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**. 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 crucial to provide reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative faculty votes and abstentions when they are known. **If the candidate filed an objection to an external evaluator who was subsequently chosen by the Unit, the Chair's Letter should note this objection.***

DENIAL AT THE DEPARTMENT (FIRST LEVEL) REVIEW

If both the Department APT Review Committee's and the Chair's recommendation are negative, the Chair must inform the candidate by letter sent by electronic and certified mail within two weeks of the date of the decision by the Chair. 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 IV.D**; see Appendix 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 the case, along with guidance for the conduct of the re-review. Upon receipt, units must reconsider the case based on the direction provided by the Dean. If no error has occurred, the Dean must write a letter to the candidate, copying the Unit Head, (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 Section IV.A.5). The letter must be sent by electronic and certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. For examples of possible wording for notification letters, see the Appendix. A copy of these letters and the dossier should be sent to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. In the case of non-departmentalized Colleges, if both the College (First Level) and Dean's recommendation are negative, the Dean must inform the candidate by letter sent by electronic and certified mail within two weeks of the date of the decision by the Dean. 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 IV.D**; see Appendix for examples).

The College forwards the case only to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If not, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will remand the case to the College to reconsider. If no error has occurred, the Associate Provost must write a letter to the candidate, copying the Dean head, (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 Section IV.A.5**). The letter must be sent by electronic and certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. For examples of possible wording for notification letters, see the Appendix.

If the decision of the Dean is to remand the case back to the first level for reconsideration, the Dean will consult with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs regarding the terms and conditions for the re-review. After the consultation, the Dean will issue a written letter regarding the terms of the re-review. A copy of the letter will be included in the dossier as part of the record of the review.

If the decision of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs is to remand the case back to the first level for reconsideration, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will consult with the Senior Vice President and Provost regarding the terms and conditions for the re-review. After the consultation, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will issue a written letter regarding the terms of the re-review. A copy of the letter will be included in the dossier as part of the record of the review.

The Office of Faculty Affairs is available for consultation or advice in matters pertaining to this process.

The Dean and the Office of Faculty Affairs should retain a copy of the dossier in case there is an appeal.

THE CHAIR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Ensuring that the APT decision meeting was properly conducted, that discussion and evaluation of the candidate was impartial, fair, and unbiased, and that the appropriate material was 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 Section IV.A.8**).
- Notifying candidates in writing, summarizing the Chair's and Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee's decisions and reasoning, and the numeric vote within two weeks of the Chair's decision (**APT Policy Section IV.D**; See example in Appendix). Note that the reported vote must total the number of eligible voting faculty members (Yes, No,

Abstentions, Absences). In cases of new appointments, inclusion of the vote count is not required. 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. The Chair of the Department (First Level) APT Review Committee may review and, if necessary, correct the information in the summary letter. In the event that the Chair of the Department (First Level) APT Review Committee and the Chair are unable to agree on the appropriate language and contents of the summary letter, each shall write a summary letter to the candidate. A copy of all materials provided to the candidate shall be added to the tenure or promotion file as the case proceeds through higher levels of review. If both the Department (First Level) APT Review Committee and Chair vote to deny tenure and/or promotion, the letter must be sent by electronic and certified mail (**APT Policy Section IV.F.6**).

- 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 Appendix) accompanying the appointment request. If the appointment is accepted, 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 Associate Provost) to determine that the review was conducted appropriately (**APT Policy IV.A.5**).
- Answering questions putatively posed by upper-level review committees (**APT Policy Section IV.B.4; Section IV.C.2**).
- Forwarding a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs if candidates withdraw from the process (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**).
- Reviewing the Department's (Unit'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 website should be consulted for updates: <https://faculty.umd.edu/apt-manual>.
- Meeting with new tenured and tenure-track faculty to provide APT information, such as Unit and University policies, this Manual, and Unit promotion criteria. Subsequently, administrators should notify faculty in writing of changes to the criteria (**APT Policy Section II; Section IV**).

COLLEGE APT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The College APT Review Committee 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 Section IV.B.5**). It should address the same areas as the Unit APT report described above.

When the vote is not unanimous, the report should explain the reasons for the negative votes or the abstentions. If the assessment differs from the Department (First Level) vote, an explanation should be provided. Minority reports are permissible (see page 36 for guidance on minority reports).

THE COLLEGE (SECOND LEVEL)

APT CHAIR AND REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Ensuring that there were no procedural or due process violations by all parties (e.g., members of the APT committee, the candidate, others outside the unit conducting the review who may have an interest in the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate) involved in the review process during the first level review, as well as ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the dossier to this point in the review. If there are significant deviations from the expected elements of a dossier, or the conduct of the review, the College APT Committee may remand the case back to the lower level with written instructions for reconsideration and corrective action.
- Reviewing and evaluating carefully the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, service, and if applicable, Extension.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.
- Ensuring that the discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, unbiased, and that conflicts of interest are mitigated and confidentiality is maintained.
- Meeting with lower level APT representatives when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing shall be provided in advance (**APT Policy Section IV.B.4; Section IV.C.2**).
- Writing a report with an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and its justification, the membership of the Committee, and the date of the decision meeting (**APT Policy Section IV.B.5; Section IV.C.3**).
- Ensuring that the Dean's summary letter notifying the candidate of the negative recommendation accurately reflects Committee deliberations when either the Dean or the Committee makes a negative recommendation.

DEAN

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 Section IV.B.5**).

*The letter should start with a specific description of the candidate's area of expertise. It should contain a candid and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring, service, and Extension activities (if applicable), and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of the Department (First Level) APT Review Committee, College (Second Level) APT Review Committee, or the Department Chair, the reasons underlying the dissent must be explained. **Negative votes or abstentions at the College level must 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.*

DEAN'S NOTIFICATION TO CANDIDATE

When either the College (Second Level) APT Review Committee or the Dean make a negative recommendation, the Dean must: (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 Section IV.D**). 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.

