
INTRODUCTION

Publication of this Document

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

This document was last updated on April 24, 2020.

Kinds of Information

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

The Structure of Reviews

Faculty members have their tenure homes in Departments, and Departments are combined into Colleges. Actions at both levels are governed by campus-wide policies. In accordance with Board of Regents Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure, II-1.00, an award of tenure and promotion can only be awarded by an affirmative decision by the President based upon a formal review. Board of Regents Policy dictates that each institution have written procedures governing the promotion and tenure process. This institution's written procedures are set forth in the **University of Maryland Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures II-1.00(A).** In keeping with this campus's commitment to shared governance, at this University a decision by the President to award tenure follows advice and recommendations from both administrators and a faculty APT Review Committee at each of three levels: Department, College and University. Reviews are conducted as follows: (1) at the first level by (a) the Department Faculty APT Review Committee and (b) Department Chair; (2) at the second level by (a) the College Faculty APT Review Committee and (b) the Dean; and (3) at the third level by: (a) the University Faculty APT Review Committee and (b) the Provost. In Colleges and Schools that are not departmentalized, there are only two levels of review and recommendations prior to a final decision by the President; the College/School Faculty APT Review Committee and Dean function as the first level of review.

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

EQUITY AND FAIRNESS IN THE REVIEW PROCESS

Proactive Procedure.

To encourage a fair and equitable review process for the candidate, 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 (a copy of the memo follows this section). This memo will state that discussions should avoid disparaging or prejudicial comments. It will include an express admonition that the evaluation of the candidate may not be based on factors such as a candidate's sex, race, sexual orientation or other protected personal characteristics. In addition, the letter will stress that neither a candidate's part-time status nor any extension of the mandatory tenure review year authorized pursuant to policy may be held against the candidate, and that such candidates shall be evaluated according to the same criteria applicable to other candidates. Chairs of the unit-level APT review committees are to distribute the letter to the voting faculty at the inception of the review process. This letter shall be referenced prior to the evaluative meeting and when inappropriate discussions arise. In departmentalized Colleges, Associate Deans of Faculty Affairs and College Diversity Officers are encouraged to formally charge individual Department APT Review Committees prior to the review process, paying specific attention to equity-related issues. Additionally, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Chief Diversity Officer will arrange to formally charge College APT Review Committees.

APT Review Committee members shall be informed when a candidate stopped the tenure clock or was on a part-time tenure clock, and informed that these are university-supported policies. The focus of discussion and decision-making in APT Review Committees should be on the candidate's performance in meeting criteria set forth by the Department, College, and University, and not how long (e.g., an extra year) it took to meet those criteria. This recommendation applies to faculty being evaluated for tenure, as well as those with tenure being evaluated for promotion.


Procedures to Follow Observed Actions of Concern.

Should faculty members of the APT Review Committee (as witnesses) believe that inappropriate comments have been made, such as disparaging remarks referencing tenure delay(s), part-time appointments, cultural background, group membership, and/or personality traits, they are encouraged to raise their concern during the meeting, citing the Administration's letter. That faculty member may also discuss the issue confidentially with the APT Review Committee Chair, or with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 16, 2020

TO: Deans, Associate Deans for Faculty, Chairs, and Directors

FROM: John Bertot
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs 

SUBJECT: Promotion and Tenure Deliberations

Please share this memo with your College APT Committee Chairs and Department APT Committee Chairs and distribute it to the faculty serving on APT committees. Chairs of first-level APT Review Committees are responsible for ensuring that voting faculty are aware of the contents of this memo, the campus APT policy, procedures and guidelines, as well as the unit's guidelines for promotion and tenure, prior to or at the inception of the evaluative meeting.

