UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
THE OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Suite 2117, Henry V. Miller Main Administration Bldg.
7901 Regents Drive
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-6803 | faculty.umd.edu

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

AEP Guidelines and Manual

AY 2026-2027
July 15, 2026

Contents

Introduction 4
Publication of this Document 4
Kinds of Information 4
Policies and Procedures Governing AEP Process 4
Useful Definitions 5
Advisory SubCommittee 5
AEP Appeals Committee 5
Criteria 5
Instructional Faculty 5
Next Level Administrator 5
Peer Evaluation 5
Promotion Dossier 5
PTK Faculty 5
Quorum 6
Unit 6
Unit Head 6
Votes possible for deciding to award appointment or promotion based on criteria 6
Faculty Categories & Ranks 7
PTK Faculty Categories and Ranks 7
The Structure of Reviews 8
Equity and Fairness in the Review Process 8
Procedures to Follow Observed Actions of Concern 8
Timeline for the AEP Process 8
Information for the Candidate 12
The Review Process 13
Review for Promotion 13
Promotions to the mid-level 15
Promotions to the third level 18
When Issues Arise During the Review Process 20
Review for change of title request 21
The Candidate's Responsibilities 21
Information for Unit Heads and Deans 23
Appointment Considerations 23
New Appointments 23
New appointments to mid-level PTK faculty ranks 23
New appointments to the third level 23
New Appointments of Emerita/Emeritus Status 24
Appointments in more than one unit 24
Expedited Appointments 25
Unit AEP Review Committee 25
External and/or Internal Evaluators 26

Reputation of Publication Outlets for PTK Faculty Members with Research Duties 28
Peer Evaluation of the Candidate's Teaching for PTK Faculty with Instructional Duties..... 28
Summary Statement of Professional Responsibilities, Achievements, and Impact..... 29
Candidate Review of Non-Evaluative Materials 29
Report of the Unit AEP Review Committee..... 30
Voting at the Unit Level 31
The Unit AEP Review Committee's Responsibilities..... 31
Unit Head 32
Unit Head's Letter 32
The Unit Head's Responsibilities 33
College/School AEP Review Committee (if applicable)..... 34
The College/School AEP Review Committee's Responsibilities 34
Dean..... 35
Dean's Letter 35
Dean's Notification to Candidate 35
The Dean's Responsibilities 35
Information Regarding Dossier Preparation 37
Overview..... 37
Creating the Dossier..... 37
Bookmarks..... 37
Password Protection 37
Searchable Text..... 37
Candidate Verification Page 37
Elements of the Dossier 38
Transmittal Form..... 39
Candidate Verification Page (Unit-Candidate) 39
Curriculum Vitae (Candidate)..... 39
Reputation of Publication Outlets (Research) (Unit) 40
Personal Statement (Candidate) 40
Optional Teaching Statement (Instructional) (Candidate) 40
Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (Unit) 40
Optional Rejoinder from Candidate (Candidate) 40
Description of Duties/Responsibilities (Unit) 41
Promotion Criteria (Unit)..... 41
Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria and/or MOU for Multiple Appointments (if applicable) (Unit)..... 41
Unit AEP Report (Unit)..... 41
Optional Minority AEP Report (Unit)..... 41
Unit Head's Letter (Unit)..... 41
College AEP Report (College)..... 41
Optional Minority AEP Report (College)..... 41
Dean's Letter (College)..... 41
Student Feedback on Course Experiences Data (Instructional) (Unit or Candidate) 42
Peer Evaluations of Teaching (Instructional) (Unit)..... 42

Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision (Candidate) 42
Credentials of External Evaluators (Unit) 42
Responses of Evaluators (Unit) 42
Candidate Notification from Unit Head (Unit) 43
Candidate Notification from Dean (College) 43
Letter Log of Evaluation Requests (Unit) 43
Sample Requests for Availability and Evaluation with Supporting Materials (Unit) 43
Declines from Evaluators (Unit) 43
Creating the Teaching Portfolio 43
Uploading the Dossier and Teaching Portfolio 44
Creating the Supplemental Dossier 44
Appendix 45
CV Template 45
Dossier Elements by Creator 45
Transmittal Form 46
Letter Log 47
Candidate Notification of AEP Decision 48
Unit Level (and Non-Departmentalized Colleges / Schools) 48
College Level (For Departmentalized Colleges/Schools) 48
Campus Level (For cases of appointment or promotion to third level in a PTK title series) 48
Candidate Verification Form 50
Sample Letter to Evaluator 51
Sample Language for Cases of Denial of Promotion 52
Sample Language for Letters of Review for Adherence to Due Process 52

Introduction

PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

The AEP 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/aep-manual).

This document was last updated on July 15, 2026.

KINDS OF INFORMATION

This manual contains two kinds of information and adheres to the following presentation styles:

1. Discussion of **The University of Maryland Policies & Procedures on the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty (APT Policy),** and the **UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty** (AEP Guidelines). These are **marked in bold, and will be cited by section number (e.g., AEP Guidelines Section III.A)**;
2. Required and recommended procedures for the conduct of reviews and dossier preparation. These are in this default font.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING AEP PROCESS

Each Unit is responsible for creating policies and procedures for promotion, as well as evaluation criteria for promotion reviews of Professional Track (PTK) faculty members (AEP Policies and Procedures) (**AEP Guidelines, Section II.A. & B.**). AEP Policies and Procedures may be created as individual Unit policies or incorporated into Unit Plans of Organization (**AEP Guidelines, Section I.B.**). Units may not appoint individuals into promotable PTK ranks without an approved AEP plan and promotion criteria in place. Further, any Unit that appoints individuals into PTK faculty ranks must adhere to all University and University System of Maryland (USM) policies and procedures related to faculty members.

Given that amending Plans of Organization can be a lengthy process, if a Unit chooses to incorporate policies into its Plan, new policies and procedures shall be developed as soon as possible and implemented prior to formal incorporation into the Plan of Organization (**AEP Guidelines Section II(B)**).

PTK faculty members shall have an opportunity to review and vote on AEP Policies and Procedures in accordance with their Unit's Plan of Organization. Unit Heads are responsible for

documenting and responding to all comments made to AEP Policies and Procedures and for maintaining a detailed record of the unit's review process and final vote count.

USEFUL DEFINITIONS

ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

Optional subgroup of voting-eligible faculty members who gather information for the review, and who may author the AEP Review Committee Evaluative Report, which they sign.

AEP APPEALS COMMITTEE

An ad-hoc committee appointed by the Office of Faculty Affairs or Dean's Office that will be charged with reviewing denials of promotions. This committee will be composed of tenured professors and PTK faculty members at the highest rank in diverse roles. It will have at least five, but no more than nine members, the majority of whom will be PTK faculty members at the highest rank. The level of appointment and departmentalized status of the College will determine whether an appeal is requested of the Dean or Provost.

CRITERIA

A unit's defined performance standards and metrics that articulate faculty member expectations for initial appointment and promotion.

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

Faculty members with primary responsibilities in teaching, advising, and/or clinical instruction.

NEXT LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR

The administrator to whom the Unit Head reports (e.g., Dean or Provost).

PEER EVALUATION

In the context of AEP promotion reviews, Peer Evaluation refers to a method of assessing a portfolio of information pertaining to the teaching-related activities of an instructor under review.

PROMOTION DOSSIER

A file containing detailed records about a faculty member seeking promotion.

PTK FACULTY

For the purposes of this document, Professional Track (PTK) Faculty are faculty members in promotable title series (see **PTK Faculty Categories & Ranks,** below) with non-tenure-eligible appointments equal to or greater than 50% full-time equivalent (FTE). All PTK Faculty require

contracts that define duties and terms of employment. Note: Instructional faculty appointed below 50% FTE are governed by USM and UMD policies for Adjunct Faculty. (**II-1.07, II-1.07(A)**).

QUORUM

Number of eligible voting members needed to conduct a valid vote on matters related to appointment or promotion, based on codified methods of operation. Quorum is calculated based on the Unit's plan of organization, which should also include information on how absences affect the quorum.

UNIT

In departmentalized Colleges and Schools, this can refer to a department, University recognized Institute or Center with an approved AEP Plan, or Dean's Office.

In non-departmentalized Colleges and Schools, this refers to the College/School or a University recognized Institute or Center with an approved AEP Plan.

UNIT HEAD

In departmentalized Colleges and Schools, this can refer to a Department Chair or School Director, or a Director of a University recognized Institute or Center with an approved AEP Plan.

In non-departmentalized Colleges and Schools, this refers to the Dean or the Director of a University recognized Institute or Center with an approved AEP Plan.

VOTES POSSIBLE FOR DECIDING TO AWARD APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION BASED ON CRITERIA

- Yes
- No
- Abstention (two types):
    - Mandatory: a faculty member who has a conflict of interest (e.g., a family member or partner of the candidate, thesis advisor), or who has already voted at a lower level. Mandatory abstentions are not counted against quorum.
    - Voluntary: a faculty member who chooses not to vote (this should be explained in summaries and letters). Voluntary abstentions are considered a non-positive vote. Voluntary abstentions count toward quorum.
- Absent: not present in person or via teleconference (if the latter is allowed by the Unit's plan of organization)

FACULTY CATEGORIES & RANKS

Table 1 lists all promotion-eligible PTK faculty categories and ranks that exist at the University of Maryland. Further classification information, including descriptions of PTK faculty titles, is set forth in II-1.00(A)(I) University of Maryland Policy & Procedures on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty.