THE DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 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 College as well as University guidelines.
- Reviewing and approving College and Department promotion criteria.
- Recommending appointees to the Campus APT and Campus Appeals Committee (**APT Policy Section IV.C.1; Section V.A.1**).
- 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.
- Certifying the procedural and substantive appropriateness of the review when candidates are denied tenure and/or promotion at a lower level of review. Deans must write and send a letter by electronic and certified mail to the candidate within two weeks of the decision that informs the candidate of the outcome, appropriateness of the review, and the consequences of this denial (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**). Copies

should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained.

- Appointing members of the College APT Review Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization (**APT Policy Section IV.B.1**).
- Providing staffing for the College APT Review Committee and ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted, and that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- 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 Section IV.B.3; Section IV.B.5**).
- Writing a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Committee summarizing the outcome of the College APT Review Committee's and the Dean's deliberations, and the rationale behind it if either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean makes a negative recommendation about the candidate's case. 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 Section IV.D**; also see Table on Candidate Notification in Appendix).
- Inspecting the dossier for accuracy and completeness.
- Remanding the case back to lower levels for reconsideration or correction to the dossier as appropriate should inaccuracies or incomplete information be detected, or any procedural or due process violations noted. If the Dean remands the case back to the first level for any corrective action, the Dean will issue a written letter detailing the concerns and requirements necessary to address the noted concerns. A copy of the letter will be included in the dossier as part of the record of the review. Prior to issuing the letter, the Dean should consult with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- Forwarding the dossier to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for further review.
- Meeting with the University APT Review Committee to address questions that may arise (**APT Policy Section IV.C.2**).
- Including in a separate memo accompanying the dossiers, the terms of appointment, start date and projected salary in appointment requests (See Appendix) for new appointments. If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.

THE CAMPUS (THIRD LEVEL) APT REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Ensuring that there were no procedural or due process violations during the first and second level reviews, as well as ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the dossier

to this point in the review. If there are significant deviations from the expected elements of a dossier, or the conduct of the review, the Campus APT Committee may remand the case back to the lower level for reconsideration and corrective action.

- If the decision of the Campus APT Committee is to remand the case back to the lower level(s) for reconsideration, the Campus APT Committee will consult with the Senior Vice President and Provost regarding the terms and conditions for the re-review. After the consultation, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will issue a written letter regarding the terms of the re-review on behalf of the Campus APT Committee. A copy of the letter will be included in the dossier as part of the record of the review.
- Conducting an independent review of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, service, and if applicable, extension – informed by the assessments of the first and second level reviews.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.
- Ensuring that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Sending questions in writing to the lower level APT representatives to seek clarification via written responses, if necessary.
- Seeking a meeting with lower level APT representatives to seek further clarification based on the answers to the initial questions submitted, or initially based on the review of the dossier by the committee, or when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made.
- Requesting additional materials for review and consideration as per University policy (**APT Policy Section IV.F.1**).
- Writing a report with an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation, and the date of the decision meeting.

New Appointments and Reappointments

PROFESSOR OF THE PRACTICE

(APT POLICY SECTION I.F.14) 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 the Associate Provosts and then the Provost and the President.

REAPPOINTMENT: Requires presidential approval based on letters of endorsement from the Chair, Dean and committee of the Associate Provosts. 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 the table on the Transmittal Form) 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.

EMERITA / EMERITUS STATUS

(APT Policy Section I.F.7) Tenured faculty members, Librarian faculty with permanent status, and select PTK faculty who have been faculty members for 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, plus a memo from the Benefits Office confirming that the faculty member has met with them. (Refer to [the Faculty Affairs website](#) for more information.) The review is ordinarily conducted during the candidate's last semester of employment (**APT Policy Section IV.G.3**). Faculty at or above the candidate's pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/ Emeritus status (**APT Policy Section IV.G.4**). 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 Section IV.G.8**). Materials submitted for emeriti appointments should include a copy of the documentation of retirement and other materials mentioned in the table in the Appendix.

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. *Note: Emeritus/Emerita*

reviews are paused between January and April to prioritize the promotion reviews of faculty members.

COLLEGE PARK PROFESSOR

(APT Policy, Section I.F.10) 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 above). Renewal of an appointment for an additional three (3) years 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.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROFESSOR

(APT Policy, Section I.F.11) This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative or performing artists, or researchers who have qualified for full-time appointments at the University of Maryland, Baltimore at the level of professor, who are active in “MPowering the State” programs, and who also qualify for full-time appointment at the University of Maryland, College Park at the level of professor. Holders of this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal investigators, and participate in departmental and shared governance. Initial appointments are for three years and are renewable for an additional three (3) years upon recommendation to the Provost by the Unit head and Dean. This is a non-paid, non-tenure track title but except in the case of appointees from the University of Maryland, Baltimore. If the appointee holds a full-time appointment as professor at the University of Maryland, Baltimore, a modified procedure is followed, as detailed below.

APPOINTING UMB FACULTY AS UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROFESSORS

The following guidelines represent a modified University of Maryland Professor appointment process for University of Maryland Baltimore faculty moving forward, summarized in the table below. Approved by the Provost and President, this modification applies only to University of Maryland Baltimore University of Maryland Professor appointments.

Departmentalized Colleges (New Appointments)

The dossier must include:

1. Nomination and support letter from Department Chair, to include the candidate's CV;
2. Department APT committee review, vote, and report;
3. College APT committee review, vote, and report; and
4. Dean's letter of support.

The dossier is reviewed by the Provost and President, with a final decision by the President.

Non-Departmentalized Colleges (New Appointments)

The dossier must include:

1. Nomination and support letter from Associate Dean of Faculty or equivalent, to include the candidate's CV;
2. College APT committee review, vote, and report; and
3. Dean's letter of support.

The dossier is reviewed by a committee comprised of the Associate Provosts, who make a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost then provides a recommendation to the President, who makes the final decision.

Reappointments

For reappointment, the dossier includes:

1. Reappointment and support letter from Department Chair or Associate Dean of Faculty (or equivalent), as appropriate for a Departmentalized or Non-Departmentalized College;
2. The Candidate's CV; and
3. Dean's letter of support.

The dossier is reviewed by the Associate Provosts, who make a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost then provides a recommendation to the President, who makes the final decision.

