

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 13, 2014

TO: University Senate Executive Committee

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

SUBJECT: 2013-2014 APT Committee Annual Report

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

TENURE COMMITTEE

John Bertot,
College of Information Studies

Bradley Boekeloo,
Behavioral and Community Health

Robert De Keyser,
Languages, Literatures and Cultures

Carol Espy-Wilson,
Electrical and Computer Engineering

Dennis M. Kivlighan,
Counseling, Higher Education and Special
Education

Frances Lee,
Government and Politics

Jianghong Meng,
Nutrition and Food Science

S. Raghu Raghavan,
Smith School of Business

Joan Jianjian Ren,
Mathematics

PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Theresa Coletti,
English

Don DeVoe,
Mechanical Engineering

Clara Hill,
Psychology

Hui Liao,
Smith School of Business

Martin Rabenhorst,
Environmental Science and Technology

Peter Reuter,
Public Policy

David Jacobs,
Computer Science

Stephen Thomas,
Health Services Administration

Kathryn R. Wentzel,
Human Development and Quantitative
Methodology

CASES HANDLED BY THE CAMPUS APT COMMITTEES 2013-2014

	Promotion w/ Tenure		Promotion to Professor / Principal Agent	New Appointment / Associate	New Appointment / Professor	Total
YES	48		40	6	8	102
NO	7					7
WITHDRAWN	8		6	2	1	17
TOTAL	63		46	8	9	126

Comments on the APT Results

Denials in 2013-2014 at the level of promotion with tenure are at 11%, a percentage slightly higher than the 9.5% rate in the period 2010-2013, as compared to the overall 6% rate since 2000. Denials at the **level of promotion to Professor/Principal-Agent level continue to be at 0% this year**, as they were last year – even though they were at 3% in 2011-2012 and ever since 2000. These data have to be qualified by withdrawals (i.e. those who dropped from the APT process for academic reasons – not a better offer elsewhere), a type of information that has only been kept recently. **For 2013-2014, withdrawals are at 12.7% of cases originally expected for Associate Professors** (as compared to 19% in 2012-2013, 16% in 2010-2011, 8% in 2011-2012) and at **13% for Professors/Principal Agents** (in comparison, in 2012-2013 withdrawals were at 19% for promotions at this higher level, at 21% in 2011-2012, at 33% in 2010-2011). Therefore, the combined rate of unsuccessful cases is approximately 24% for the tenure level and 13% for the professorial level. **These numbers are not significantly different from those last year or the previous year.** The Appendix has a brief discussion of associated demographic data.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES ADDRESSED BY THE APT GUIDELINES TASK FORCE

Because of recurrent themes over the years (e.g. inconsistent use of APT criteria; 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, etc.) the Provost and the Senate charged a joint Task Force in 2013 with substantive tasks related to the APT Process. After a year of work at these matters, the Task Force came up with the recommendations summarized below. These recommendations are presently being evaluated by the campus community and will be formally discussed in the Senate during Fall 2014.

EQUITY, FAIRNESS, & INCLUSION

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

CHANGING DYNAMICS OF SCHOLARSHIP

- Broadened definition of scholarship to recognize scholarship as the discovery, integration, engagement and transmission of knowledge. Quality of scholarship assessed through peer review, impact, and significance.
- Onus remains on candidate to present documentation that work meets criteria.

Innovation & Entrepreneurship

- Entrepreneurial activities that enhance teaching, service, or scholarship should be recognized for consideration in promotion and tenure reviews.
- Onus on candidate to justify significance and impact.

Interdisciplinary Research and Agreements of Modified Unit Criteria

- Faculty can, either at appointment or later in career, request agreement specifying modified criteria for tenure or promotion (e.g., if engaged in scholarship in multiple fields or that crosses boundaries of traditional disciplines). As in current policy, this requires approval by faculty and Chair of first-level unit, Dean, and Provost.
- APT reviews of cases with modified unit criteria should include faculty member knowledgeable in other applicable discipline(s) to serve in advisory capacity to subcommittee and Department APT committee.
- Candidate's approved agreement for modified unit criteria included in dossier in addition to standard unit criteria.

EXTERNAL EVALUATORS/LETTER SOLICITATION

- Letters from collaborators may be included but must be justified.
- Evaluators should be leaders in field regardless of institution.
- Initial email contact to establish evaluator's availability required.
- Reference request asks for evaluation based on UM unit's criteria.
- Letter log will include availability requests.

TEACHING

- Systematic periodic peer reviews of teaching are a mandatory element of dossier.
- Teaching portfolio required of candidates, including items such as course syllabi, reflective assessments, mentoring, etc.