PTK FACULTY CATEGORIES AND RANKS

Category	Ranks
PTK Faculty | Research, Scholarship or Artistic Creativity	
Research Faculty	Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, Research Professor
Research Scientist	Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist
Research Engineer	Assistant Research Engineer, Associate Research Engineer, Research Engineer
Research Scholar	Assistant Research Scholar, Associate Research Scholar, Research Scholar
Artist-in-Residence	Assistant Artist-in-Residence, Associate Artist-in-Residence, Artist- in-Residence
PTK Faculty | Instructional	
Lecturer	Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer
Clinical	Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Professor
Field Faculty	
Agent Associate	Agent Associate, Senior Agent Associate, Principal Agent Associate
Specialist Faculty	
Faculty Specialist	Faculty Specialist, Senior Faculty Specialist, Principal Faculty Specialist

Individuals appointed into the above instructional ranks must have an FTE of 50% or greater to be considered for promotion. Instructional faculty appointments below 50% FTE are governed by USM and UMD policies for Adjunct Faculty (**II-1.07, II-1.07(A)**). Information about Professor of the Practice appointments may be found in the University's APT Manual.

THE STRUCTURE OF REVIEWS

There are two levels of promotion review for PTK faculty members: Review to the middle/second rank (e.g., Senior Lecturer, Associate Research Professor) level and review to the highest/third rank) level (e.g., Principal Lecturer, Research Professor). Promotion to the next higher rank in a faculty classification is based on a PTK faculty member's academic and professional qualifications and achievements in the categories of teaching, scholarship, program management/leadership, and/or service as specified in the unit's AEP Policies and Procedures (**AEP Guidelines, Section III.C.**) and performance of duties set forth in their employment contract. Time in rank may be considered as a criterion for promotion eligibility but, by itself, is not sufficient to qualify a candidate for promotion.

For additional details, see the "Review Process" below, under "Information for the Candidate."

EQUITY AND FAIRNESS IN THE REVIEW PROCESS

To encourage a fair and equitable review process for the candidate, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will send out a memo to all faculty review committees and administrators at each level reminding them of the importance of conducting a fair and unbiased evaluation (hereinafter, "the Equity Memo") (a copy of the Equity Memo is included in the Appendix - TBD). Chairs of the Unit-level AEP review committees are to distribute the Equity Memo to the voting faculty at the inception of the review process. It shall be referenced prior to the evaluative meeting and whenever inappropriate discussions arise. In departmentalized Schools/Colleges, Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs and College Diversity Officers are encouraged to formally charge first level Unit AEP Review Committees prior to the review process, paying specific attention to equity-related issues. Additionally, College AEP Review Committees will receive a formal charge by the Office of Faculty Affairs and the College's Equity Officer prior to its deliberations.

PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW OBSERVED ACTIONS OF CONCERN

Should faculty members of the AEP Review Committee witness others making inappropriate comments (e.g., remarks referencing cultural background, group membership, and/or personality traits) or violations of procedures, they are encouraged to raise their concern(s) during the meeting. Concerned faculty members may also discuss the issue confidentially with the AEP Review Committee Chair or the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

TIMELINE FOR THE AEP PROCESS

On an annual basis, Units shall set deadlines to submit applications for promotion (**AEP Guidelines, Section V.G**) and publish a calendar that sets forth these deadlines. The Office of Faculty Affairs will set deadlines annually to submit applications for promotions to the third

level that are to be reviewed by the Campus AEP Committee. The Office of Faculty Affairs strongly encourages units to submit dossiers earlier to allow for the resolution of any questions that arise before committee review. Table 2 sets forth a suggested timeline for faculty members, Unit Heads (and other administrators), and staff members with respect to PTK promotions.

Note: The Office of Faculty Affairs does not conduct off-cycle reviews for PTK promotions or new appointments into the highest PTK ranks. To receive consideration for promotion or a new appointment into the highest rank during the normal review timeline (to take effect in the upcoming fiscal or academic year), Units must submit complete and correctly formatted dossiers no later than the spring semester date designated by the Office of Faculty Affairs. Dossiers that are not submitted by the designated date will not be reviewed until the following academic year, unless approved by the Provost (upon review of a written justification provided by the Dean). In such cases, the individual should be appointed into a position with visiting status (e.g., Visiting Clinical Professor) while the unit conducts the formal appointment review.

	Faculty Member	Unit Head	Staff
Winter	Prepare/update CV. Prepare personal statement. For candidates seeking promotion to the third level, develop list of external and internal evaluators and choose materials to be sent to evaluators if applicable under their Unit's AEP plan.	Ensure all PTK faculty members are scheduled for review at least every other year. Ensure all unit and college AEP committees are trained and staffed. Double-check for joint or multiple appointments.	Upcoming promotions - Finalize the current year's dossiers for uploading to the Office of Faculty Affairs website. Make dossiers searchable. Add bookmarks, password. Ensure pages all display the same way. Check to make sure all items are present. Set dossier to display.

	Faculty Member	Unit Head	Staff
Spring	Prepare/update teaching portfolio and supplemental dossier materials if applicable under their Unit's AEP plan Notify the Unit Head or other appropriate individual(s) by April 1 (9 month faculty) or June 30 (12 month faculty) of your intent to seek promotion the following year.	Determine if PTK faculty member requesting promotion is eligible and communicate the decision with reasons to PTK faculty member with a copy to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs Double-check for joint or multiple appointments and whether there are specific criteria for the candidate. Choose and prepare materials to be sent to external and/or internal evaluators, if applicable under Unit AEP plan. Request external and internal evaluations.	Upcoming promotions - For each candidate, set up a transmittal form. Prepare letter log, student feedback on Course Experiences and citation counts if applicable under their Unit's AEP plan. Upload dossier to the Office of Faculty Affairs website no later than the designated date. Looking ahead: Gather preliminary materials (e.g., promotion criteria, reputation of publication outlets) for next year's dossiers.
Summer	Continue preparation of promotion materials as necessary.	Schedule AEP committee meetings. If applicable, follow up with external and internal evaluators.	For the following year's promotion cycle, begin dossier for each candidate. If applicable, update letter log; add external and internal evaluator letters as they are received.

	Faculty Member	Unit Head	Staff
Fall	Create CV addenda as needed. Submit promotion application materials by date(s) established by the Unit. Promotions may not be considered further if the candidate fails to meet established Unit dates.	Committee members prepare Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and provide this, along with other non-evaluative materials, for candidate's review/ signature. Unit and College-level review committee meetings held. Notify candidates. Unit Heads and Deans write evaluative letters.	Upcoming promotions - Update transmittal forms with meeting dates, votes. Add committee reports and Unit Heads'/Deans' letters to the dossier as they become available. Get packets ready for review by Unit and College AEP Review committees.

Information for the Candidate

A candidate's preparation for promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. Soon after the candidate arrives, their Unit Head should:

- Provide the candidate with a copy of (or link to) this campus AEP Manual and the Unit's promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which they will be evaluated (**AEP Guidelines, Section II.B. and Section IV.A.**), and
- Appoint one or more senior faculty mentors, in accordance with **Section V.B. of the AEP Guidelines** and UMD Mentoring Guidance. Each unit is required to have a mentoring plan; candidates should consult this plan for further details regarding mentorship.

Review for promotion is the University's primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university, as well as for recognizing the impact and quality of the faculty member's accomplishments. Candidates for promotion in the PTK faculty ranks will be evaluated based on the duties and expectations associated with the specific faculty rank they hold as described in the Unit's AEP plans, which must be consistent with the titles defined in II-1.00(A) University of Maryland Policy & Procedures on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty, and in the PTK faculty member's employment contract (**AEP Guidelines, Section V.D.**). Units are responsible for developing and adhering to their adopted criteria (unless approved modified criteria are in place for a candidate) and procedures for appointments and promotions.

Generally, PTK faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence and accomplishment in one or more of the following areas: (1) research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service. If relevant, PTK faculty members may also demonstrate excellence and accomplishment in areas such as program administration, leadership (e.g., center/institute direction, lab management), extension activities, or other areas as relevant to the faculty member's documented appointment. Given that PTK faculty members might be active in only one or two of the three dimensions of academic activity, Units shall establish explicitly the scope of the appointee's efforts in terms of the dimensions of academic activity (e.g., Teaching, Research, Service, Administration), thereby providing a clear set of expectations during performance evaluation and promotion reviews (**AEP Guidelines, Sections III.C. and IV.B.**).

REVIEW FOR PROMOTION

Unit Heads are expected to discuss a promotion plan with PTK faculty members upon their hiring and during their reviews (e.g., annual, merit). The University has not prescribed a timeline for promotion for PTK faculty members. Although details related to the promotion process have been left to individual Units (**AEP Guidelines, Section V.C.**), no Unit shall prohibit an eligible PTK faculty member, based on unit criteria, from applying for promotion due to budgetary issues, nor shall Units require a PTK faculty member to undergo review.

The Unit Head's determination of eligibility for promotion is final. In the event that a Unit Head declines a request to go up for promotion from a faculty member who is eligible to do so based on the criteria, the faculty member may have the right to grieve this decision under the University's Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Grievances, II-4.00(A). The Faculty Ombuds can provide additional information:

https://president.umd.edu/administration/administrative-offices/university-of-maryland-ombuds-services/faculty-ombuds.

