MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 1st 2013

TO: University Senate Executive Committee

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

SUBJECT: 2012-2013 APT Committee Annual Report

2012-2013 Committee Members:

Jennifer Rice, Chair, Department of Education Policy and Leadership
Carol Espy-Wilson, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Julie Greene, Department of History
Seppo Iso-Ahola, Department of Kinesiology
Carl Lejuez, Department of Psychology
Martin Rabenhorst, Department of Environmental Science and Technology
Subramanian Raghavan, Robert H. Smith School of Business
Peter Reuter, School of Public Policy
Larry Sita, Department of Chemistry

<div align="center">

Cases Handled by Campus APT Committee 2012-2013

</div>

TOTAL Cases that entered the APT Process (as of 6/13/13)					
	YES	**NO**	**WITHDRAWN**	**PENDING**	**TOTAL**
Promotion to Associate Professor/Senior Agent	46	6	12	0	64
Promotion to Professor/Principal Agent	29	0	7	0	36
New Associate Professor/Senior Agent	6	0	0	3	9
New Professor/Principal Agent	10	0	1	3	14
Total	**91**	**6**	**20**	**6**	**123**

Comments on the APT results

The data above can be compared with numbers for the last decade in the Faculty Affairs archives, as well as last year's results. **Denials in 2012-2013 at the level of promotion to Associate Professor/Senior-Agent are at 9%,** as compared to the 10% rate of 2011-2013 and the overall 6% rate since 2000. In turn denials at the **Professor/Principal-Agent level are at 0% this year,** even though they were at 3% in 2011-2012 and ever since 2000. These data have to be qualified, however, by data on withdrawals (i.e. those who dropped from the APT process for academic reasons – not a better offer elsewhere), a type of information that has only been kept recently. **For 2012-2013 withdrawals are at 19% of the cases expected for Associate Professors** (as compared to 16% in 2010-2011 and 8% in 2011-2012) and also at **19% for Professors** (in comparison, in 2010-2011 withdrawals were at 33% for promotions to Professor, and 21% in 2011-2012). Significant changes have to do with the higher number of withdrawals

from the process at the Assistant-to-Associate level and the success of promotions to Professor that stay within the process. The Appendix has a discussion of associated demographic data.

Issues that need attention
As in previous years, some themes keep recurring:
- The inconsistent use of APT criteria (some of which have not been reviewed in decades)
- The unsystematic assessment of teaching and mentoring
- The proper request, gathering and analysis of external evaluation letters
- The clear and upfront analysis of negative evidence
- The fair treatment of scholars outside the main stream (particular in joint appointments)

Because of concerns related to these topics, the Provost and the Senate charged a joint Task Force with the following tasks, all related to the APT Process.

Task Force's Substantive Tasks
Aside from reviewing the UMD Guidelines for APT and the UMD Policy on APT as it relates to the APT Guidelines, in consultation with the Office of Faculty Affairs and representatives from the Committee of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs, the APT Task Force was charged with:
- Reviewing the standards used to select external evaluators.
- Considering the elements and approaches used to evaluate candidates including:
    - (a) the current process for requesting letters and evaluating letters and "non-responses" from external evaluators
    - (b) the evaluation of teaching and whether a teaching dossier is appropriate
    - (c) the candidate notification process
- Considering how the following should be evaluated as part of the APT review process:
    - (a) innovation and entrepreneurship (including social entrepreneurship)
    - (b) application of intellectual property through technology transfer
    - (c) interdisciplinary/collaborative research
    - (d) the application of research to solve existing problems in society
- Considering the impact of work-life balance policies on the APT review process.

Formal Issues
All of the following mechanical problems (among others) clearly slow down the APT process:
- Non-searchable PDFS.
- Inclusion of materials in main dossier that should be supplemental.
- Meeting dates and votes in letters & transmittal forms that conflict.
- Missing candidate notifications or presenting a notification that was just verbal or too informal (e.g.: cc: in an email).
- Dates on CV and personal statement later than the date sent to external evaluators or an updated CV is substituted for the original CV. (Updated publications, grants, etc. can be submitted as supplemental.)
- Date on Summary Statement less than 2 weeks before Department meeting.
- Evaluators not given time to respond (less than 2 months).

Because of these sorts of difficulties, two related approaches will be attempted, as follows.

Task Force's Formal Tasks
Aside from addressing the substantive tasks presented above, the APT Task Force will also:
- Consider developing a dossier format based on best practices at peer institutions.
- Consider methods for streamlining the entire APT process, particularly so in the appointment of "star" senior faculty.