MENTORING

- Faculty assigned one mentor but encouraged to seek out multiple mentors.
- Unit must develop mentoring plan, filed with Office of Faculty Affairs.
- Annual formal mentorship meetings should be held until tenure review is complete.
- Mentoring should be ongoing after tenure and Chairs provide for mentoring of each Associate Professor, if candidate desires.

WORK-LIFE BALANCE

- APT committee members need to be informed when a candidate took parental leave, stopped tenure clock, or was on part-time appointment, and reminded that these are university-supported policies.
- Tenure delay text included in reference letter request stating that faculty member shall not be disadvantaged because of delay with explicit statement to evaluate candidate's dossier as if it were completed in ordinary period of review.

CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION

- Candidate may indicate if there are specific individuals in field who might not be expected to give objective reviews as external evaluators.
- Candidate must be shown and certify (sign/date) reputation of outlets, student evaluations, record of mentoring/advising/research supervision 2 weeks prior to departmental deliberation.
- Candidate informed of decisions within 2 weeks of decision by Chair and decision by Dean. Vote count not sent to new hires.

STAR APPOINTMENTS

- Streamlined process for "star" appointments.
- Cases nominated by both Chair and Dean and approved by Provost.
- Materials could be transferred from search process, including 3 evaluative letters suggested by candidate and CV (no signature needed). Still requires total of 6 letters.
- Process would go through normal first-level review followed by expedited upper-level review, then review by Provost and final decision by President.
- College review by 3-person ad hoc group from current College APT Committee.
- No review by University APT Committee except for non-departmentalized Colleges.

STANDARD FORMAT

- Re-ordering dossier to reduce duplication and place primary emphasis on candidate's record and first-level review materials.

FORMAL ISSUES

The following mechanical problems (among others) 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 email).
- Dates on CV and personal statement later than date sent to external evaluators or an updated CV substituted for 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, the APT Task Force also considered methods for streamlining the entire APT process. The Task Force and the Office of Faculty Affairs, together with the Committee of Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs (CADFA), have considered developing a standard dossier format based on best practices at peer institutions. Among the steps in this direction, the following have been taken already:

- Stricter dates for dossier delivery are now assumed.
- The university APT level now includes two different committees (see front page): one for Assistant-to-Associate cases (whose work starts in early January and is expected to be completed by Spring Break) and one for Associate-to-Full and Appointment cases (whose work starts in early February and extends until all appointments are finalized).
- Non-searchable PDFs are no longer accepted.
- APT college-level committees are now formally charged by deans in the presence of the Associate Provost for Faculty to answer specific questions as needed.

Other such initiatives, so as to streamline the APT process, involve the complex process of updating all faculty CVs.

IMPROVING DATA SYSTEMS FOR FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Office of Faculty Affairs has procured a software package, *Lyterati*, for improving how the institution records and manages data related to faculty activity and accomplishments. The system maintains all records related to each faculty member's professional accomplishments in a searchable database, and the information can be reconfigured and reproduced in different formats for different purposes.

The direct implication for the APT process is that much of a tenure or promotion dossier will be generated automatically, based on the faculty member's career at UM:

- contributions that faculty report in Annual Activity Reports will automatically be in official CV format;
- grants data will be read into CV from the Office of Research Administration database;
- courses taught lists and student evaluations will be tabulated automatically;
- as UM adopts other recording and reporting systems, e.g. a content management system for teaching portfolios, *Lyterati* will be able to pull relevant pieces of that information into APT dossiers.

Additionally, once it is fully deployed, *Lyterati* will provide the means to manage all levels of the APT process electronically, thereby addressing many of the issues discussed above:

- CVs will be formatted appropriately and any updates/revisions will be inserted as supplemental, per policy;
- meeting dates and votes in letters and transmittal forms will be accurate, avoiding delays caused when that information is inconsistent across documents in dossier;
- order of elements in dossiers will be fixed;
- requests for, as well as tracking and results of, external reviews can be logged automatically.

The expectation is that, with *Lyterati*, the entire APT process will be both more efficient and, by virtue of the regularities imposed by the system, more equitable.

MENTORING ISSUES

Many of the substantive issues arising in the APT process appear to relate to the mentoring system, which is required by policy at the university. The APT Task Force has also considered this matter, making the following recommendations:

- Faculty members will be assigned at least one mentor but are encouraged to seek out multiple mentors.
- Unit must develop mentoring plan, filed with the Office Faculty Affairs.
- Annual formal mentorship meetings should be held until tenure review is complete.

- Mentoring should be ongoing after tenure, and Chairs should provide for the mentoring of each Associate Professor, if candidate desires.