For those title series that require candidates to have a specific level of experience in order to be eligible for promotion, as set forth in **Section II-1.00(A)** of the APT policy (e.g., appointees to the rank of Principal Lecturer "shall have…at least 5 years full-time service or its equivalent as a Senior Lecturer [or similar appointment at another institution]"), Units should determine and articulate clearly what qualifies as equivalent experience.

From start to finish, the AEP review process takes about one year (**AEP Guidelines, Section V.G.**), though candidates should be looking ahead to promotion from the day they begin at the University. While each Unit has its own AEP plan, in general, the case will go forward if the candidate meets all promotion eligibility criteria as articulated in the Unit's AEP criteria and either the Unit AEP Review Committee or the Chair supports promotion. Cases brought forward by units that do not meet the Unit's criteria will be returned to the Unit and not receive further consideration.

Because the promotion dossier will be reviewed by individuals who may or may not be familiar with the candidate's work, the information provided in the dossier should be clearly presented and conform to dossier requirements. The candidate's mentor(s) can provide advice about preparation of those materials. This candidate-provided 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.

The Curriculum Vitae

PTK faculty members perform a wide variety of duties at the University. They may focus on any or all of the following functions:

1. Research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity;
2. Teaching, advising, mentoring, and curriculum development;
3. Service to the unit, campus, and discipline;
4. Administration of programs, labs, units or sub-units; and/or
5. Extension activity.

The CV should present an accurate portrait of the candidate's accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible.

The CV, which will be included in each request for internal and external evaluation, must be in the required University format (see information about the CV template on the Office of Faculty Affairs website); it must be signed and dated, indicating that it is up to date and accurate. Note: the University's CV template is designed to encompass all fields and disciplines; candidates may modify the template to remove CV categories that are not relevant to their activities.

If there are subsequent changes to the candidate's credentials, such as additional funding or new publications, they may be recorded as addenda to the CV, which may then be included in the dossier up to the time that the dossier is transmitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs for campus-level review. Any addenda must also be signed and dated.

The Personal Statement

This statement provides candidates with the opportunity to articulate how they merit promotion based upon their record of achievement in one or more of the following areas: research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity, teaching and mentoring, service, administration and/or leadership. It is incumbent on candidates to show that their work calls upon their academic and/or professional expertise. They must provide evidence that their work satisfies the Unit's criteria (or modified criteria, if applicable) for excellence; such evidence will vary depending on the candidate's roles and responsibilities and may address the following (if applicable):

- Impact of research and scholarship;
- Demonstrated excellence in instruction and/or instructional activities;
- Significance/innovation related to their teaching, research and/or service duties;
- Supervision of employees;
- Outreach/community engagement activities;

- Administrative leadership and other support provided to units;
- Creation and/or growth of programs;
- Connections to business, government and non-profit sectors;
- Advising/mentoring roles; and/or
- Professional development including external activities and experience.

If the candidate has been involved in collaborative publications or activities, they should explain the extent of participation and type of contribution to those collaborative efforts.

The personal statement should be relatively short (generally 3-4 single-spaced pages, **but no more than 5**) and directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate's field. The signed and dated statement must be included in each request for external or internal evaluation letters, if applicable. It may not be changed after it is given to the AEP Review Committee and, if applicable, sent to external or internal reviewers.

Teaching Portfolio

In addition to materials compiled into the promotion dossier, instructional PTK faculty members must prepare a teaching portfolio, according to Unit guidelines, which may include the following types of items: course syllabi; a statement of teaching philosophy; reflective assessments; learning outcomes assessment materials; and mentoring accomplishments, such as placement of advisees in academic and professional positions. More information about the teaching portfolio is included in the Appendix, as shared by the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC).

Supplemental Materials

The candidate may wish to include representative pieces of scholarship, descriptions of awards and honors, or media coverage in an optional supplemental dossier. If the materials chosen for inclusion are publicly available, the candidate is advised to include a description of the item and a link, rather than copying the full item into the supplemental dossier.

Candidates are encouraged to view the supplemental materials file as a place for representative scholarship and other extraordinary materials. The candidate should choose items for inclusion carefully. Supplemental dossiers may not exceed 150 pages total.

PROMOTIONS TO THE MID-LEVEL

Departmentalized Colleges

In departmentalized Colleges/Schools, there are two levels of review:

1. At the first level by (a) the Unit AEP Review Committee and (b) the Unit Head;

2. At the second level by (a) the College AEP Review Committee and/or the Dean.

Units, in their discretion, may form an Advisory Subcommittee to facilitate the review process. The first level Unit review will be conducted by the Unit AEP Review Committee (or Advisory Subcommittee) and voted on by those faculty members specified in the unit's AEP plan. Eligible faculty members include PTK and TTK faculty members who are at or above the promotion rank (i.e., associate or full professors or PTK faculty members in the second or third level ranks). A 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 first level Unit). Voluntary abstentions are a non-positive vote that are counted in the total number of votes cast.

Following the first level Unit review and vote, the Unit Head will evaluate the dossier. If either the Unit AEP Review Committee or the Unit Head supports the case, it goes forward. Next, the dossier is reviewed by a College AEP Review Committee or the Dean of the College, as per the College's AEP plan.

During higher levels of review, questions may arise regarding a recommendation from a lower level of review. In such cases, the College AEP Review Committee or the Dean shall meet with the Unit AEP Review Committee Chair(s) and Unit Heads from the lower levels. A written list of questions must be provided to the lower level representatives in advance to serve as a basis for discussion.

Final authority for mid-level promotions resides solely with the College or School (**AEP Guidelines, Section V.F.**). The candidate shall be notified of the promotion decision by the Dean.

If the faculty member's appointment resides in the Dean's Office, the Dean will form a Unit AEP Review Committee that will make a recommendation to the Dean regarding promotion. Upon providing an independent review and evaluation of the case, the Dean will transmit the dossier for mid-level promotions to the Office of Faculty Affairs for review and certification.

Non-Departmentalized Colleges

In non-departmentalized Colleges/Schools, the process is the same as outlined above for departmentalized Colleges/Schools except that the first level of review will be conducted by the College AEP Review Committee (or Advisory Subcommittee) and voted on by those faculty specified in the College's AEP plan. Following review by the College AEP Review Committee and vote, the Unit Head will evaluate the dossier. Once the College AEP Review Committee and the Unit Head have made a decision related to the promotion, the Unit Head shall notify the

candidate in writing of the committee's vote and their own decision within two weeks. The candidate's dossier shall then be sent to the Office of Faculty Affairs for review and certification. The Office of Faculty Affairs shall notify the Unit upon certification of the promotion, after which the Unit shall notify the candidate of the final outcome.

Denial of mid-level promotion

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation by both the first level Unit Head and the first level AEP Review Committee, the review will not proceed further and the Unit Head shall provide written notice to the faculty member within two weeks of their decision. The letter should 1) state the faculty decision and the Unit Head's decision and 2) summarize briefly, in general terms, the reason for the denial. This letter should include the vote of the **Unit AEP Review Committee** (see Appendix for examples).

The Unit then forwards the case to the Next Level Administrator (the NLA) (i.e., the Dean in the case of departmentalized Colleges, and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs in the case of non-departmentalized Colleges), who will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received substantive and procedural due process.

Violation of substantive due process arises when (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g., upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, disability, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected First Amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision 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 arises when the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the AEP review: (1) to take a procedural step or (2) to fulfill a procedural requirement established in the Unit's AEP plan. Violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.b**).

If the NLA determines that there has been a violation of due process, they will remand the case to the Unit for reconsideration. If no error has occurred, the NLA must notify the Unit, certifying that no violation of substantive or procedural due process was found. The NLA or Unit then notifies the candidate that the decision is final. 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 the Appendix.

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.

The faculty member may appeal a negative decision based on procedural and/or substantive grounds to the NLA. In departmentalized Colleges/Schools, the Dean will establish an ad-hoc Appeals Committee to review approved cases of appeal for promotions to the second level, or any cases denied at the unit level. The Office of Faculty Affairs will establish a campus-level AEP Appeals Committee to review approved cases of appeal for non-departmentalized Colleges/Schools (**AEP Guidelines V.H.**). A request for an appeal must be made in writing to the NLA within 60 calendar days of receipt of the final decision (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.a**). The request must detail the basis for the appeal and evidence to support the claims. If the appeal request is granted, the appellant has an additional 60 days in which to submit materials related to the case to the NLA. 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.

The Appeals 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 NLA who makes the final decision. When the NLA supports the findings of the Appeals Committee, and authorizes corrective action to be taken, the NLA has the responsibility for oversight and implementation of any such corrective action (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.e.1**).

Denial of promotion does not affect a candidate's existing appointment, nor does it prevent contract renewal. In the event of a denial, a faculty member may seek promotion again in a future year, following Unit and campus procedures and processes.

PROMOTIONS TO THE THIRD LEVEL

A decision by the Provost to promote PTK faculty to the third level follows advice and recommendations from the Unit Head, Dean, and faculty AEP Review Committee(s).

Departmentalized Colleges

In departmentalized Colleges/Schools, there are three levels of review:

1. At the first level by (a) the Unit AEP Review Committee and (b) the Unit Head;
2. At the second level by (a) the College AEP Review Committee and/or the Dean; and

3. At the third level by (a) the Campus AEP Review Committee and (b) the Provost.

At the first level, the promotion case is voted on by those faculty members specified in the Unit's AEP plan. Eligible faculty members include PTK and TTK faculty members who are at or above the promotion rank (i.e., full professors or faculty members in the highest PTK rank). A 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 Unit procedures or guidelines). Voluntary abstentions are non-positive votes that are counted in the total number of votes cast. Following this review and vote, the Unit Head will evaluate the dossier.