Steps in the Review Process

| | | New UMD Professor Appointment (Departmentalized College) | New UMD Professor Appointment (Non-Departmentalized College) | Reappointment of UMD Professor |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Nominated by | | Department Chair | Associate Dean | Department Chair or Associate Dean |
| Reviewed By | Department APT Committee | ✓ | | |
| | College APT Committee | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | Dean | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | Campus Level | | Associate Provosts | Associate Provosts |
| | Provost | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | President | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Final Decisions, Concerns that Arise, and Appeals

DENIAL AT THE UNIT (FIRST LEVEL) REVIEW

If both the Unit (First Level) APT Review Committee's and the Chair's recommendation are negative, the Chair must inform the candidate by electronic and 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 IV.D**; see Appendix 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 Section IV.A.5**). The letter should be sent by electronic and certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. 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.

In the case of non-departmentalized Colleges, if both the College (First Level) and Dean's recommendation are negative, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If not, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will remand the case to the College to reconsider. If no error has occurred, the Associate Provost must write a letter to the candidate, copying the Dean head, (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 Section IV.A.5**). The letter should be sent by electronic and 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.

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 Section IV.A.5**). 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 Section IV.B.4; Section IV.C.2**).

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 Section IV.D**). The College-level notification letter should be included in the dossier file appended to the Dean's letter and should be sent by electronic and certified mail.

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).

APPEALS PROCESS FOR DENIAL OF PROMOTION

GROUNDINGS FOR APPEALS

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 arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.b**).

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for tenure and/or promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion

and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal and are dealt with under the provisions of paragraph 4 of the introduction to Section IV, Promotion, Tenure, and Emeritus Review (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.b**).

THE APPEALS PROCESS

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 Section V.B.1.a**). 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 Section V.B.1.b**). 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 Section V.A**). 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 Section V.B.1.a**).

The Committee will meet with the Appellant, and other parties, and investigate the case, as it deems appropriate (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.d.3**). If there were any objections to evaluators submitted by the appellant during the process of selection of external reviewers, this information may be requested. 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 Section V.B.1.d.4**). When the President supports the findings of the APT Appeals Committee, and authorizes corrective action to be taken, the Provost has the responsibility for oversight and implementation of any such corrective action. (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.e.1**)

Faculty members and administrators involved in the APT review process are reminded that they are bound by the terms of and expectations for confidentiality during the appeals process. Under no circumstances should anyone involved with the APT review of a candidate discuss the content and/or process details of the APT deliberations with the candidate. Candidates should be referred to the Office of Faculty Affairs regarding any questions that they may have regarding the appeals process.

Information for Staff

OVERVIEW

Staff members make an essential contribution to the promotion and tenure process through their careful preparation of the materials in a candidate's dossier. Often, the last person to see the dossier before the university level review is a staff member. Through the efforts of the staff, the dossiers are clearly laid out and easy to evaluate.

Inclusion of a candidate's teaching portfolio is required, and it must be submitted as a separate document from the main dossier. Representative pieces of scholarship (Supplemental Materials) may be submitted in addition to the main dossier and teaching portfolio. These additions may be specified in the form of a URL (preferred for large documents) or they may be uploaded to the area on the APT website for supplemental materials. If the Supplemental Materials are offered as a URL/link to external content, the Unit must ensure that neither the candidate nor the Unit may modify the content once the Unit has voted on the case. 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.

It is crucial for APT documents to be searchable. Non-searchable documents will be returned to the Units where they originated.

GATHERING MATERIALS FOR THE DOSSIER

While dossier materials will vary according to the nature of the case, there are some elements that are found in every dossier:

1. Transmittal Form. The transmittal form, besides providing the information used to record the candidate's new or changed appointment, serves as a summary of the first and second level meeting dates and votes, along with the evaluations of the Dean and Department Chair. The transmittal form is a PDF form, so you can open it from the Faculty Affairs website, enter the appropriate information, and then save it to your own computer for when you come back to add information to it. More information about completing the transmittal form is available in the Elements of the Dossier section below.
2. Promotion Criteria. The promotion criteria included must be current. Additionally, if the candidate has modified criteria for tenure or promotion, these must be included in the dossier.
3. Letter Log. The letter log constitutes a summary of the requests for external evaluation. Letters from external evaluators make up an important part of the dossier, so the log

must show clearly who has been contacted, when, and what their response was. Use the [Letter Log template](#) available from the Faculty Affairs website.


4. Reputation of Publication Outlets. Though this information is likely to be prepared by members of the Advisory Subcommittee, it should be presented in a clear and consistent fashion, which may well mean it becomes the responsibility of a staff member.

CREATING THE DOSSIER

The electronic dossier must meet three essential criteria:

1. It must be bookmarked.
2. It must be password-protected.
3. It must be searchable.


BOOKMARKS



The bookmarks in the dossier form a table of contents for the included materials. The items which are to be bookmarked are listed at the bottom of the transmittal form, in the appropriate order. Note that the order has changed from recent years. Of course, not all of the listed materials will appear in every candidate's dossier. If an item is not present in the dossier, there is no need to create a bookmark for it.

To create a bookmark: navigate to the page you wish to bookmark. If the bookmarks pane is open, click the new bookmark button and enter the appropriate label.

You can alter the text of the bookmark by right clicking the bookmark and choosing Rename from the menu. Another bookmark problem is that they sometimes go awry when pages are added or deleted. To edit the page a bookmark links to: navigate to the correct page, then right click the bookmark and choose Set Destination.



PASSWORD PROTECTION

Every uploaded document (dossier, teaching portfolio, and any supplemental material) must be password-protected to ensure confidentiality. The Faculty Affairs Office will let you know what the password should be at the beginning of each APT cycle. To add a password to the dossier, in Adobe Acrobat Pro version 2024 under All Tools, select “Protect a PDF”, then click “Encrypt with Password” under the Advanced Options. A dialogue box will appear, check the box labeled “Require a password to open document” and enter the provided password. Click OK, and then retype the password in the confirmation dialogue box that appears. Save the document to ensure the PDF file is now password protected.

Next, click the Initial View tab. Change the Navigation tab dropdown to “Bookmarks Panel and Page.” Change the Magnification dropdown to “Fit Width.” Finally, click OK. This sets the default view of the dossier so that bookmarks are visible and the dossier pages are easy to read.