These tasks will be pursued in parallel with efforts from the Office of Faculty Affairs to systematize the web-based APT process. Steps in this direction to be implemented in the 2013-2014 APT cycle include:
- Stricter dates for dossier delivery, as established in cooperation with the Committee of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs.
- As proposed by the Committee of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs, the university APT level will include two different committees: one for Assistant-to-Associate cases (whose work will start in early January and is expected to be completed by Spring Break) and one for Associate-to-Full and Appointment cases (whose work will start in early February and will extend until all appointments are finalized).
- Non-searchable PDFs will not be accepted.
- APT college-level committees must be formally charged.

In the immediate future further such initiatives are expected, so as to streamline the APT process.

Mentoring Issues
Many of the substantive issues arising in the APT process clearly relate to the mentoring system, which is required by policy at the university. See in this respect the demographic data in the Appendix. The APT Task Force is also required to consider:
- How the APT Guidelines can be modified to encourage stronger, consistent, and more effective mentoring of junior faculty.
- How issues of diversity impact the equity of the APT process, for example, how faculty research on diversity issues or underserved populations can be evaluated fairly.

Concluding Remarks
The 2012/2013 APT cycle has been full of initiatives that will only be brought to completion once the APT Task Force presents its report to the Provost and the Senate, and a way to appropriately discharge the relevant recommendations is in place. While the 2013/2014 APT cycle will initiate some of these transitions (e.g. attempting to streamline the process), full completion of this agenda – particularly when extended to the mentoring system – will only be possible in years to come. This will require the cooperation of the campus as a whole, and very especially the administrators in charge of the process (deans and chairs) as well as the relevant committee chairs at all levels. A healthy, transparent, rigorous and fair APT process is key to confirm the university as the institution of integrative excellence that it already has become.

Appendix: Demographic data

These demographics are about "promotions" (from within the ranks at UMD) and not "appointments" (hired into UMD). Withdrawn cases concentrate on those that renounced the APT process without a better academic offer. Evidently, given the sample size one cannot reach solid conclusions regarding some of the demographic distinctions introduced here – but it is still significant that the patterns observed do not differ from those in recent years.

Cases that entered the Promotion Process (as of 6/13/13) *							
	Total	% Female vs. male	% Asian	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Unreported
Assistant to Associate	64	44% (28) 56% (36)	20% (13)	8% (5)	5% (3)	61% (39)	6% (4)
Associate to Full	36	25% (9) 75%(27)	25% (9)	0%	6% (2)	69% (25)	0%
TOTAL	100	37% 63%	22%	5%	5%	64%	4%

* Includes withdrawals and denials

Consider first successful cases. **48% of the successful Assistant-to-Associate cases were women,** from a 44% percentage of women in the entire population (during the last decade 36% of the Associate Professors at AAU institutions are women). In turn, **24% of the successful Associate-to-Full cases are women,** from a 25% percentage of women in the entire population (the average figure of women full professors at AAU institutions during the last decade is 21.4%). These are obviously positive and reliable numbers, given the size of the data sets.

Sample size drops for the racial breakdown of successful cases, as compared to their presence in the relevant population, at least with regards to minorities. The breakdown is roughly as follows (comparing successful rates vs. presence in the population). For Assistant-to-Associate: **Asian: 20% vs. 20%; Black: 9% vs. 8%; Hispanic: 4% vs. 5% Whites: 60% vs. 61%.** For Associate-to-Full: **Asian: 24.1% vs. 25%; Black: 0% vs. 0%; Hispanic: 3.5% vs. 6% Whites: 72.4% vs. 69%.** While the numbers for each minority groups are small and, therefore, hard to interpret, the **combined minority numbers come to 30.6% of the promoted cases,** vis-à-vis their presence in the group of candidates for promotion, at 32%. There is a 4% of cases where ethnicity is unreported, which could alter these data – but the trend is that **slightly more white folks that enter the promotion process are awarded promotion than minorities.**

Cases that were awarded Promotion (as of 6/13/13)							
	Total	% Female vs. male	% Asian	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Unreported
Assistant to Associate	46	48% (22) 52% (24)	20% (9)	9% (4)	4% (2)	60% (28)	7% (3)
Associate to Full	29	24% (7) 76% (22)	24.1% (7)	0%	3.5% (1)	72.4% (21)	0%
TOTAL	75	39% (29) 61% (46)	21.3% (16)	5.3% (4)	4% (3)	65.3% (49)	4% (3)

A different way to present these data combines denied and renounced (i.e. unsuccessful) cases. Overall, **33.3% of the unsuccessful cases were women** (significantly less than their presence in the relevant population sample, at 44%). Although **the numbers for men look slightly worse** (unsuccessful 66.6% of the time, for a presence in the relevant population at 56%), there were no

differences in terms of actual denials (at 50% for each population); the differences came in the **withdrawals: 70% of which were males.**

The racial breakdown of unsuccessful cases, as compared to their presence in the relevant population (again with all the caveats about sample size) is roughly as follows: **Asian: 22% vs. 22%; Black: 5.5% vs. 5%; Hispanic: 5.5% vs. 5% Whites: 61% vs. 64%.** (Total Minority 32% vs. 33% presence in population.) While all of these numbers mostly track one another, it is noteworthy that **half of the denied cases were minorities** (vis-à-vis their constituting only one third of the entire relevant population). While the participation of minorities in the process as compared to previous years is somewhat similar, if declining (38% in 2010-2011, 39% in 2011-2012), the proportion of those who were denied tenure seems troubling.