A promotion case will proceed to the second level of review if either the Unit AEP Review Committee or the Unit Head (or both) are in support. If the College AEP Review Committee or the Dean (or both) support the case, it is sent to the Campus level AEP Review Committee, which makes a recommendation for promotion to the Provost. The candidate shall be notified of the promotion decision by the Dean.

For promotion cases in which the candidate reports to the Dean of a departmentalized College/School, there are only two levels of review prior to a final decision. The AEP Review Committee appointed in accordance with the Unit's procedures and Dean functions as the first level of review. If the AEP Review Committee or the Dean (or both) support the case, it is sent to the Campus level AEP Review Committee, which makes a recommendation for promotion to the Provost.

Non-Departmentalized Colleges

In non-departmentalized Colleges/Schools, there are only two levels of review prior to a final decision. The process is the same as outlined above for departmentalized Colleges/Schools except that the first level of review will be conducted by the College AEP Review Committee and voted on by those faculty specified in the College's AEP plan. If the College AEP Review Committee or the Dean (or both) support the case, it is sent to the Campus level AEP Review Committee, which makes a recommendation for promotion to the Provost.

Denial of third-level promotion

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation at either the first or second level (as specified above), the procedure as set forth for "Denial of mid-level promotion" should be followed.

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation for promotion to the third level by the Campus AEP Review Committee, the faculty member will be notified in writing by the Provost. The faculty member may appeal a negative decision based on procedural or substantive

grounds to the Provost (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5, AEP Guidelines V (H)**). A request for an appeal must be made in writing to the Provost within 60 calendar days of the candidate's receipt of the Provost's letter. The request must detail the basis for the appeal and evidence to support the claims. If an appeal request is granted, the appellant has 60 additional days in which to submit materials relevant to the case to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The appellant should be aware that submitted materials will be shared with the Appeals Committee, parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee (**APT Policy Section V.B.1.a**).

A campus-level AEP Appeals Committee is formed by the Office of Faculty Affairs. The Committee will meet with the Appellant, and may interview 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 Provost who makes the final decision (APT Policy Section V.B.1.d.4). When the Provost 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**).

Denial of promotion does not affect a candidate's existing appointment, nor does it prevent contract renewal. In the event of a denial, a faculty member may seek promotion again in a future year, following Unit and campus procedures and processes.

WHEN ISSUES ARISE DURING THE REVIEW PROCESS

Administrators and faculty committees are responsible for ensuring that all candidates undergoing review receive fair and impartial treatment. They should deal with perceived problems either within their Unit AEP Review Committee or through the administrative structure as soon as the issue arises. It is recommended that the Chair of the Unit AEP Review Committee inform the voting faculty about these responsibilities whenever cases are reviewed (**University Senate Review of Appeals No. 99-00-13**).

Any 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 Unit Head, Dean, or Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs of the perceived violation (**University Senate Review of Appeals No. 99-00-13**).

REVIEW FOR CHANGE OF TITLE REQUEST

To request a change of title, a faculty member must submit a written request to their Unit Head. The Unit Head may approve the request upon a determination that the PTK faculty member satisfies the qualifications for a new appointment into that title. There should be no expectation on the part of the faculty member that their request for change of title will be granted.

The requested change must be a lateral move or change to a lower level in the new series (depending on the qualifications for appointment into the new title series), i.e. the faculty member cannot advance in rank at the same time as a title change (e.g., from a Lecturer to a Clinical Professor; however, a change from Principal Agent Associate to Associate Research Scientist may be possible).

In departmentalized Colleges/Schools, upon approval by the Unit Head, the request will be forwarded to the Dean for their approval. Upon approval by the Dean, the Unit will process the change in title series in the APA system. A title change is considered a new appointment, thereby requiring the issuance of a new contract and terms (e.g., salary, assigned duties, FTE) by the Unit to the faculty member.

THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The candidate is responsible for providing and verifying:

- Their signed and dated CV in the required University format;
- A signed and dated Personal Statement which makes a case for promotion based on the facts in the CV and on the unit's criteria for promotion, as set forth in the AEP plan;
- Description of duties listed in candidate's contract and, if applicable, any additional teaching, research, service, administration or extension activities requested of candidate (signed by the Candidate **and** the Unit Head);
- The names of qualified internal or external evaluators, if applicable (as further explained in the "Unit AEP Review Committee Members" section);
- If applicable:
    - A teaching portfolio with documentation (e.g., syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, teaching evaluations);
    - Select samples of publications or other forms of scholarship;
    - Evidence of leadership and management roles and responsibilities (e.g., number of employees supervised);
    - Description of program(s) created and/or managed (e.g., size of program, financial contributions to the academic unit and details of responsibilities);

    - Evidence of funding secured;
    - Evidence of community engagement and professional clinical work; and
- Any other relevant information requested by the AEP Review Committee (e.g., of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of award, recognition for other achievements related to the candidate's discipline).

APPOINTMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The Unit Head should provide the Unit's AEP plan/guidelines to candidates in the PTK ranks and address any questions the candidate may have about the promotion process.

New faculty appointments to limited term, non-promotable, and first-level PTK faculty ranks are handled according to Unit and/or college AEP processes and are not subject to the processes for new appointments set forth in this Manual.

NEW APPOINTMENTS

Benefits-eligible PTK appointments in promotable ranks are subject to the University's Hiring Guidelines for Search and Selection.

The dossier must include:

1. Nomination and support letter from Unit Head (in departmentalized Colleges) or Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs or equivalent (in non-departmentalized College);
2. The candidate's CV;
3. The Unit AEP Review Committee's vote and report (in departmentalized Colleges);
4. The Unit Head's Letter of Support;
5. The College AEP Review Committee's vote and report (if applicable); and
6. The Dean's letter of support.

For the duration of the review, the individual may be granted a visiting appointment. Note: there is not a University "off-cycle" review process for appointments into the highest PTK rank.

NEW APPOINTMENTS TO MID-LEVEL PTK FACULTY RANKS

New appointments to the ranks of mid-level PTK faculty ranks will follow the procedures for mid-level promotions set forth above.

For the duration of the review, the individual may be granted a visiting appointment.

NEW APPOINTMENTS TO THE THIRD LEVEL

New faculty appointments to the third level must be 1) reviewed in accordance with the procedures for promotion to the third level set forth above (including review by the Campus AEP Review Committee), and 2) approved by the Provost. No offer of appointment to the third level PTK faculty rank is valid in the absence of the Provost's approval.

For the duration of the review, the individual may be granted a visiting appointment.

All requests for new appointments at the third level must be accompanied by a separate memo that provides the information on the New Faculty Appointment Information Form (see Appendix), required for the Provost's approval of the appointment.

Dossiers for new appointments to the third level PTK rank may differ slightly from dossiers of candidates being promoted from within. A Summary of Professional Achievements and Personal Statement are not required, but may be included. Additionally, for instructional faculty, a teaching portfolio is recommended but not required. Such dossiers should, however, contain as much information as possible to demonstrate that the candidate has the qualifications, experience, and skills to perform their duties at the third level. The Unit, in accordance with its AEP plan, may require letters from internal and/or external evaluators, in accordance with the guidance set forth below.

NEW APPOINTMENTS OF EMERITA/EMERITUS STATUS

Professional track faculty members **at the third rank** with ten years of service are eligible for nomination to Emerita/Emeritus status (see **APT Policy Section IV.G** for review information). Candidates for Emerita/Emeritus status are not reviewed by faculty committees beyond the first level Unit AEP or APT Review Committee. Materials submitted for emeritus/emerita appointments should include a copy of the documentation of retirement and other materials mentioned 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.

APPOINTMENTS IN MORE THAN ONE UNIT

PTK faculty members with appointments in promotable PTK ranks in more than one unit must be appointed into the same rank and title series across their appointments.

With a joint appointment, a faculty member holds simultaneous appointments (of any percentage) in more than one Unit, and those appointments must be governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Units. At a minimum, the MOU must specify: 1) the primary Unit for any promotion review (this could be determined by percentage FTE or by agreement among the Units and faculty member in the case of equal FTE distribution among units); 2) conduct of promotion reviews, including composition of the review committee (which may include representative(s) from the secondary Unit) and the mechanisms through which input from the secondary Unit will be gathered; and 3) promotion criteria to be used for the review. The primary Unit's criteria may be used, or the Units and the faculty member may

agree upon modified review criteria for the faculty member. If modified criteria are developed, the faculty member and Unit Heads of the appointing Units must approve the criteria.

A PTK faculty member may also hold simultaneous appointments, in more than one Unit, that are not governed by an MOU. A faculty member with such dual (or multiple) appointments of any percentage FTE that, when combined, total 50% or more, who decides to seek promotion must inform the Unit Heads of each Unit in which they have an appointment. Upon being informed by the faculty member, the Unit Heads must confer and reach an agreement that covers the MOU terms set forth in the preceding paragraph.[1]

EXPEDITED APPOINTMENTS

In cases where a Unit has identified a potential faculty hire it has reason to believe is highly competitive and warrants an expedited review (sometimes referred to as a "target of opportunity" appointment), the review process can be streamlined. It is anticipated that appointments of this nature would be rare, as these individuals should possess an exceptional professional and reputational stature that merits consideration for an expedited review. The streamlined process may also be used for individuals considered for administrative positions (e.g., center/institute leadership, program director).