The deliberation and decision on promotion and tenure cases is important to the individual faculty member and vital to the University's pursuit of excellence. The campus is committed to ensuring a thorough review and the fair and impartial treatment of candidates. Four key elements contribute to the fairness of the decision-making process:

- 1) Ensuring that APT guidelines and policy are followed;**
- 2) Confidentiality with respect to the contents of decision-making meetings;**
- 3) Careful attention to evaluative statements; and**
- 4) Avoidance of discussion of topics that are irrelevant to APT criteria or introduce bias into APT considerations.**

Administrators of the APT process have the responsibility of ensuring the integrity of the unit level APT deliberations and procedures. Administrators must follow the University's APT [Policy](#) and [Guidelines](#) throughout the entire process. In recognition of the impact of the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic on AY 2020-21 APT deliberations, the Office of Faculty Affairs developed the attached [Guidance on Remote and Virtual APT/AEP/Permanent Status Deliberations and Voting](#). Please review and adhere to the temporary guidance provided within the document to ensure the integrity of the APT review process. Administrators should familiarize themselves with the Policy and the most recent Guidelines (including the temporary guidance) **prior to initiating APT cases**.

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

Senate Resolution 99-00-13 provides faculty members involved in APT deliberations with two pathways to raise objections if they perceive that the deliberations about a candidate for promotion have been conducted inequitably or contained procedural violations: (1) within the decision meeting itself, or (2) through confidential discussions with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, who will investigate the matter thoroughly and seek resolution. Such discussions with the Associate Provost do not constitute a violation of the confidentiality of the review meeting and are authorized by the University Policy.

The Office of Faculty Affairs stands ready to consult with faculty and administrators throughout the APT process when questions or concerns arise.

**Guidance on Remote and Virtual
APT/AEP/Permanent Status Deliberations and Voting
April 15, 2020**

In light of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on University operations, including compliance with stay-at-home and restricted research directives from the State Government and Campus Administration, many APT, AEP, Permanent Status and other confidential processes that fall to faculty affairs require adjustment to virtual formats and online platforms. While some units have in place governing rules and processes that permit online/remote participation in deliberations in whole or part, others do not.

In recognition that virtual participation and voting may be unregulated or prohibited in certain unit- or college-level APT, AEP, and Permanent Status policies, the Provost authorized units to modify rules temporarily in order to ensure that review processes can continue under current circumstances.

Provost Mary Ann Rankin (March 11, 2020 2:38pm)

Similarly, rules requiring in-person participation in dissertation defense and promotion and tenure committee meetings may need to be relaxed during this period to allow for on-line participation of committee members or candidates. Again, it is important that these emergency measures be implemented equitably with appropriate documentation and approvals. We encourage and authorize the use of virtual meeting tools to facilitate these review processes.

The below provides implementation guidance regarding APT/AEP/Permanent Status online review processes due to the COVID-19 situation.

Confidential Deliberations and Voting during Telework

In recognition of more recent April 6 [instructions from UHR](#) that telework shall continue through May 22, 2020, to be followed by the standard dispersal of 9-month appointment and promotion committee members during the summer months, the Office of Faculty Affairs provides the following guidance on confidential APT, AEP, and Permanent Status deliberations that may take place at anytime through the end of the AY 2020-21 review cycle. Further adjustments may be necessary based on further guidance from campus, USM, and/or the Governor.

The four principal guidances are:

1. Standing APT, AEP, and Permanent Status policy, guidelines, and procedures remain in effect regardless of the modality of the deliberations. University APT [Policy](#) and [Guidelines](#); AEP [Guidelines](#); and APPS [Policy](#) and APPSC [Guidelines](#), remain in effect, as do the first- and second-level (department, school, college, library) policies and guidelines. Expectations for confidentiality, security, equity, due process, and other requirements governing the APT, AEP, and Permanent Status processes continue to apply. It is solely the means by which deliberations and operations (e.g., discussions, voting, workflow) occur that require adaptation under this guidance.
2. Candidate dossiers shall be assembled, shared, and transmitted exclusively via secure University-supported platforms (e.g., Canvas; UMD Box; UMD Google Drive; Office of Faculty Affairs Appointments Promotions, and Awards portal). Access rights should be managed to ensure that solely eligible faculty and administrators as well as appropriate support staff be able to view, edit, download, and/or share electronic dossiers. To further ensure the security of the materials, dossiers should be password-protected when transmitted.
3. All APT, AEP, and Permanent Status meetings are expected to take place via a secure University-supported video or tele-conferencing platform (e.g., Zoom, WebEx, Hangouts Meet).
4. In the absence of an insurmountable technological breakdown, the same meeting rules, settings, and platform should be used for all APT, AEP, and Permanent Status cases under consideration in the same unit.