SEARCHABLE TEXT

The text in the dossier must be searchable so that committee members can easily move around within the dossier and confirm various elements of the content. The easiest way to create searchable text is to create the elements of the dossier straight from Word or from Excel (in the case of the summaries of student evaluation of teaching), using the “Save as PDF” function from the File Menu. However, you can also create searchable text from a traditionally-scanned page (if, for example, you receive an external evaluator’s letter through the mail), using the optical character recognition built into Adobe Acrobat Pro. To use this OCR function, click on All Tools on the side of the Acrobat menu. Click on “Scan & OCR” and then click “In this file.” Acrobat will convert the scanned text into searchable text. It is a requirement that all dossiers be searchable. Contact the Faculty Affairs Office if you have concerns about this step. *Non-searchable dossiers will be returned to the Units that created them.*

CANDIDATE VERIFICATION PAGE

Following revisions to these Guidelines and the University’s APT Policy (II-1.00 (A)), several documents in the dossier must be signed and dated by the candidate. The candidate may sign each individual document, or a candidate verification page may be used, where the candidate initials next to each document and then signs one time. A combination of signature and date on individual documents and the candidate verification page is also acceptable. The [verification page template](#) is available on the Faculty Affairs website. If the Unit chooses to use the Candidate Verification page, place it second in the dossier, after the transmittal form. Be aware that the candidate must sign and date the CV and the personal statement on those documents; the Candidate Verification Page cannot be used for the CV or the personal statement.

ELEMENTS OF THE DOSSIER

The items below are numbered as they are in the reference list at the bottom of the transmittal form, and are included simply as an aid to organizing these materials. These numbers are not required in the bookmark label of the dossier file.

1. Transmittal Form
2. Candidate Verification Page
3. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated by candidate)
4. Reputation of Publication Outlets (signed & dated by candidate) *
5. Personal Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (signed & dated by candidate) *
7. Optional Rejoinder from Candidate (signed & dated by candidate)
8. Promotion Criteria (signed & dated by candidate) *
9. Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria (if applicable; signed & dated by candidate) *
10. Department APT Report (Vote & Evaluative Summary)
11. Optional Minority Report
12. Department Chair's Letter
13. College APT Report
14. Dean's Letter
15. Optional Teaching Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
16. Student Evaluation Data (signed & dated by candidate) *
17. Peer Teaching Evaluations / Information (signed & dated by candidate) *
18. Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision (signed & dated by candidate) *
19. Credentials of External Evaluators
20. Responses of External Evaluators
21. Candidate Notification from Chair
22. Candidate Notification from Dean
23. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests
24. Sample Message Formally Requesting Evaluation (signed & dated by candidate) #
25. Sample Message Requesting Availability (signed & dated by candidate) #
26. Declines from Evaluators

* Must be made available to the candidate and signed/dated AT LEAST two weeks prior to the discussion/vote meeting date.

Must be available to the candidate and signed at least two weeks prior to sending out request letters to selected evaluators.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

The blank [transmittal form](#) is available from the Faculty Affairs website. Check the accuracy of information on the transmittal form carefully, particularly the record of votes, the dates of meetings, and the type of appointment (e.g., nine month, twelve month, etc.). For new appointments, a separate letter with the proposed salary and start dates must be sent to the Faculty Affairs Office when the dossier is uploaded to the APT website (See [New Faculty Appointment Form](#)). Note: There are several different transmittal forms available from the Faculty Affairs website. They are easily distinguished by the title at the top of the form. Be sure you are using the correct form, or perhaps download a new form each time you need it.

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, and (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc. The sum of the numbers in categories 1- 5, which will be automatically calculated on the transmittal form, should equal the total number of regular faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body, NOT the Unit Chair – the Chair's vote is recorded separately. ***Numbers recorded on the transmittal form must match numbers reported in APT Review Committee Reports.*** When filling out contact information, be sure to include the Department and the College APT spokesperson.

CANDIDATE VERIFICATION PAGE

The candidate may sign each individual document, or a candidate verification page may be used, where the candidate initials next to each document and then signs one time. A combination of signature and date on individual documents and the candidate verification page is also acceptable. A [verification page template](#) is available on the Faculty Affairs website. If the Department chooses to use the Candidate Verification page, place it second in the dossier, after the transmittal form. Be aware that the candidate must sign and date the CV and the personal statement on those documents; the Candidate Verification Page cannot be used for the CV or the personal statement.

CURRICULUM VITAE (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)

The candidate's CV must be in the format required by the University. The [CV template](#) is available on the Faculty Affairs website. The CV must be signed and dated by the candidate PRIOR TO its distribution to any evaluators to indicate that it is complete and current; this

signed and dated copy is sent to external evaluators. If there are subsequent changes to the candidate's credentials, such as additional funding or new publications, they must be recorded as an addendum to the CV, which can then be included in the dossier. The addendum must also be signed and dated. The entire CV, including addenda, must be searchable.

REPUTATION OF PUBLICATION OUTLETS

The information contained in this document will vary according to discipline. However, the document should refer only to the outlets where the candidate's work appears and use objective metrics to assess publication impact. The document must be shared with the candidate, and receipt acknowledged with the candidate's signature and date. A tabular format is preferred for presenting this information.

| Journal | No. of Articles | Impact Factor | Acceptance Rate |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Journal 1 | 5 | 4.3 | 15% |
| Journal 2 | 10 | 2.3 | 20% |
| Journal 3 | 15 | 1.9 | 22% |

PERSONAL STATEMENT

The candidate's personal statement is *strictly limited to a maximum of 5 pages*, and directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate's field. Like the other materials provided by the candidate, it must be signed and dated.

DISRUPTIONS TO FACULTY WORK

Faculty members may elect to describe the impact of disruptions (external circumstances) on their work as part of the promotion and tenure review process through their Personal Statements, CV annotations, and documentation (e.g., notification of contract/grant cancellations from funding agencies).

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

This statement of the candidate's achievements must be reviewed by the candidate at least two weeks before the full Unit APT meeting; the candidate must sign and date the report to indicate that he or she agrees with the contents. Typically, this document is passed back and forth between the subcommittee and the candidate for review and revisions until it is complete, accurate, and signed/dated.