This streamlined process requires candidates to be nominated by both the Unit Head (if applicable) and the Dean and then approved by the Provost's Office. The first-level and second-level reviews would take place per current practice in the candidate's Unit, to be followed by a review by the Dean and then a review by the Provost.

For the duration of the review, the individual may be granted a visiting appointment.

UNIT AEP REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Unit AEP Review Committee must have at least three members at or above the rank sought by the candidate. PTK faculty must constitute at least half the AEP Review Committee and it is strongly recommended that the Committee be majority PTK. Professors of the Practice may serve on the Unit AEP Review Committee, if permitted in the Unit's AEP Plan, but they do not count toward the 50% PTK requirement. Any additional requirements regarding the composition of the Committee must be set forth in the Unit's AEP Plan.

The Unit AEP Review Committee has the key responsibility of preparing and soliciting review materials that will be the foundation of the candidate's dossier:

[1] This refers to standard faculty appointments, and does not apply to overload appointments (e.g., a Faculty specialist in one Unit with a teaching overload as a Lecturer in another Unit to teach a course).

- Choosing external and/or internal evaluators (for promotions to the third level, if required by the Unit) and requesting their evaluations;
- If applicable, evaluating the candidate's publications and preparing a report on the reputation of publication outlets;
- If applicable, gathering reports of peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching and summarizing them;
- If applicable, evaluating qualifications and duties related to administrative responsibilities and achievements;
- Creating the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements;
- Evaluating the candidate according to the Unit's promotion criteria.

EXTERNAL AND/OR INTERNAL EVALUATORS

Dossiers for candidates seeking promotion may include letters from internal or external evaluators at the discretion of the Unit and as articulated in the Unit's AEP plan.. For the purpose of this manual, "internal" is defined as former or current faculty or staff members within the candidate's Unit. The Unit's AEP plan should expressly set forth the number of evaluation letters, if any, required for promotion to the third level. Candidates should be informed of the University's perspective on appropriate evaluators and the right of the Unit to select from the candidate's nominations those that the AEP Review Committee deems appropriate.

For instructional PTK candidates seeking promotion to the third level, unless the Unit's AEP plan explicitly states otherwise, the University recommends the solicitation of at least three evaluation letters, one of which should be from an evaluator who is external to the candidate's Unit (but may be internal to the University). For research PTK candidates, unless the Unit's AEP plan explicitly states otherwise, the University recommends the solicitation of at least three evaluation letters, one of which should be from an evaluator who is external to the University. External letters should be solicited from individuals who are considered at or above the rank being sought in a corresponding academic title series, or in a leadership position of a program or organization outside academia. Units have discretion in determining the qualifications needed in order for an external evaluator to be considered at or above the candidate's rank. The required qualifications should be expressly set forth in the Unit's AEP plan. The evaluators nominated by the candidate should be familiar with the candidate's work, but not current collaborators. It is a good idea to nominate more than the number of evaluators that are required by the Unit's AEP plan, in case any nominee is unavailable to serve as an evaluator.

The candidate may not contact evaluators to determine their willingness to provide information, or to inquire about the contents of the evaluation. In this selection process, the

candidate may also identify non-preferred reviewers (i.e., individuals who may have personal or subjective reasons to react negatively to the candidate's promotion case). In this case, the candidate must provide a written statement with reasons, which will be filed with the Unit Head and accessible to faculty involved in selecting evaluators for the review.

If a candidate is being reviewed less than three years after being reviewed for promotion to a mid-level PTK faculty rank, new evaluators should be chosen unless there are strong justifications for repeated selection. The AEP Committee Chair should discuss the matter with the Unit Head and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs prior to selecting and contacting any potential external reviewers.

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 Committee must create a log that lists all of the evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, including those individuals who do not reply or decline to write. In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial communication), and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review). The letter log should also indicate which evaluators are collaborators with, or mentors of, the candidate. A template for the letter log is available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website (copied in the Appendix). Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal must be included in the dossier.

Once the evaluator has agreed, a formal packet of materials should be distributed. A reminder email shall be sent within one week of the submission 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.

Upon finalization of the list of evaluators, the Committee should create a one-paragraph summary of each evaluator's credentials. CVs of the evaluators should not be included. It is helpful if the order of these summaries mirrors the order of letters in the dossier.

Because AEP review committees at all levels should have access to the same external and/or internal 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 should not be relied upon for evaluative purposes during deliberations.

Although the contents of the letters are to be shared with eligible voters at each level of review, 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.

The following guidelines should be followed in presenting letters:

- Letters that arrive in time for consideration by the first level AEP Review Committee must be included in their entirety;
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation; and
- The bookmark for each letter should clearly indicate whether the evaluator was nominated by the candidate, or by the committee.

Letters to evaluators should use the text provided in the Appendix as a template; specific items for evaluation may be added, when appropriate, and after review and approval by the Office of Faculty Affairs. Attachments to the letter should include the criteria for promotion, any agreement of modified Unit criteria for promotion, the candidate's CV and Personal Statement, and a list of scholarly and teaching materials being sent, or made available, to the evaluator. For instructional PTK candidates, their teaching portfolio should also be provided to evaluators. The attachments should be listed within the sample letter.

REPUTATION OF PUBLICATION OUTLETS FOR PTK FACULTY MEMBERS WITH RESEARCH DUTIES

The Unit should provide an appraisal of the reputations of the journals, presses and other outlets (e.g., theaters, exhibits, etc.) for the candidate's scholarship/creative activity. The appraisal should Indicate whether peer review is required for each type of outlet. Units should develop a standard, stable, credible method of rating the quality and reputation of the journals or other medium. The candidate will sign and date (or initial the applicable box on the signed Candidate Verification Page) the appraisal before it is included in the dossier.

PEER EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TEACHING FOR PTK FACULTY WITH INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES

Units must engage in systematic and periodic peer review of teaching based on classroom visits as appropriate to the mode of course delivery by faculty colleagues. OFA recommends that the Unit conduct at least two peer teaching evaluations (from different terms) before the candidate goes up for promotion. Documentation of the candidate's teaching record, including the outcomes of regular periodic peer evaluations, should be maintained by the Unit Head. The documentation should also contain any response from the candidate to those evaluations, which can be incorporated into the candidate's personal statement or included in the teaching portfolio. The candidate will sign and date the peer evaluations included in the dossier, provide

a separate statement that confirms that they have reviewed all the peer evaluations included, or initial the applicable box on the signed Candidate Verification Page.

Detailed information about peer evaluation is available through the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (see the Peer Teaching Observation Guide).

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND IMPACT

This summary report is often written by the Advisory Subcommittee or a representative thereof. The purpose of the summary is to ensure that committees have correct and complete information about the candidate on which to base their evaluation It is a factual statement of the candidate's responsibilities, accomplishments, and impact in: research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; service, leadership, and/or administration as required by the Unit's AEP Plan as well as the specific responsibilities of the candidate as set forth in their contract. It should place the candidate's accomplishments in the context of the discipline, and the candidate's professional achievements in teaching, research, service, and/or leadership and administration in the context of the requirements of the candidate's title as set forth in the Unit's AEP Plan and the candidate's contributions to the Unit, the College/School, the University, and the community. Measures of quality and impact of the candidate's activities should be included as appropriate (e.g., citation counts, patents, program enrollments). A summary of the peer evaluation of teaching reports should also be included. It should be a neutral description; no evaluation of the candidate's work should be included.

CANDIDATE REVIEW OF NON-EVALUATIVE MATERIALS

The candidate must be shown the Summary Statement, Reputation of Outlets (if applicable), Student Feedback on Course Experiences and Peer Reviews of Teaching (if applicable), the Unit's promotion criteria or any approved agreement of modified Unit criteria relevant to the candidate, and the sample letter sent to evaluators (with any evaluators' names redacted) at least two weeks before the Unit deliberates about the candidate's case. Candidates must certify in writing that they have seen these document(s), either by signing and dating the individual document(s) or using a Candidate Verification Page, and must be allowed to draft a Rejoinder to the Summary Statement if they wish before the documents are reviewed by the Unit AEP Review Committee as a basis for discussion and vote. The date(s) on these materials (and any rebuttal by the candidate) **must predate the meeting on which the case is decided**.

To facilitate production and "certification" of the report, Units should inform candidates in advance of deadlines for reviewing the Summary Statement, Reputation of Outlets, Student

Feedback on Course Experiences and Peer Reviews of Teaching, and for return of the signed document(s) with any Response.

REPORT OF THE UNIT AEP REVIEW COMMITTEE

This report has two separate parts, neither of which is shown to the candidate. In addition, the Unit AEP Review Committee may include an optional Minority Report in cases of major disagreement with the substance of the report. All parts of the report are incorporated into the dossier sent by the Unit Head to higher levels of review.

The first part is the Unit AEP Review Committee Meeting Report, describing the decision meeting. Minimally, it should contain the discussions, the exact vote and any Unit rules about the number of votes required for a positive recommendation, and the meeting date.

The second part is the Evaluative Report, which may be completed by an Advisory Subcommittee. The Evaluative Report evaluates - in light of the Unit's promotion criteria and the candidate's job duties and responsibilities as set forth in their contract - the candidate's performance, accomplishments, and impact in the following areas as appropriate: research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; service; and/or leadership, and administration. Some 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 Report should indicate its author or authors, and should be signed by the members of the AEP Review Committee or Advisory Subcommittee.