Technologies and Practices

The Office of Faculty Affairs strongly recommends the Zoom platform for online deliberations due to its stability, security, and meeting management features. However, units may opt to use a University-supported platform other than Zoom (e.g, UMD Webex, UMD Google). Regardless of the adopted platform for APT/AEP/Permanent Status deliberations, the committee chair/convener and appropriate support staff are responsible for ensuring that the requirements/guidances described below are technically possible. Further, OFA urges the APT, AEP, and Permanent Status committee chair/convener and appropriate support staff to test the selected platform ahead of any scheduled deliberative meeting; ensure that those managing the deliberations are familiar with the platform(s) ahead of time; ensure that all eligible participants are able to use the platforms (Accessibility); and ensure that the platform meets the requirements articulated below. Units are also strongly encouraged to select and familiarize participants with a backup platform in case there are technical challenges with the platform of first choice and it becomes unusable for any reason.

Preserving Confidentiality and Securing Privacy

Expectations for confidentiality remain unchanged. All virtual meetings and proceedings still require strict adherence to best practices of confidentiality and records privacy before, during, and after virtual meetings including deliberations and binding votes. Information regarding Zoom security features is available [here](#). Information regarding WebEx security features is available [here](#).

Before the meeting:

The unit- or college-level APT/AEP/Permanent Status policy continues to govern meeting convening requirements such as the meeting announcement, the required period of advance notice, dossier availability, meeting attendance, and if and how absentee balloting is permissible.

Either the person serving as the chair/convenor of the meeting or a designee should schedule a video or teleconference using a University-supported platform and account.

Any meeting during which confidential matters are to be discussed must be assigned a unique ID and password. By default, eligible participants shall be expected to login to the meeting by authenticating with University credentials and a password. However, when UMD authentication is unavailable or not working properly, eligible participants shall still be extended the rights of voice and vote, subject to relevant policy restrictions.

Consistent with the first- or second-level policy, the person designated to convene/chair the meeting or a designee is responsible for announcing the meeting length, agenda, eligible participants, login information, and any other meeting logistics. The policy-designated convenor/chair or designee should also detail the parameters of online participant behavior and the meeting, including the permissible use of audio and video settings, chats, screen-sharing, and file uploads. Guidance on managing Zoom meeting participant features is available [here](#). Guidance on managing WebEx meetings is available [here](#).

Given the number of administrative steps required to schedule an online meeting, invite participants, monitor waiting rooms, verify participants, etc., it is recommended that a designee of the APT/AEP/Permanent Status committee convenor/chair should have responsibility for managing participant settings and functionalities as well as the enabled waiting rooms.

Accessibility

It is essential that all eligible participants be able to fully engage in the APT/AEP/Permanent Status deliberations and if necessary, provided with reasonable accommodations to ensure participation. For questions/concerns related to accessibility of the online meeting platforms, contact the DIT Accessibility office at itaccessibility@umd.edu.

During the meeting:

To ensure that only authorized participants are present and to ensure a quorum, the committee chair/convener (or designee) should start each meeting with a roll call of attendees.