OPTIONAL REJOINDER FROM CANDIDATE

In the event that the candidate disagrees with or needs to clarify any inaccuracies not resolved prior to final signature, they may wish to draft a rejoinder to the report, which would also be signed and dated, and would be included directly after the Summary Statement in the dossier.

PROMOTION CRITERIA

The Department's current APT criteria and agreement of modified Unit criteria (if applicable) must be included in the dossier. The text of the promotion criteria and any agreement must be signed and dated by the candidate for inclusion in the dossier, and must be searchable.

AGREEMENT OF MODIFIED UNIT CRITERIA (IF APPLICABLE)

Modified Criteria must be approved by the Provost and President ahead of usage. The Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria must be signed and dated by the candidate.

DEPARTMENT APT REPORT

The department APT report must include the date of the meeting and the exact vote. This report provides the evaluative summary of the candidate's record by the Department APT Review Committee. It must include the number of: (1) positive votes, (2) negative votes, (3) mandatory abstentions, (4) voluntary abstentions, and (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc. These numbers *must match those reported on the Transmittal Form*, according to the number of regular faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body, NOTE: the Unit Chair is not considered a mandatory abstention – Chairs vote separately and are accounted for as their own unique, separate category. The text of the report must be searchable.

OPTIONAL MINORITY APT REPORT

This report may be generated if one or more faculty members in the Unit disagree with the assessment provided in the committee report. If such a report is included, it must be signed by its authors.

DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S LETTER

The Chair should perform an independent assessment of the candidate, separate from that of the Department APT Review Committee. The letter should contextualize the Unit discussion and vote, particularly in the event of any negative comments and/or vote outcomes. It must also include the Chair's own recommendation regarding promotion. Make sure the date on the letter matches the date on the transmittal form. Remember that the text of the letter must be searchable.

COLLEGE APT REPORT

This report must include the date of the meeting and the names of all Committee members, and include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation (**APT Policy**)

Section IV.B.5). Check to be sure the meeting date and votes match what is on the transmittal form. The text of the report must be searchable.

DEAN'S LETTER

The Dean should perform an independent assessment of the candidate, separate from that of the College APT Review Committee. The letter should contextualize the College discussion and vote, particularly in the event of any negative comments and/or vote outcomes. It must also include the Dean's own recommendation regarding promotion. Make sure the date on the Dean's letter agrees with the date on the transmittal form. Also, remember that the text of the Dean's letter must be searchable.

OPTIONAL TEACHING STATEMENT

If the candidate prepares a teaching statement for the teaching portfolio, include a copy of that statement, signed and dated by the candidate, here. This is the only document that will be included in both the candidate review materials dossier and the teaching portfolio.

STUDENT FEEDBACK ON COURSE EXPERIENCES DATA (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)

This feedback data is an important indicator of teaching excellence. They must be clearly presented using the Tableau report developed by IRPA and the Office of Faculty Affairs:

- Faculty members may access the instructor version of the report [here](#).
- Administrators may access the administrator version of the report [here](#).

Be aware that you must **log into the VPN** before accessing either of the above links.

In general, we recommend that units use the Administrator version of the report. However, administrator versions of the report may not fully encompass all of the student assessments. For example, the administrator report will not include course evaluations for courses taught by a faculty member outside the unit (such as Honors courses), or cross-listed courses.

Student comments should not be included, though a faculty member may include student comments in their teaching portfolio if they wish to do so. Note also that Spring 2020 student course evaluations are not provided in the administrator view of faculty course evaluations and should not be included in the main dossier. Faculty members may include Spring 2020 course evaluations in the teaching portfolio, should they elect to do so.

The course evaluation summary to be included in the dossier must be shared with the candidate, who will indicate agreement by signature and date.

If your College does not use the university standard course evaluation system or the candidate teaches in a non-traditional format that does not generate system evaluations, there should

also be an explanation of the rating system that is used, as well as documentation of instructional assessments.

PEER TEACHING EVALUATIONS / INFORMATION

Units may provide a summary report that lists all peer course evaluations undertaken and detailed results of those reviews, or they may elect to include all of the corresponding scoresheets along with any responses from the candidate. These documents must be shared with the candidate as indicated by signature and date.

MENTORING, ADVISING & RESEARCH SUPERVISION

This bookmark may jump to the appropriate page in the candidate's CV, unless there is additional information about these activities not appropriate to include in the CV. If you are bookmarking to a page in the CV, set the bookmark to the exact page and the exact heading, rather than to the beginning of the CV. There is no need to include a separate page here which merely refers to the CV. If this is a document separate from the CV, it must be signed and dated by the candidate.

CREDENTIALS OF EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Credentials of the external evaluators should be briefly summarized in a single document under this bookmark. Each evaluator's credentials should be provided in a paragraph. Evaluators should be grouped by Unit Selections and Candidate Selections, listed in alphabetical order by last name in their respective sections. Remember that this document must be searchable.

RESPONSES OF EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

A minimum of 6 letters must be provided, with no more than half of those being Candidate selections. Organize the external evaluator responses according to the requestor, grouped by Unit Selections and Candidate Selections, listed in alphabetical order by last name in their respective sections. So, the letters from evaluators requested by the Unit would come first (alpha order by last name), and those suggested by the candidate would come second (alpha order by last name). Give each letter a separate bookmark that includes a C for candidate or a U for Unit (e.g., C – Smith; U – Jones). It is also helpful if the letters are provided in the same order that they appear in the Credentials of External Evaluators and the Letter Log, in alphabetical order by last name within each subcategory.

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION FROM CHAIR

The notification letter must be sent to promotion candidates within two weeks of the Chair's decision. It must include the tally of votes cast by type at the Department APT Committee meeting (number of positive votes, negative votes, mandatory abstentions, voluntary abstentions, and absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc.). These numbers *must match those*

reported on the Transmittal Form. The notification should also indicate whether or not the Chair supports promotion.