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

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

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

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

Concluding Remarks

The 2013/2014 APT cycle has brought to fruition a number of initiatives that started the previous year, with collegiate work from various offices of the Senate, the Administration, and beyond. The work is not complete yet. While the 2014/2015 APT cycle should initiate some of the proposed transitions (e.g. streamlining the process), full completion of this agenda will take years. This report acknowledges the critical cooperation of the campus as a whole. A transparent, rigorous and fair APT process continues to be key in confirming 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. One need not emphasize that these numbers are very small to reach truly significant conclusions.

TENURE CASES (2013-14)

	ALL TENURE CASES		DENIED TENURE CASES		WITHDRAWN TENURE CASES	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
TOTAL	63		7		8	
FEMALE	24	38%	4	17%	1	4%
MALE	39	62%	3	8%	7	18%
ASIAN	15	24%	2	13%		
BLACK	6	10%			1	17%
LATINO	4	6%	1	25%		
WHITE	31	49%	4	13%	7	23%
NOT REPORTED	7	11%				

The combination of denied and renounced (i.e., unsuccessful) cases offers the safest statistical representation for the sample size. Overall, 21% of the unsuccessful tenure cases were women (less than their presence in the relevant population sample, at 38%). Interestingly, although the numbers for men look worse (unsuccessful 26% of the time, for a presence in the relevant population at 62%), the major difference (aside from the overall volume of each population) comes from the withdrawals, most of whom were males. This was true last year as well. In essence, not only do more men go through the tenure process than women do (as their numbers are larger at hiring), but they also withdraw more readily. (These data, although referring to tenure, include non-mandatory cases.)

The racial breakdown of unsuccessful cases, as compared to their presence in the relevant population, is roughly as follows: Asian: 13% vs. 24%; Black: 17% vs. 10%; Latino: 25% vs. 6% Whites: 36% vs. 49%. (Total Under-represented Minority 20% vs. 16% presence in population.) While it is good to see that only one of the denied cases and only one of the withdrawn cases were under-represented minorities, it is nonetheless the case that only a combined 16% of the total population undergoing tenure were under-represented minorities. The numbers for faculty of color in general are better, and comparable to those in recent years (40%), but only because of Asian faculty (24%).

'SLAM DUNK' CASES

	TENURE CASES				PROMOTION CASES			
	Total	% of Total Pop.	% of Total Pop. Type	% of Total Slam Dunks	Total	% of Total Pop.	% of Total Pop. Type	% of Total Slam Dunks
TOTAL	34	54%	54%	100%	37	80%	80%	100%
FEMALE	14	22%	61%	41%	13	28%	81%	35%
MALE	20	32%	53%	59%	24	52%	80%	65%
ASIAN	10	16%	67%	29%	7	15%	70%	19%
BLACK	4	6%	67%	12%	0			
LATINO	2	3%	100%	6%	1	2%	100%	3%
WHITE	14	22%	45%	41%	26	57%	81%	70%
NOT REPORTED	4	6%	50%	12%	3	7%	100%	8%

Slightly over half the tenure cases were entirely straightforward in terms of positive votes at the campus-level committee. Of those, the proportion among women (41%) was larger than the proportion of women in the general sample (38%). This is a significant improvement with regards to last year (36%, for a presence of 44% in the population), though it is early to discern any trends yet (data of this sort have only been collected for two years). The faculty of color categories were also relatively high (ranging from 67% Black and Asian to 100% Latino, of the total of under-represented minorities), but only the population sample for Asians is relatively significant to reach any conclusions. The majority of promotion to professor cases were straightforward in the intended sense (80% “slam dunks”).

CASES THAT WERE INVITED BACK

	TENURE CASES				PROMOTION CASES			
	Total	% of Total Pop.	% of Total Pop. Type	% of Total Group	Total	% of Total Pop.	% of Total Pop. Type	% of Total Group
TOTAL	9	14%	14%	100%	2	4%	4%	100%
FEMALE	5	8%	21%	56%	1	2%	7%	50%
MALE	4	6%	10%	44%	1	2%	4%	50%
ASIAN	2	3%	13%	22%				
BLACK								
LATINO	1	2%	25%	11%				
WHITE	5	8%	16%	56%	2	4%	7%	100%
NOT REPORTED	1	2%	14%	11%				

Cases that required further discussion at the campus level (“invite-backs”) amounted to 14% of those discussed for tenure (and 4% for full professors). 55% of the actual cases were women, while again their presence in the population was 38%. So although women fared proportionally better than men in terms of “slam dunks”, they did worse than men in terms of “invite backs” (21% of women vs. 10% of men). Only two cases were “invite backs” within full professor promotions, one man and one woman. Any other numbers in these tables are too low to find any other serious generalizations. Although they could be construed as improvements vis-à-vis last year’s, until data from a number of years are collected there shouldn’t be much weight given to putative trends.