APT/AEP/Permanent Status deliberations are confidential personnel matters. OFA strongly discourages online recording of APT, AEP, and Permanent Status deliberations. By default, the committee chair/convener (or designee) should disable all recording features. If for some reason it becomes necessary to record in audio or video (or both) the deliberations, it is required that State Law and privacy considerations are followed, in particular, explicit consent from each meeting participant must be obtained and should be reflected in the minutes. In addition to seeking consent for recordings, participants must be informed regarding the access to and use of the recording, by whom, and how long it will be available. See here for University [guidance](#) on this matter.

The Office of Faculty Affairs instructs the meeting committee chair/convener or designee to [disable the Private Chat in Zoom](#) feature to ensure that all deliberations are conducted in the open. Guidance on managing the chat feature within WebEx is available [here](#).

Consistent with the unit-level policy and established rules of order, the convener/chair or designee shall moderate the deliberations and voting. Consistent with the appropriate policy first- or second-level, minutes of discussion and votes shall be recorded.

As online deliberations proceed, the convener/chair and participants may make ample and appropriate use of the meeting engagement features such as hands-up, yes/no, reactions, and polling. It is important to recognize, however, that if some participants are participating by video connections and others by phone, the reactions, polling, and group chat features may not be visible to all and the meeting convener/chair should ensure that all participants are able to engage in the meeting activities.

When voting on APT/AEP/Permanent Status cases, the committee chair/convener (or designee) may use the reactions and related features for non-binding straw polls, but when established plans call for secret balloting, the voting process must be kept confidential from all voting-eligible participants. Units should select the University-supported voting platform (e.g., Zoom, Qualtrics, TurningPoint) and determine Voting procedures ahead of the meeting and those procedures, along with instructions, should be communicated to the meeting participants ahead of time so that participants can familiarize themselves with the voting process. Units may wish to consider using a non-voting attendee (i.e., unit/college administrative support) to manage secret balloting, make public the vote tally, and to record the binding vote.

DivIT provides a basic overview of Zoom polling [here](#). Zoom provides additional support, including how to make them anonymous, [here](#). Information regarding TurningPoint is available [here](#). Information regarding Qualtrics is available [here](#).

After the meeting:

If participant rosters, group chats, and polling features were enabled before the meeting, the meeting committee chair/convener (or designee) will have to determine if a log is to be saved. Any files that are saved to a cloud service or downloaded shall be treated with the same level of confidentiality, security, and document retention as expected for candidate dossiers and meeting minutes.

Meeting IDs and passwords should not be reused.

For more information, contact:

[John Bertot](#), Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

Useful Definitions

APT Review Committee

Group of voting faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate who deliberate and vote on whether to award appointment, promotion, or tenure. There are three levels of APT Review Committee – Department, College, and Campus.

Advisory Subcommittee

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

Joint Appointment

When a faculty member holds simultaneous appointments (of any percentage) in more than one Department or other Unit (e.g., Center or Institute). Tenure is sought in the primary Department, or tenure home of the candidate.

Quorum

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

Votes possible for deciding to award appointment, promotion or tenure based on criteria:

- Yes
- No
- **Abstention** (two types): these actions count toward quorum
 - **Mandatory:** a faculty member who has a conflict of interest (e.g., a family member or partner of the candidate), or who has already voted at a lower level
 - **Voluntary:** a faculty member who chooses not to vote (this should be explained in summaries and letters)
- **Absent:** not present in person or via teleconference (if the latter is allowed by Department or College plan of organization)

TIMELINE FOR THE APT PROCESS

This schedule is just a recommendation, and it does not include every detail of the process.