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION FROM DEAN

The Dean must inform the candidate of the second-level APT Review Committee's decision and the Dean's decision within two weeks of the date of the decision by the Dean. This letter is included in the dossier, and like the Chair's letter, must include the tally of votes cast by type at the APT Committee meeting (number of positive votes, negative votes, mandatory abstentions, voluntary abstentions, and absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc.). These numbers ***must match those reported on the Transmittal Form.*** The notification should also indicate whether or not the Dean supports promotion.

LETTER LOG OF EVALUATION REQUESTS (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)

This is a list of all external evaluators to whom any inquiry regarding evaluation was sent (including emailed requests for availability and formal requests with supporting materials), even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write a letter. Some evaluators are suggested by the candidate and others are identified by the Unit APT Review Committee, and this must be indicated on the letter log. In addition, the letter log should indicate the dates of requests for availability and formal evaluation, an evaluator's availability, if an evaluator declined to write a letter after initially expressing availability, or did not respond to the request. ***The required template is available on the Faculty Affairs website.***

SAMPLE MESSAGE FORMALLY REQUESTING EVALUATION (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)

The formal letter requesting evaluation (accompanied by supporting materials) must be dated and must be made available to the candidate prior to sending out to evaluators. The required template is available in the Appendix.

SAMPLE MESSAGE REQUESTING AVAILABILITY (REQUIRED TEMPLATE)

The sample email requesting availability must be dated and must be made available to the candidate prior to contacting any evaluators. The required template is available in the Appendix.

DECLINES FROM EVALUATORS

If any evaluators decline to write, even after initially expressing availability, their message(s) to that effect – whether it is an email or a letter – must be included in the dossier. They should be in alpha order by last name, with a U or C next to their name indicating whether they were selected by the Unit or the Candidate.

CREATING THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO

The teaching portfolio is a required part of the candidate's materials. It is a separate PDF that must be searchable, bookmarked, and password protected just like the other elements of the dossier. Also like the other elements of the dossier, it should be set to open with the bookmarks panel visible.

More information about the teaching portfolio is available on the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center website (<http://tltc.umd.edu/portfolios>).

CREATING THE SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FILE

The supplemental documents (within a single, bookmarked PDF) might include sample pieces of scholarship and other materials submitted by the candidate. The contents of the supplemental dossier should be bookmarked to show what they are. The supplemental dossier must also have a password, and be set to open with the bookmarks panel visible and the page zoomed to the full width of the screen. If a candidate or Unit elects to make supplemental materials available through a URL or other linked content, the candidate/Unit must ensure that the content cannot be modified once the Unit has voted. This ensures that the remaining levels of review (College, Campus) are able to view the same content throughout the review process.

UPLOADING THE DOSSIER AND OTHER FILES

To upload a dossier and other candidate materials to the Faculty Affairs website, go to <http://faculty.umd.edu/apa> and login with your university login. If you are unfamiliar with the APA system, refer to the Help menu for instructions on how to proceed. There is no need to notify the Faculty Affairs office when you upload a dossier or a teaching portfolio; we receive an automatic notification.

Appendix

CV TEMPLATE

The University formatted CV must be used by candidates undergoing a promotion and tenure review. Candidates may modify the CV to accommodate annotations regarding items contained within the CV (e.g., identifying student authors, indicating order of authorship) and removing irrelevant CV items (e.g., types of publications, types of activities). [Click here to download the CV template from the Faculty Affairs website.](#)

LETTER LOG

The Letter Log records requests for external evaluation, as well as receipt of those letters. [Click here to download the Letter Log from the Faculty Affairs website.](#)

NEW FACULTY APPOINTMENT INFORMATION

The New Faculty Appointment Information form provides information about the new faculty member's appointment and salary. It is used primarily by the Budget Office and Personnel. [Click here to download the New Faculty Appointment Information form from the Faculty Affairs Website.](#)

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION OF APT DECISION

| Department Level | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Type of Case | Letters From | Contents of Letters | Placement in Dossier | Deadline / Delivery Method | Who May Review the Letter |
| Both chair & committee vote negatively | Department Chair & Dean | Dept. Chair: Votes, decision, rationale of Committee & Chair | Front of Dossier. Send entire dossier to Faculty Affairs | Chair's: Required within 2 weeks of chair's decision, electronic and certified mail. | Chair's: Required: Committee Chair Optional: Committee Members |
| | | Dean: Confirm review was conducted appropriately; promotion denied | | Dean's: Suggested within 1 month, electronic and certified mail | Dean's: No one |
| Either / both vote(s) positively | Dept. Chair | Dept. Chair: Votes, decision, rationale of Committee & Chair | In Dossier | Required within 2 weeks of Chair's decision | N/A |
| College Level | | | | | |
| Type of Case | Letter From | Contents of Letter | Placement in Dossier | Deadline / Delivery Method | Who May Review the Letter |
| Either / both vote(s) negatively | Dean | Decision & rationale of Committee & Dean | In Dossier | Within 2 weeks of Dean's decision | Required: Committee Chair Optional: Committee Members |
| Both are positive | Dean (Optional) | Votes, decision, rationale of Committee & Dean | In Dossier | Within 2 weeks of Dean's decision | N/A |
| Campus Level | | | | | |
| Type of Case | Letter From | Contents of Letter | Placement in Dossier | Deadline / Delivery Method | Who May Review the Letter |
| All Cases | Associate Provost | Decision | Before President's Letter | Following decision of the President | N/A |
| President | | | | | |
| Type of Case | Letter From | Contents of Letter | Placement in Dossier | Deadline / Delivery Method | Who May Review the Letter |
| Decision is negative | President | Decision (if mandatory case, termination date) | Front of Dossier (Dossier placed in candidate's personnel file) | Suggested within 2 weeks of President's decision, electronic and certified mail | N/A |
| Decision is positive | | Decision and effective date of promotion | | Suggested within 2 weeks of President's decision | |



Transmittal Form

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------|----------------------|--|
| Candidate's Name | | UID No. | |
| Primary Unit | | Secondary Unit | |
| College | | Date to Present Rank | |
| Present Rank | | Proposed Rank | |
| Mandatory Review | Yes No | Citizenship | |
| New Hire | Yes No | Type of Appointment | |