The Evaluative Report should address the following questions:

- What are the standards and expectations of the Unit or discipline with respect to the candidate, as expressed in the Unit's criteria, and how are they measured?
- What are the candidate's major contributions? Why are these contributions important in the candidate's field?
- Has the candidate met or surpassed the Unit's standards and expectations? And
- What evidence supports the AEP Review Committee's evaluation?

A comprehensive and balanced evaluative report should capture the discussion regarding a candidate's merits for promotion based on the Unit's criteria and the candidate's record as presented. Members of the Unit AEP Review Committee who do not think that the Committee's report adequately represents their views of the review and discussion may write a signed minority report that will become part of the dossier. A minority AEP report is intended to be employed in cases of major disagreement with the AEP Review Committee report.

VOTING AT THE UNIT LEVEL

Mandatory abstentions often arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice (e.g., at the College/School 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 Units (because both the candidate and the voter have similar joint appointments), the voting faculty member may only vote in their primary Unit and must abstain from voting in the second Unit.

As a general matter, voluntary abstentions are to be discouraged. Higher-level AEP 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. Non-mandatory abstentions are non-positive votes and factor into the total vote count. Should the total number of 'no' and 'voluntary abstention' votes exceed greater than 50% of the total vote, this represents a negative decision at the Unit level.

Only PTK and tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is to be promoted or appointed may vote on that candidate's case (**AEP Guidelines, Section III.C.**).

THE UNIT AEP REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Gather information and documents from the candidate.
- Draft the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements.
- Present the draft of the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements to the candidate for approval two weeks prior to the time it will be distributed to the faculty, ensuring its prompt return.
- Request internal and/or external evaluation letters.
- Obtain from the Unit Head documentation on the candidate's teaching, including peer reviews, Student Feedback on Course Experiences, and information on the candidate's mentorship record.
- Obtain available information on the candidate's service record.
- Obtain available information on the candidate's employment record at UMD, including a comprehensive summary and evaluation of the candidate's duties and assignments whether or not these duties or assignments are specified in the candidate's employment contract.
- If applicable, evaluate journals and other outlets in which the candidate's scholarship is disseminated.
- Carefully review and evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, service, leadership and administration, based on the candidate's CV, documented duties and responsibilities, personal statement, and all other supporting documentation that is clearly set forth in the Unit's/College's AEP plan.

- Meet to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for promotion.
- The AEP Review Committee Chair has the responsibility of ensuring that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Write 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) the Evaluative Report, which is often prepared by an advisory subcommittee and is available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.
- Review the Chair's summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy (usually done by AEP Review Committee Chair).
- Represent the Unit AEP Review Committee's perspective to higher levels of review, if needed.

UNIT HEAD

Preparation for promotion review begins when the candidate accepts an appointment in the Unit (i.e., signs a faculty employment contract with the University) (**AEP Guidelines, Sections II.C. & IV.A.**). The Head of the Unit in which the candidate has their primary appointment or greatest percentage FTE shall (a) meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the Unit's AEP plan and promotion criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated (**AEP Guidelines, Section II.B**), and (b) appoint a mentor (**AEP Guidelines, Section V.B.**) and provide the candidate with a copy of the Guide for Mentors and Mentees. The Unit Head shall also regularly meet with each PTK faculty member and provide written feedback following the meeting. Such meetings should occur no less frequently than every two years.

It is the Unit Head's responsibility to ensure implementation of the Unit's plan for peer evaluation of teaching for every instructional candidate. It is recommended that peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching be conducted regularly by faculty members. Peer evaluation reports should be made available to the candidate, and any response by candidates should be filed with the Unit Head for inclusion in the AEP dossier.

UNIT HEAD'S LETTER

The letter should contain the Unit Head's independent evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, service, and/or leadership and administration, and should make a clear recommendation supported by the reasons for it.

The Unit Head's letter is most useful when it places the performance of the candidate in the context of the Unit or discipline, and it comments on the AEP Review Committee's report. While the letter may summarize the basic information about the case, it should provide an honest and balanced assessment in a clearly stated recommendation. The Unit Head 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 Unit Head's Letter should note this objection**.

THE UNIT HEAD'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Inspect dossiers for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Ensure that the Unit AEP Review Committee decision meeting is properly conducted, that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased, and that the appropriate material is available to eligible voting faculty.
- Write a letter to the NLA making an independent judgment about each promotion case, including the Unit's promotion criteria and, for those candidates who do not pass the initial level of review, providing sufficient information for the NLA to determine that the review was conducted appropriately.
- Answer questions posed by upper-level review committees.
- Notify candidates in writing, summarizing the Unit Head's and Unit AEP Review Committee's decisions and reasoning, and the numeric vote within two weeks of the Unit Head's decision (See example in Appendix). In cases of new appointments to mid-/third levels, inclusion of the vote count is not required. A copy of this summary letter should be available for faculty members who participated in the deliberations who wish to see it, and it should be included in the dossier.
- If candidates withdraw from the process, forward a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- Review the Unit's Plan of Organization and AEP plan to ensure they contain sufficient procedural guidelines for the conduct of reviews, and that the review conforms to the guidelines.
- Keep informed of changes in the AEP Guidelines and Manual and all new policies related to the appointment, evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty and disseminating these changes to the faculty. The Office of Faculty Affairs web page should be consulted for updates: www.faculty.umd.edu/policies.
- Oversee the creation and/or updating of Unit AEP policies in conformance with the standards set forth in the AEP Manual and Guidelines, as well as other policies and rules related to the appointment, evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty.
- Meet with new PTK faculty members to provide AEP information, such as Unit and University policies, this Manual, Unit promotion criteria, the Guide for Mentors and Mentees, and the Unit's mentoring plan. Subsequently, Unit Heads should notify faculty members of changes to this information.
- **Oversee regular periodic peer evaluations of full-time PTK Instructional Faculty**.

COLLEGE/SCHOOL AEP REVIEW COMMITTEE (IF APPLICABLE)

In non-departmentalized Colleges/Schools, the College/School AEP Review Committee, in conducting the first level Review, will operate in accordance with the information set forth in the Unit AEP Review Committee section. Departmentalized Colleges/Schools may, but are not required to, establish a College/School AEP Review Committee but, in all cases, they must follow the procedures for a second level review set forth in their AEP plan.

The College/School AEP Review Committee must have at least three members at or above the rank sought by the candidate. PTK faculty must constitute at least half the AEP Review Committee, and it is strongly recommended that the Committee be majority PTK. Professors of the Practice may serve on the College / School AEP Review Committee, if permitted in the College's AEP Plan, but they do not count toward the 50% PTK requirement. Any additional requirements regarding the composition of the Committee must be set forth in the College/School Plan of Organization or AEP Plan. In the event that the College/School does not have the requisite number of PTK faculty to staff the committee, they must supplement committee membership with PTK faculty from outside of the College/School, in accordance with College policies and procedures.

The College/School AEP Review Committee Chair has the responsibility of ensuring that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased. The College/School AEP 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. It should address the same areas as the Unit AEP report described above.

When the vote is not unanimous, the report should explain the reasons for the negative votes or abstentions. If the assessment differs from the Unit vote, an explanation should be provided. Minority reports are permissible.

THE COLLEGE/SCHOOL AEP REVIEW COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Review and evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, service, and, if applicable, other relevant areas of assigned responsibilities.
- Meet to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for promotion.
- Meet with lower-level AEP representatives (in departmentalized Colleges/Schools) if questions arise, or when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing shall be provided in advance.
- Write 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.

- Ensure that the Dean's summary letter notifying the candidate of the recommendation accurately reflects Committee deliberations in the event that either the Dean or the Committee (or both) 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. The letter should start with a specific description of the candidate's area of expertise. It should contain an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and/or leadership and administration, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of the Unit AEP Review Committee, the College/School AEP Review Committee (if applicable), or the Unit Head, the Dean must explain the reasons underlying the dissent. **Negative votes or abstentions at the College/School level also must be explained**. The Dean can provide a context for evaluating the candidate through characterizing the strengths of the Unit, their role in the College/School, and the role of the candidate in enhancing the excellence of the Unit. The letter should also discuss the expectations of the College/School and Unit for promotion.

DEAN'S NOTIFICATION TO CANDIDATE

When either the College AEP Review Committee or the Dean (or both) makes 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/School AEP Review Committee (if applicable) to review and, if necessary, correct information in the summary letter, and (3) include this letter in the dossier directly following the Dean's letter. Members of the College/School AEP Committee may see the Dean's letter.

A summary is not necessary if both the College AEP Review Committee and Dean provide positive recommendations.

THE DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- Review the College's/School Plan of Organization and/or the College/School's AEP plan to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the appointment of a College/School AEP Review Committee and the role of the Dean with respect to the Committee.
- Ensure that the review conforms to those guidelines.
- Review and approve College/School and Unit promotion criteria.
- Recommend appointees to the Campus AEP and Appeals Committee (**APT Policy Section IV.C.1.; Section V.A.1.**).