	FACULTY	ADMINISTRATION	STAFF
WINTERTERM			Finalize this year's dossiers for uploading to Faculty Affairs website. Make dossiers searchable. Add bookmarks, password. Set dossier display. Upload to Faculty Affairs website.
	Prepare / update CV. Prepare personal statement. Develop list of external evaluators. Choose materials that will be sent to external evaluators.	Begin developing list of faculty who will be reviewed in the fall. Double-check for joint appointments and for non-mandatory reviews.	Gather preliminary materials (e.g., promotion criteria, reputation of publication outlets) for next year's dossiers.
SPRING	Prepare / update teaching portfolio and supplemental dossier materials, such as selected publications.	Choose and prepare materials to be sent to external evaluators. Request external evaluations.	For each candidate, set up transmittal form. Prepare letter log. Prepare student evaluation of teaching summary tables. Prepare citation counts.
SUMMER		Schedule committee meetings. Follow up with external evaluators as needed.	Begin dossier for each candidate. Update letter log; add external evaluator letters as they are received.
FALL	Create CV addenda as needed.	Committee members prepare Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and provide this, along with other non-evaluative materials for candidate's review/ signature. Department and College-level review committee meetings held. Notify candidates. Chairs/ Deans write evaluative letters.	Update transmittal forms with meeting dates, votes. Add committee reports and Chairs', Deans' letters to dossier as they become available.

INFORMATION FOR THE CANDIDATE

A candidate's preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. Soon after the candidate arrives, APT policy calls for the unit administrator

- a) to provide the candidate with a copy of the promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which he or she will be evaluated (**APT Policy Section II, Section IV**) and
- b) to appoint one or more senior faculty mentors (**APT Policy Section IV.A.3**; see also the Senate Task Force Report available at www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/mnt_ndx.html).

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

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

The Review Process

Third-Year Review

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

Review for Tenure and/ or Promotion

Candidates for promotion and tenure will be reviewed at the Department level by the Department APT Review Committee, and the case will be voted on by all Department faculty members who are at or above the rank the candidate is seeking. If the candidate holds a joint appointment, the dossier may be reviewed by the APT Review Committee of the secondary unit as well (prior to review in the tenure home). Following the committee review, the Department Chair will evaluate the dossier. Next, the dossier is reviewed by the College level APT Review Committee, by the Dean of the College, and finally, it is sent to the Campus level APT Review Committee, which makes a recommendation about tenure and promotion to the President, through the Provost. These reviews usually take place during the sixth year of the appointment. Some faculty may seek a non-mandatory (i.e., early) tenure review, and others may receive one or more delays of their mandatory tenure review, following campus policy on extension of time for tenure review (**University Policy Section II-1.00(D)**). From start to finish, the APT review process takes about a year, though candidates should be looking ahead to tenure review from the day they begin at the university.

Because the tenure dossier will be reviewed by so many people who may or may not be familiar with the candidate or his or her work, the information provided in the dossier should be well-prepared and in a form that is as clear as possible. The candidate's mentor(s) can help with advice about preparation of those materials. The information in the dossier must remain the same as it moves from one review level to the next, other than any necessary addenda to the CV.

Withdrawal from Consideration

Candidates for promotion may voluntarily withdraw from the review process at any time prior to the President's decision by writing a letter to the Department Chair (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**). Copies of the letter of withdrawal should be forwarded to the Dean, the Chair of the APT Review Committee, and Office of Faculty Affairs. When an untenured faculty member withdraws at the time of mandatory review, the faculty member is entitled to an additional terminal one-year appointment at the individual's current rank (**APT Policy Section IV.F.4**). This terminal appointment does not apply for withdrawals by candidates for early tenure or promotion to Professor/Principal Agent.

Denial

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

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation by both Chair and Department APT Review Committee, the review will not proceed further and the candidate must be notified of the situation. The Chair must also inform the administrator at the next level (e.g., Dean) who must certify that the procedures to evaluate the candidate conformed to the regulations in the APT Policy (APT Policy Section IV.A.5).

The Curriculum Vitae

CV information should be organized according to the three areas on which candidates will be evaluated:

- 1) Research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity
- 2) Teaching, advising, and mentoring
- 3) Service

The CV should present an accurate portrait of the candidate's accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible. The CV must be signed and dated when given to the department staff member who will create the tenure dossier. This indicates that it is up to date and accurate (APT Policy Section IV). The CV will be included in each request for external evaluation.