Primary Unit

| Tenure Home | Meeting Date | Vote Summary | | Abstentions | | Absent | Sum |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|----|-------------|------|--------|-----|
| | | Yes | No | Vol. | Man. | | |
| Unit APT Committee | | | | | | | |
| Unit Head | | | | | | | |
| College APT Committee | | | | | | | |
| Dean | | | | | | | |

Secondary Unit

| Joint Appointment | Meeting Date | Vote Summary | | Abstentions | | Absent | Sum |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|----|-------------|------|--------|-----|
| | | Yes | No | Vol. | Man. | | |
| Unit APT Committee | | | | | | | |
| Unit Head | | | | | | | |
| College APT Committee | | | | | | | |
| Dean | | | | | | | |

Contact Information

| | Name | Phone | Email | Campus Address |
|--------------------------|------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Dean | | X- | | |
| College APT Spokesperson | | X- | | |
| Unit Head | | X- | | |
| Unit APT Spokesperson | | X- | | |

Items to be Included in the Dossier

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transmittal Form 2. Candidate Verification Page 3. Curriculum Vitae † 4. Reputation of Publication Outlets † 5. Personal Statement # † 6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements # † 7. Optional Rejoinder from Candidate † 8. Unit Promotion Criteria † 9. Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria (if applicable) † | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Department APT Report 11. Optional Minority Report 12. Department Chair's Letter 13. College APT Report 14. Dean's Letter 15. Optional Teaching Statement # † 16. Student Feedback on Course Experience † 17. Peer Teaching Evaluations / Information # † 18. Mentoring / Advising / Research Supervision † | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 19. Credentials of External Evaluators 20. Responses from External Evaluators 21. Candidate Notification from Chair 22. Candidate Notification from Dean 23. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests 24. Sample Message Formally Requesting Evaluation † 25. Sample Message Requesting Availability † 26. Declines from Evaluators |
|--|---|---|

Not Required for New Appointments

† Signed and Dated by Candidate

Candidate Verification

Name:

Unit:

(First Last)

I have seen the following components of my dossier:

| | | Initials | Date Viewed |
|--|---|----------|-------------|
| | Reputation of Publication Outlets | | |
| | Summary Statement of Professional Achievements | | |
| | Unit Promotion Criteria | | |
| | Student Feedback on Course Experiences | | |
| | Peer Teaching Information / Evaluations | | |
| | Mentoring / Advising / Research Supervision (Option: Bookmarked section of CV or separate document) | | |
| | Sample Message Formally Requesting Evaluation | | |
| | Sample Message Requesting Availability | | |

Signature

Date

*Note: CV and personal / teaching statement(s) are signed
directly on those documents.*

WHAT'S IN THE DOSSIER FOR DIFFERENT CASES?

For tenure and promotion cases, see the Elements of the Dossier section for a full list of required and optional items, in appropriate order. Otherwise, use this table as a reference for other cases.

| | Emeriti | Professor of the Practice | New Professors or New College Park Professors | New University of Maryland Professor | Associate Professor without Tenure |
|---|---------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Transmittal Form | ✓ | ✓* | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Reputation of Publication Outlets (signed & dated) | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Promotion Criteria | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Dept. APT Review Committee Report | ✓ | ✓* | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Department Chair's Letter (and Secondary Unit Head's Letter, if applicable) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| College APT Review Committee Report | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Dean's Letter | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Student Evaluations of Teaching (signed & dated) | | ✓ | ✓** | ✓ | |
| Mentoring, Advising, Research Supervision (signed & dated) | | ✓* | ✓** | ✓ | |
| Credentials of External Evaluators | | ✓* | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Responses of External Evaluators (at least 6, 3 chosen by candidate) | | ✓* | ✓ | ✓ | ✓† |
| Log of Letters of Evaluation | | ✓* | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations | | ✓* | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Supplemental Materials | | | ✓ | | |
| Retirement Documentation | ✓ | | | | |
| Submit: Electronic Copy | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |

* Not needed for renewal.

** Not necessary for College Park Professors. *For College Park Professors of extreme stature (e.g., Nobel Laureates), letters may be bypassed.*

† Recommendation letters, as for a job application.

SAMPLE MESSAGE REQUESTING AVAILABILITY

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

Dr. XXXX XXX is due to be reviewed for (select as appropriate: Associate Professor with tenure/promotion to the rank of Professor) in academic year YYYY-YYYY. We are developing a list of external evaluators for (select as appropriate: his/her/their) case, and you were recommended as an eminent scholar in (her/his/their) field. I am emailing you now to ask about your availability.

Would you be willing to serve as an external evaluator for Dr. XXX, and if so, would you be able to evaluate (select as appropriate: his/her/their) case and submit your review letter **no later than (date)**?

We would send you Dr. XXX's CV, (select as appropriate: his/her/their) personal statement, examples of (select as appropriate: his/her/their) scholarship, and the department's promotion criteria **by (date)**.

Thank you very much for your consideration, and I would be grateful if you could **respond by (date)** concerning your availability.

Sincerely,

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATOR (TENURE AND PROMOTION)

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

Dr. XXXX XXX is due to be reviewed for Associate Professor with tenure 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 Park, College of XXXX and Department of XXXX, I request your evaluation of the following:

- The quality of the candidate's research and/or creative activity, including the quality of the candidate's publications, exhibitions, or performances; the quality of the journals, presses, or outlets in which the candidate has published, exhibited, or performed;
- The impact and significant accomplishments of the candidate's research and/or creative activity to date;
- The candidate's promise of becoming a leading scholar;
- The candidate's teaching and mentoring to the extent you are able to do so; and
- The candidate's service activities (e.g., public service, service to the profession/field).

In assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion and tenure, please:

- Base your analysis only on the criteria and materials provided;
- Indicate whether you would or would not recommend this candidate for promotion and tenure at the University of Maryland; and
- Comment on the nature of your professional interaction with the candidate and also on the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in his/her field, if applicable.

The University of Maryland acknowledges that faculty across the academy may have experienced disruptions to teaching and mentoring; research, scholarship, and creative activities; service; and extension activities due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the loss or reduction of competitively secured contracts and grants, travel restrictions, or other factors. We ask that you take into consideration these disruptions as relevant or as described in the included materials for review. Candidates for promotion and tenure may also receive additional extensions of the tenure clock according to University policy. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure at the University of Maryland are the same for all faculty regardless of length of service during the probationary period.