- Inform Unit Heads of changes to the AEP Guidelines and all new policies related to the appointment, evaluation and promotion of PTK faculty
- Discuss with Unit Heads their evaluation of the preceding year's AEP process and outcomes.
- Set deadlines for candidates' submission of dossiers to Units in the College/School, and inform Units of those deadlines in a timely manner.
- Appoint members of the College/School AEP Review Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization and its AEP Plan.
- Provide staffing for the College/School AEP Review Committee.
- Ensure that the AEP decision meeting is properly conducted, and that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Inspect the dossier for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Review recommendations of the prior level of review and the College/School AEP Review Committee, and write a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each case for promotion to the highest rank.
- In the event of a denial, review and certify the procedural and substantive appropriateness of the review and notify the candidate in writing within two weeks of the final decision. Copies should be sent to the Unit Head and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained.
- Write a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Unit Head, and Chair of the Unit AEP Review Committee of the outcome of the College/School AEP Review Committee's and Dean's deliberations, and the rationale behind it if either the College/School AEP Review Committee or the Dean makes a negative recommendation about the candidate's case. This summary letter should be available for review by members of the College/School AEP Review Committee and should be included in the dossier (see Table on Candidate Notification in Appendix).
- For third-level promotions, submit the dossiers and all other materials to the Office of Faculty Affairs' APA System by the campus submission deadline.
- Meet with the Campus AEP Committee to address questions raised during their review of promotions to the third level.

Information Regarding Dossier Preparation

OVERVIEW

An appropriately prepared dossier is essential to the promotion review process. To maintain integrity throughout the process, units should designate a specific individual to have primary responsibility for the compilation and final preparation of a candidate's dossier.

CREATING THE DOSSIER

The electronic dossier must meet three essential criteria:

1. It must be bookmarked;
2. It must be password-protected; and
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. 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.

PASSWORD PROTECTION

The dossier must be password-protected to ensure the confidentiality of the materials within. The Office of Faculty Affairs will let you know what the password should be at the beginning of each AEP cycle.

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. Contact the Office of Faculty Affairs if you have concerns about this step. **Non-searchable dossiers will be returned to the units that created them**.

CANDIDATE VERIFICATION PAGE

The candidate is required to sign and date several documents in the dossier. Both physical and electronic signatures are acceptable. 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 Office of Faculty Affairs website, and there is an example in the Appendix. If the

Department/College chooses to use the Candidate Verification page, it should be placed immediately after the transmittal form. **Be aware that the candidate must sign and date the CV and the personal statement directly on those documents, regardless of whether they have submitted a Candidate Verification Page**.

ELEMENTS OF THE DOSSIER

OFA provides a transmittal form for research and instructional promotion cases. Not all elements will be applicable for all promotion cases; rather, note which materials are required depending on the candidate's role and duties (i.e., research or instructional). Candidates with primarily administrative roles should include elements for which their role is of service (e.g., research for lab manager, or instructional for program director). Depending on the candidate's faculty role, the dossier will contain the following elements:

1. Transmittal Form
2. Candidate Verification Page (if applicable, initialed, signed & dated by candidate)
3. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated by candidate) †
4. Reputation of Publication Outlets (signed & dated by candidate)
5. Personal Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
6. Optional Teaching Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
7. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (prepared by committee, signed & dated by candidate)
8. Optional Rejoinder from Candidate (signed & dated by candidate)
9. Documentation of Duties/Responsibilities
10. Promotion Criteria* †
11. Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria (if applicable)*
12. Unit AEP Report (Vote & Evaluative Summary) †
13. Optional Minority Report
14. Unit Head's Letter †
15. College/School AEP Report †
16. Dean's Letter †
17. Optional Teaching Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
18. Student Feedback on Course Experiences (signed & dated by candidate)
19. Peer Evaluation Data (signed & dated by candidate)
20. Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision (signed & dated by candidate)
21. Credentials of External Evaluators †
22. Responses of External Evaluators
23. Candidate Notification from Chair
24. Candidate Notification From Dean

25. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests
26. Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation* & Message Requesting Availability
27. Declines from Evaluators

* Must be made available to the candidate
† Must be searchable

A list of dossier elements organized by the responsible party (i.e., Candidate, Unit, College) is provided in the Appendix.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

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 Office of Faculty Affairs when the dossier is uploaded to the APA system (See New Faculty Appointment Form in Appendix).

Candidate's Name: Give the candidate's full legal name.

UID No: **Never disclose Social Security Number** – list University ID number.

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 faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant AEP body. **Numbers recorded on the transmittal form must match numbers reported in AEP Review Committee Reports**.

CANDIDATE VERIFICATION PAGE (UNIT-CANDIDATE)

If a Candidate Verification Page is used for streamlined review of applicable documents, insert this following the Transmittal Form (See Appendix for example).

CURRICULUM VITAE (CANDIDATE)

The candidate's CV must be in the format required by the University. A template is available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website. The CV must be signed and dated by the candidate to indicate that it is complete and current; this signed and dated copy will be 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.

REPUTATION OF PUBLICATION OUTLETS (RESEARCH) (UNIT)

The information contained in this document will vary according to discipline. However, the document is most useful when it refers only to the outlets where the candidate's work appears and uses 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
Psychological Review	5	4.3	15%
Cognition	10	2.3	20%
Child Development	15	1.9	22%

PERSONAL STATEMENT (CANDIDATE)

The candidate's personal statement should be relatively short (3-4 pages, but **no more than 5**), 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.

OPTIONAL TEACHING STATEMENT (INSTRUCTIONAL) (CANDIDATE)

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 section and the teaching portfolio.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS (UNIT)

This statement of the candidate's achievements is often written by the Advisory Subcommittee members or a representative. The statement must be reviewed by the candidate at least two weeks before the Unit's deliberation about the candidate's case; the candidate must sign and date the report to indicate that they agree with the contents.

OPTIONAL REJOINDER FROM CANDIDATE (CANDIDATE)

If the candidate does not agree with the contents of the Summary Statement, and changes have not been made, they may wish to submit a rejoinder to the document. This rejoinder would also be signed and dated, and would be included directly after the Summary Statement in the dossier.

DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES/RESPONSIBILITIES (UNIT)

Please do not include the candidate's latest contract, which could contain sensitive information not applicable to the promotion process. Duties and responsibilities may be drawn from the contract and included as a separate document in the dossier.

PROMOTION CRITERIA (UNIT)

The Unit's AEP 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.

AGREEMENT OF MODIFIED UNIT CRITERIA AND/OR MOU FOR MULTIPLE APPOINTMENTS (IF APPLICABLE) (UNIT)

UNIT AEP REPORT (UNIT)

The Unit AEP 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 Unit AEP Review Committee. Make sure the report matches what is on the transmittal form.

OPTIONAL MINORITY AEP REPORT (UNIT)

If such a report is included, it must be signed by its author(s).

UNIT HEAD'S LETTER (UNIT)

The Unit Head should perform an independent assessment of the candidate, separate from that of the Unit AEP Review Committee. The inclusion of quotations from external evaluators' letters and the Unit AEP Review Committee report should be avoided. Make sure the date on the letter matches the date on the transmittal form.

COLLEGE AEP REPORT (COLLEGE)

This report must include the date of the meeting and the names of the Committee members, and should avoid unnecessary repetition of prior reports contained in the dossier. The report should include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation. Check to be sure the meeting date and votes match what is on the transmittal form.

OPTIONAL MINORITY AEP REPORT (COLLEGE)

If such a report is included, it must be signed by its author(s).

DEAN'S LETTER (COLLEGE)

The Dean should perform an independent assessment of the candidate, separate from that of the College AEP Review Committee. The inclusion of quotations from external evaluators'

letters and the College AEP Review Committee report should be avoided. Make sure the date on the Dean's letter agrees with the date on the transmittal form.

STUDENT FEEDBACK ON COURSE EXPERIENCES DATA (INSTRUCTIONAL) (UNIT OR CANDIDATE)

As an important indicator of teaching ability, teaching evaluation data must be clearly presented for easy evaluation at all levels of review. The document must be shared with the candidate and indicated by signature and date. There are instructor and administrator versions available in a Tableau report provided by IRPA. See courseexp.umd.edu to access. It is recommended to use the administrator view, unless the candidate has instructional appointments in multiple units.

PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING (INSTRUCTIONAL) (UNIT)

Include all reports of peer evaluations of teaching and any responses from the candidate. These documents must be shared with the candidate and indicated by signature and date.

MENTORING, ADVISING & RESEARCH SUPERVISION (CANDIDATE)

This bookmark can 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 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 there is a document with information here, it should also include the entire CV section on mentoring, advising, etc. If this is a document that is separate from the CV, it must be signed and dated by the candidate.

CREDENTIALS OF EXTERNAL EVALUATORS (UNIT)

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. Remember that this document must be searchable.

RESPONSES OF EVALUATORS (UNIT)

Organize the external evaluator responses according to the requestor. The letters from evaluators requested by the Unit should come first, to be followed by those suggested by the candidate. Give each letter a separate bookmark that includes a C for candidate or a U for unit (e.g., C – Smith; U – Jones). Within each of these subcategories, organize the letters in alphabetical order.

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION FROM UNIT HEAD (UNIT)

The notification letter must be sent to promotion candidates within two weeks of the Unit Head's decision. It must include the tally of votes cast at the Unit AEP Review Committee meeting.

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION FROM DEAN (COLLEGE)

If either the College AEP Review Committee or the Dean makes a negative recommendation about the candidate's case, the Dean must inform the candidate of the second-level AEP 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.