Research, Scholarly, Creative and/or Professional Activities

Scholarship is defined as the discovery, integration, engagement and transmission of knowledge. The quality of scholarship is assessed through peer review, impact, and significance. The onus is on the candidate to present documentation that his or her work meets these criteria. Such documentation will include traditional means (e.g., citations, journal impact factors) but may also take other forms.

In each category, published works should be listed first, in either chronological order or its inverse, followed (or preceded) by works not yet published but accepted for publication. If listing books, specify whether a manuscript has been accepted without the need for further revisions. All of the works listed in this section should be numbered. The candidate should distinguish between authored and edited works and refereed vs. un-refereed outlets and should clarify the status of unpublished works (e.g., accepted, in press). There should be a full citation for each work, inclusive of all authors in the order of publication, page numbers, and DOI if available.¹

*In exceptional cases, e.g., when the work is a product of a large group (more than 10 authors), not all authors need be listed. As an example, the candidate may list the first three, the last three, and the candidate him or herself (including placement in the total author list). That is, if a candidate named "Candidate" is the 97th author, the citation may be listed as: Smith, Jones, Curley...Candidate (97th)...Moe, Larry, Shemp (total of 189 authors). Candidates may designate the identity of the author with intellectual leadership on jointly authored papers (if this designation can be appropriately ascertained) by using * or*

¹ If pre-print electronic publication (epub) exists, indicate and include URL and anticipated date of print publication.

*placing that name in bold, and identifying which co-authors they mentored as undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, faculty research assistants, and junior faculty. In some units, the designation with * and bold may be inappropriate for the culture of the area; a unit with the approval of its college may choose a policy of abstaining from these designations. Candidates should clearly characterize their contribution(s) to a collaborative activity, as practiced in the Department. When the research is published in a foreign language, the translation of the title should be included.*

Teaching, Mentoring and Advising

For courses taught in the last five years, indicate approximate enrollments and any unusual formats. For advising and mentoring, indicate numbers of students per year. Additionally, list any contribution to learning outcomes assessments in the Department.

Under teaching innovations, list course or curriculum development, including the creation of courses that focus on underrepresented populations, the integration of diverse cultural perspectives into existing courses, and the use of varied pedagogical strategies to meet the learning styles of a diverse student body. Include any other advising and mentoring activities, like advising student groups, underrepresented students, special assignments, recruiting, faculty membership mentorship, and recruiting/advising/mentoring activities that enhance diversity and inclusion, etc.

Addenda to the CV

If there are subsequent changes to the candidate's credentials, such as additional funding or new publications, they may be recorded as an addendum to the CV, which can then be included in the dossier. The addendum must also be signed and dated.

The Personal Statement

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

- Peer review
- Impact
- Significance/Innovation

If the candidate has been involved in collaborative activities, he or she should explain the extent of participation and type of contribution. These statements 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. The personal

statement must be signed and dated. The statement must be included in each request for external evaluation. The document may not be changed after it is given to the APT Review Committee and sent to external reviewers (APT Policy Section IV).

Teaching Portfolio

In addition to materials for the tenure and/or promotion dossier, the candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio, according to Department guidelines, which could include the following types of items: course syllabi; a statement of teaching philosophy; a statement about how the candidate addresses diversity and inclusion in teaching; reflective assessments; learning outcomes assessment materials; and mentoring accomplishments, such as placement of advisees in academic and professional positions. More information about the teaching portfolio is included in the Appendix.

Supplemental Materials

The candidate may wish to include representative pieces of scholarship or descriptions of awards and honors in an optional supplemental dossier. If the materials chosen for inclusion are publicly available, 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 remember that the supplemental materials file is a place for *representative* scholarship and other extraordinary materials. The candidate should choose items for inclusion carefully. Though there are no rules in this area, the candidate is strongly encouraged not to exceed 150 pages in the supplemental materials file.