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] sample works listed below selected by Dr. XXX, and a copy of the promotion criteria.

I realize that this information is rather extensive and will require considerable effort on your part to review. Given your prominence and achievements in the field, the importance of peer review in the tenure process, and the significance of a tenure decision, your expert assessment constitutes an important element in the overall evaluation of Dr. XXX's credentials. Further, maintaining confidentiality is an essential requirement for the University of Maryland's tenure and promotion review process. As such, I ask that you refrain from the use of generative artificial intelligence ("Gen AI") tools in your evaluation of the dossier materials and preparation of your review letter to ensure confidentiality and the integrity of peer review.

Thank you again for agreeing to conduct the review of Dr. XXX's candidacy for tenure. I would be very grateful if you could respond to us in writing no later than..... Please send your signed letter on your organization's letterhead by e-mail to.....umd.edu as an attachment.

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX

Chair, APT Review Committee

Department of XXX

enclosures: CV, personal statement, publications (please list), Unit promotion criteria.

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATOR (PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR)

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

Dr. XXXX XXX is due to be reviewed for promotion to 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 Professor of XXXX.

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 and impact of the candidate's research and creative activity, including the quality of the candidate's publications, exhibitions, or performances; the quality of the journals, presses, or outlets in which the candidate has published, exhibited, or performed; and the candidate's potential for future contributions;

- The impact and significant accomplishments of the candidate's research and/or creative activity;
- The standing of the candidate in their field;
- The candidate's teaching and mentoring to the extent you are able to do so; and
- The candidate's service activities (e.g., public service, service to the profession).

In assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion, please:

- Base your analysis only on the criteria and materials provided;
- Indicate whether you would or would not recommend this candidate for promotion at the University of Maryland; and
- Comment on the nature of your professional interaction with the candidate and also on the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in his/her field, if applicable.

The University of Maryland acknowledges that faculty across the academy may have experienced disruptions to teaching and mentoring; research, scholarship, and creative activities; service; and extension activities due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the loss or reduction of competitively secured contracts and grants, travel restrictions, or other factors. We ask that

you take into consideration these disruptions as relevant or as described in the included materials for review.

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] sample works listed below selected by Dr. XXX, and a copy of the promotion criteria.

I realize that this information is rather extensive and will require considerable effort on your part to review. Given your prominence and achievements in the field, the importance of peer review in the promotion process, and the significance of a promotion decision, your expert assessment constitutes an important element in the overall evaluation of Dr. XXX's credentials. Further, maintaining confidentiality is an essential requirement for the University of Maryland's promotion review process. As such, I ask that you refrain from the use of generative artificial intelligence ("Gen AI") tools in your evaluation of the dossier materials and preparation of your review letter to ensure confidentiality and the integrity of peer review.

Thank you again for agreeing to conduct the review of Dr. XXX's candidacy for promotion. I would be very grateful if you could respond to us in writing no later than..... Please send your signed letter on your organization's letterhead by e-mail to.....umd.edu as an attachment.

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX

Chair, APT Review Committee

Department of XXX

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

SAMPLE LANGUAGE FOR CASES OF DENIAL OF PROMOTION

The eligible voting members of the Department met on October 25, 2023 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

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

TEMPLATE FOR STUDENT FEEDBACK ON COURSE EXPERIENCES

These evaluation scores are an important indicator of teaching excellence. They must be clearly presented using the Tableau report developed by IRPA and the Office of Faculty Affairs:

- Faculty members may access the instructor version of the report [here](#).
- Administrators may access the administrator version of the report [here](#).

In general, we recommend that units use the Administrator version of the report. However, administrator versions of the report may not fully encompass all of the student assessments. For example, the administrator report will not include course evaluations for courses taught by a faculty member outside the unit (such as Honors courses), or cross-listed courses.

Student comments should not be included, though a faculty member may include student comments in their teaching portfolio if they wish to do so. Note also that Spring 2020 student course evaluations are not provided in the administrator view of faculty course evaluations and should not be included in the main dossier. Faculty members may include Spring 2020 course evaluations in the teaching portfolio, should they elect to do so.

The course evaluation summary to be included in the dossier must be shared with the candidate, who will indicate agreement by signature and date.

If your College does not use the university standard course evaluation system or the candidate teaches in a non-traditional format that does not generate system evaluations, there should also be an explanation of the rating system that is used, as well as documentation of instructional assessments.

ADDRESSING DISRUPTIONS TO FACULTY WORK

Faculty members may elect to describe the impact of disruptions (external circumstances) on their work as part of the promotion and tenure review process through their Personal Statements, CV annotations, and documentation (e.g., notification of contract/grant cancellations from funding agencies).

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Faculty can elect to include the impact of disruptions on their research/ scholarship/ creative works, teaching and mentoring, and service activities as part of their personal statement that is included in the dossier and goes out to external letter writers.

Examples of disruptions may include, but are not limited to, grant/contract termination, funders no longer support the a particular domain or type of research/scholarship/creative work, supply chain or procurement challenges that have negatively impacted productivity or ability to conduct research, the discontinuation and/or removal of public data collection activities and datasets.

CV ANNOTATION

Faculty members may elect to annotate their CV that is submitted for tenure and/or promotion reviews. OFA recommends the below annotation for grant/contract cancellations/terminations.

After the normal citation for a grant, contract, or award, include an asterisk (*) by the end date for period of the award, and, following the citation include a note similar to the following example: *Note: This grant/contract/award was terminated on [date of termination] by [name of funding agency terminating the award] due to [reason provided, if any, by the funding agency; if no reason provided, indicate "for unknown reasons."].

NOTICE(S) FROM GRANTING / CONTRACTING AGENCIES

Candidates may elect to include in their review materials, as evidentiary documentation, the official notice(s) received from funding entities cancelling/terminating their grants and/or contracts, or requests for modifications to their grants/contracts. If provided, such notices

would remain internal to the University and not shared with external evaluators (e.g., external letter writers). These would be included in the Supplemental Materials dossier.