LETTER LOG OF EVALUATION REQUESTS (UNIT)

This is a list of all external evaluators to whom a request for 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. The letter log should indicate whether the evaluator was suggested by the candidate or the Unit/College AEP Review Committee. In addition, the letter log should indicate the dates of requests for availability and formal evaluation, if an evaluator indicated their availability, if an evaluator declined to write a letter after initially expressing availability, or an evaluator's failure to respond to the request. There is a letter log template available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website, or you can create your own, as long as all the requisite information is included.

SAMPLE REQUESTS FOR AVAILABILITY AND EVALUATION WITH SUPPORTING MATERIALS (UNIT)

The sample email requesting availability and the formal letter requesting evaluation (accompanied by supporting materials) must be dated. In addition, the sample letter must be made available to the candidate.

DECLINES FROM EVALUATORS (UNIT)

If an evaluator declines to write after initially expressing availability, his or her message to that effect – whether it is an email or a letter – must be included in the dossier.

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).

UPLOADING THE DOSSIER AND TEACHING PORTFOLIO

The dossier and teaching portfolio should be uploaded by the individual with primary responsibility for compiling and preparing dossiers within the Unit. The online review system is available at faculty.umd.edu/apa. Users login with their regular university credentials. After login, choose "Add Faculty Action" from the Active Cases menu. Find the candidate's name in the dropdown list, and click submit. Next, click Add Action and complete the online form. The Office of Faculty Affairs receives an automatic notification when a dossier or teaching portfolio is uploaded and so there is no need to send a separate notification.

CREATING THE SUPPLEMENTAL DOSSIER

The optional supplemental dossier (not to exceed 150 pages) might include additional pieces of scholarship and other materials submitted by the candidate. The supplemental dossier must be password protected and submitted separately in the APA system. It must be bookmarked and be set to open with the bookmarks panel visible and the page zoomed to the full width of the screen.

Appendix

CV TEMPLATE

For more information about details to include on the CV, the candidate should check with their unit and check the OFA website for more information about creating the CV. Sections that are inapplicable to the candidate, based upon their experience as well as their job duties and responsibilities as set forth in their contract, may be omitted.

DOSSIER ELEMENTS BY CREATOR

Candidate	Unit	College
Curriculum Vitae	Transmittal Form	Dean's Letter
Personal Statement	Candidate Verification Page	College AEP Committee Report
Optional Teaching Statement	Reputation of Publication Outlets	Candidate Notification from Dean
	Summary Statement of Professional Achievements	
Optional Rejoinder from Candidate	Documentation of Duties / Responsibilities	
Student Course Experience Data	Unit Promotion Criteria	
Peer Teaching Evaluations / Information	Unit AEP Committee Report	
Mentoring / Advising / Research Supervision	Optional Minority Report	
Teaching Portfolio	Unit Head's Letter	
	Student Course Experience Data	
	Credentials of External Evaluators	
	Responses from External Evaluators	
	Candidate Notification from Unit Head	
	Other UMD Evaluator Letters	
	Unit Evaluator Letters	
	Letter Log of Evaluation Requests	
	Sample Letter(s) Requesting Evaluation	

TRANSMITTAL FORM

Professional Track Faculty Promotion

CANDIDATE INFORMATION

Candidate's Name		Present Rank	
UID Number		Proposed Rank	
Primary Unit		Type of Appointment	◯ 9 Month ◯ 12 Month
College		Effective Date	

VOTING INFORMATION

VOTING RECORD

	Meeting / Ltr. Date	Yes Vote	No Vote	Voluntary Abstention	Mandatory Abstention	Absent	Total
Unit AEP Committee							0
Unit Head							
College AEP Committee							0
Dean							

REVIEWER CONTACT INFORMATION

COLLEGE		PRIMARY UNIT	
Dean Name		Unit Head Name	
Dean Email		Unit Head Email	
College AEP Spokesperson		Unit AEP Spokesperson	
Spokesperson Email		Spokesperson Email	

DOSSIER ELEMENTS

1. Transmittal Form
2. Candidate Verification Page
3. Curriculum Vitae *
4. Reputation of Publication Outlets *†
5. Personal Statement *
6. Teaching Statement *†
7. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements **
8. Optional Rejoinder from Candidate †
9. Documentation of Duties / Responsibilities
10. Unit Promotion Criteria **
11. Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria †
12. Department AEP Committee Report
13. Optional Minority Report †
14. Unit Head's Letter
15. College AEP Committee Report
16. Optional Minority Report †
17. Dean's Letter
18. Student Course Experiences Data †
19. Peer Evaluations of Teaching **†
20. Mentoring / Advising / Research Supervision **
21. Credentials of External Evaluators †
22. Responses from External Evaluators †
23. Candidate Notification from Unit Head
24. Candidate Notification from Dean
25. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests †
26. Sample Requests for Availability and Evaluation with Supporting Materials **
27. Declines from Evaluators

* Signed and Dated by Candidate directly on the document
** Initialed / dated on Signed Verification Form
† If applicable

Note: CV, Personal Statement, Promotion Criteria, and Sample Letter must all be seen by the candidate and dated prior to distribution to evaluators. Remainder of signed documents should be seen by the candidate and dated accordingly at least two weeks prior to unit vote.

Note for Candidates with Instructional / Mentoring Responsibilities: The Teaching Portfolio is required for all instructional professional-track promotions. The Teaching Portfolio should be uploaded to APA as a separate PDF.

Letter Log | External Evaluators

UNIT SELECTIONS	DATES			
EVALUATOR / AFFILIATION	DATE OF INITIAL CONTACT	AVAILABLE, UNAVAILABLE, NO RESPONSE	DATE MATERIALS SENT	DATE RECEIVED OR ENTER "NO RESPONSE"

CANDIDATE SELECTIONS	DATES			
EVALUATOR / AFFILIATION	DATE OF INITIAL CONTACT	AVAILABLE, UNAVAILABLE, NO RESPONSE	DATE MATERIALS SENT	DATE RECEIVED OR ENTER "NO RESPONSE"

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION OF AEP DECISION

UNIT LEVEL (AND NON-DEPARTMENTALIZED COLLEGES / SCHOOLS)

When both Unit Head & Committee vote negatively

- Candidate notified by Unit Head and Dean
    - Unit Head describes votes, decision, rationale of committee & Unit Head. Letter is sent within two weeks of decision. The committee chair and committee members may review the letter.
    - Dean or Associate Provost confirms review was conducted appropriately and that promotion is denied. Letter is sent within one month. Review of the letter is not required.
- Letters are placed in front of dossier, and entire dossier sent to Dean's Office.

When either / both Unit Head and committee vote positively

- Candidate notified by Unit Head
    - Unit Head describes votes, decision, rationale of committee & Unit Head. Letter is sent within two weeks of Unit Head's decision.
- Letter is placed in dossier as usual

COLLEGE LEVEL (FOR DEPARTMENTALIZED COLLEGES/SCHOOLS)

Cases of appointment or promotion to the second/mid level end here

When either / both Dean & committee vote negatively

- Candidate is notified by Dean
    - Dean describes decision and rationale of committee and Dean. Letter is sent within two weeks of Dean's decision. The committee chair and committee members may review the letter.
- Letter is placed in dossier as usual

When both committee and Dean vote positively

- Candidate may optionally be notified by Dean
    - Dean describes the votes, decision and rationale of the committee and Dean. Letter is sent within two weeks of Dean's decision.
- Letter is placed in dossier as usual

CAMPUS LEVEL (FOR CASES OF APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO THIRD LEVEL IN A PTK TITLE SERIES)

Candidate is notified of Provost's decision by Associate Provost

When decision is negative

- Associate Provost notifies candidate of decision. Letter is sent within two weeks of Provost's decision.
- Letter is placed in front of dossier, which is then placed in the candidate's personnel file.

When decision is positive

- Candidate is notified by Associate Provost
- Associate Provost notifies candidate of Provost's decision and effective date of promotion. Letter suggested to be sent within two weeks of Provost's decision.
- Letter is placed in front of dossier, which is then placed in the candidate's personnel file

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.

SAMPLE LETTER TO EVALUATOR

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

Dr./Mx. XXXX XXX is due to be reviewed for [Principal Lecturer/Clinical Professor/Research Scientist/etc] in academic year YYYY-YYYY. [Brief description of title, if applicable.] I am writing to request your confidential evaluation of the qualifications of Dr./Mx. XXX for promotion to this rank.

In accordance with the AEP 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:

- [For faculty engaged in research] 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;
- [For faculty engaged in teaching] The candidate's teaching and mentoring (to the extent you are able to do so); and
- The candidate's service to the profession.

To assist in your evaluation, I am enclosing the following information: Dr./Mx. XXX's latest curriculum vitae and personal statement, copies of the [X number of] sample works listed below selected by Dr./Mx. XXX, and a brief summary of the promotion criteria.

I realize that this information is rather extensive and will require considerable effort on your part to review. However, your assistance in helping evaluate Dr./Mx. XXX's credentials will be greatly appreciated and will constitute an important element in the overall evaluation. 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.

I would be very grateful if you could respond to us in writing no later than… If possible, would you send your reply electronically to umd.edu as an attachment [or submitted online, e.g., Dropbox link]?

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX

Chair, AEP Review Committee
Department of XXX

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

SAMPLE LANGUAGE FOR CASES OF DENIAL OF PROMOTION

The eligible voting members of the Department met on Month Day, Year 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 … . 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.

I, therefore, accept the judgment of the Department AEP Review Committee and the Chair that you not be promoted to the rank of … at this time. I hope and trust that your continued efforts in … will warrant promotion at a later date.

Sincerely,

Dean ….