The Candidate's Responsibilities:

- Providing the *curriculum vitae* in the approved format. The document must be signed and dated to indicate that it is a complete and accurate record of accomplishments.
- Providing a Personal Statement which makes a case for tenure and/or promotion based on the facts in the *curriculum vitae*, on the Department's criteria for Promotion and Tenure, and on the perspective of achievements in the context of the discipline.
- Suggesting the names of three or more qualified external evaluators (APT Policy Section IV.A.2). These should be widely recognized authorities in the field. The candidate may not contact evaluators to determine their willingness to provide information, or to inquire about the contents of the evaluation. The evaluators nominated by the candidate should be familiar with the candidate's work, but not collaborators. It is a good idea to nominate more than three, in case one of the nominees is not available to serve as an external evaluator. In this selection process, the candidate may also identify other individuals who might not be expected to give an objective review. 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 external evaluators for the review.
- Providing a teaching portfolio with documentation (e.g., syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, teaching evaluations).

- Providing publications or other forms of scholarship.
- Selecting samples of scholarship for reviews by higher-level review Committees and working with the APT Review Committee to select materials for external reviewers.
- Providing any other relevant information requested by the APT Review Committee (e.g., of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of awards).

INFORMATION FOR FACULTY ADMINISTRATORS

Appointment Considerations

Considerations for interdisciplinary, non-traditional, or emerging scholarship

Scholarship is a dynamic process, and the University of Maryland recognizes that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines change over time. Faculty are encouraged to engage in innovative discovery and dissemination. Several units are already accustomed to recognizing such different approaches and would not require modifications to existing unit criteria for tenure and/or promotion; however, many fields are challenged with assessment of faculty exploring non-traditional research paths. Such individuals will often publish in venues unfamiliar to faculty in their tenure homes, and may have different, though similarly important measures of impact, funding sources, and career networks.

Examples of faculty practicing non-traditional scholarship include those who:

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

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

Each candidate should be made aware of the opportunity to request an agreement specifying a modification of criteria for tenure and promotion. This formal written agreement would specify the nature of the candidate's duties and obligations to the Department. It is recommended that the Department consult with a scholar from the relevant discipline(s), or one who does similar research, if applicable, to develop the agreement. Additionally, Chairs should assign appropriate mentors from a relevant discipline(s).

APT Review of Faculty with Agreements for Modified Unit Criteria

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

- Research or scholarly essays published in refereed journals or books, or accepted for publication in journals or books outside one's discipline.

- Peer-reviewed handbooks
- Cross-disciplinary analysis of extant literature
- Popularizations or applications of scholarly research and theory in journals
- Computer programs or other media products

In reviewing candidates with agreements for modified criteria, APT review committees should include a professor knowledgeable in other discipline(s), from on or off campus, to serve in an advisory capacity to both the Advisory Subcommittee and the Department APT Review Committee. The Department may wish to have this professor present at the APT Review Committee meeting, in a non-voting capacity, in order to provide context for the candidate's work. The Chair of the Advisory Subcommittee for the candidate should ensure that some of the reference letters are from scholars who conduct research in the other discipline(s), or of a similar nature to that of the candidate. Faculty involved in the third-year review and the Department APT Review Committee should be provided with the agreement as part of their deliberations. Additionally, the executed agreement must be signed and dated by the candidate and included in materials for external evaluators, as well as in the APT Dossier for review at all levels.

Information about Joint Appointments

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

- the tenure home;
- division of responsibility for the line and, where appropriate, arrangements for allocation of DRIF money, lab and office space;
- rights and obligations of the secondary unit(s) and conditions under which line responsibility might be renegotiated (e.g., if units disagree about promotion and/or tenure); and arrangements for reviewing renewal of contract and promotion (if appropriate).