Cases that were denied during the Promotion Process (as of 6/13/13)						
	Total	% Female vs. male	% Asian	% Black	% Hispanic	% White
Assistant to Associate	6	50% (3) 50% (3)	16.66%(1)	16.66%(1)	16.66%(1)	50% (3)
Associate to Full	0	0% 0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL	**6**	**50% 50%**	**16.66%**	**16.66%**	**16.66%**	**50%**

Cases that Renounced the Promotion Process (as of 6/13/13)							
	Total	% Female vs. male	% Asian	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Unreported
Assistant to Associate	12	25% (3) 75% (9)	25% (3)	0%	0%	66.7% (8)	8.3% (1)
Associate to Full	7	29% (2) 71% (5)	29% (2)	0%	14% (1)	57% (4)	0%
TOTAL	**19**	**26% 74%**	**26.3%**		**5.3%**	**63.1%**	**5.3%**

Cases that were DENIED or RENOUNCED the Promotion Process (as of 6/13/13)							
	Total	% Female vs. male	% Asian	% Black	% Hispanic	% White	% Unreported
Assistant to Associate	18	33.3% (6) 66.6%(12)	22% (4)	5.5% (1)	5.5% (1)	61%(11)	5.5% (1)
Associate to Full	7	29% (2) 71% (5)	29% (2)	0%	14% (1)	57% (4)	0%
TOTAL	**25**	**32% (8) 68% (17)**	**24% (6)**	**4% (1)**	**8% (2)**	**60% (15)**	**4% (1)**

One other significant set of data pertains to "slam dunk" cases (those whose decision was unanimous) vs. "invite back" cases (which require visitations by lower committees). **22% of the women were "slam dunk" cases** (the presence of women in the population undergoing promotion being 37%), while **35% of the men were "slam dunks"** (for a presence of men in the relevant population of 63%). That is, not only is the overall number of women seeking promotion significantly lower than the number of men – but among those, the number of the promotion-seeking women who are deemed straightforward by committees is also significantly lower than the corresponding men. In contrast, **25% of the women cases required further discussion** by lower committees, while only **12% of the men** cases involved such a need. These data may be seen as putting the success numbers for women reported above in a more nuanced

perspective: While the numbers of women that get promoted is significantly larger than averages in AAU institutions, the process for women to "get there" is by no means straightforward.

It may also be significant that **the majority of "slam dunk" cases corresponded to White faculty (75%).** There were no Black "slam dunks" and only one Hispanic such case, while the percentage of Asians in that category (18%) is below their presence in the overall sample population (22%). In contrast, the percentage of cases from White faculty that required further discussion (14%) is much lower than their presence in the sample population (64%).

Cases that were Slam Dunks (as of 6/13/13)							
	Total	**% Female vs. male**	**% Asian**	**% Black**	**% Hispanic**	**% White**	**% Unreported**
Assistant to Associate	14	36% (5) 64% (9)	21.4% (3)	0%	7.2% (1)	57.1% (8)	14.3% (2)
Associate to Full	10	20% (2) 80% (8)	0%	0%	0%	100% (10)	0%
TOTAL	**24**	**29% (7) 71% (17)**	**12.5% (3)**	**0%**	**4.2% (1)**	**75% (18)**	**8.3% (2)**
% of total*	**30% (81)**	**22% (32) 35% (49)**	**18% (17)**	**0% (5)**	**25% (4)**	**35% (52)**	**67% (3)**

Cases that were Invited Back (as of 6/13/13)							
	Total	**% Female vs. male**	**% Asian**	**% Black**	**% Hispanic**	**% White**	**% Unreported**
Assistant to Associate	12	58% (7) 42% (5)	33% (4)	8% (1)	8% (1)	50% (6)	0%
Associate to Full	2	50% (1) 50% (1)	50% (1)	0%	0%	50% (1)	0%
TOTAL	**14**	**57% (8) 43% (6)**	**36% (5)**	**14% (1)**	**14% (1)**	**50% (7)**	**0%**
% of total*	**17%(81)**	**25% (32) 12% (49)**	**29% (17)**	**29% (1)**	**25% (1)**	**14% (52)**	**0% (3)**

*total cases of tenure & promote case considered at campus level; does not include withdrawals

Again, these numbers are certainly low to make definitive generalizations, but they are very consistent with numbers in previous years. This suggests that the place of minorities in the APT process has to be critically examined, as well as **how or whether mentoring mechanisms are working for the relevant faculty.**