Review of newly hired joint appointments as well as promotions for candidates with joint appointments: In joint appointments, the tenure home Department is referenced here as primary, usually the Department with the greatest fraction of the appointment line. It is the prerogative of the primary Department to grant tenure. However, because the rank held by an individual must be consistent across Departments or Units, the primary Department needs to consider advisory input from the secondary Department or Unit (e.g., an Institute) as part of the APT review. The Department may wish to have a representative from the other unit present at the APT Review Committee meeting, in a non-voting capacity, in order to provide context for the candidate's work.

Voting by faculty with joint appointments

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

- must hold a tenured appointment in the University,
- must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion,
- must hold a regular appointment in the unit (with a given percentage of time attached),

- may only vote in a single unit providing the plan of organization permits it, and at only one level of review,
- must vote at the Department level of review and in the tenure home, when there is the opportunity to vote more than once.² (APT Policy Section IV.A.1)

The following scenarios reflect three different kinds of joint appointment.

Appointment split between two independent tenure granting Departments and Schools

At the inception of the review, the Chair (or Directors) of the primary and secondary Departments or units are encouraged to coordinate the timing of the review process to obtain timely input from the secondary Department. They are also encouraged to draw up a mutual letter that solicits evaluation of the candidate. Ordinarily, this letter should be signed by both APT Chairs. The two units may wish to form a joint review committee consisting of members of both units, which then delivers the report to the respective units for a decision.

STEP 1. The secondary unit should conduct a complete review and make its recommendation before the case is considered by the primary unit. The secondary unit's recommendation is for promotion to a higher rank, not tenure, because the secondary unit is not the individual's tenure home. The APT report of the secondary unit's review committee and its votes, as well as the recommendation of the administrator in the secondary unit, should be forwarded to the primary unit for consideration in its APT process. Thus, the secondary unit's review becomes part of the promotion dossier.

STEP 2. The primary unit votes based on its own review and the material furnished by the secondary unit. If the recommendations of the two units disagree, the Chair of the primary unit's APT Review Committee should provide a written list of questions to the administrator of the secondary unit and the spokesperson for the secondary unit's APT Review Committee, and invite them to meet with the primary unit to discuss the case. The primary unit incorporates its input (from faculty and unit administrator) into the dossier, to forward it to higher levels of review.

STEP 3. The APT Review Committee for the College wherein the primary unit resides evaluates the entire Dossier that includes material from the primary and secondary units' reviews. This College APT Review Committee votes and writes a report, the Dean writes a letter, and the Dossier is submitted for evaluation by the Campus APT Review Committee. When disagreements arise between voting units, the Committee should inform and invite the APT Review Committee Chairs and administrators to discuss the case.

² Chairs and Deans cannot vote as faculty in their Departments. When there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty in a Unit, Deans may appoint faculty from related units as voting faculty, to ensure the APT Committee contains at least three persons. These faculty may not vote on the candidate more than once.

OUTLINE OF THE JOINT APPOINTMENT / REVIEW PROCESS

Two Departments or Units meet to decide on external evaluators.

Letters are sent under joint signature of APT Review Committee Chairs;
A joint advisory subcommittee or separate advisory subcommittee may be appointed.

Secondary Unit performs review.

Secondary Unit APT Review Committee votes and writes a report;
Secondary Unit administrator writes a letter;
Material is forwarded to Primary Unit.

Primary Unit completes review.

The APT Review Committee considers its own material and the material supplied by the Secondary Unit committee;
Primary Unit votes and writes a report;
Primary Unit administrator writes a letter;

Primary College review.

Primary College evaluates Dossier containing Primary and Secondary Units' reviews;
College APT Review Committee votes and writes report;
Dean writes letter;
Material is submitted for evaluation by the Campus APT Review Committee.

Appointment split between tenure home and a "permanent" appointment in a secondary unit.

If a candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither a secondary Department nor a non-departmentalized School, the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from the relevant (at rank) faculty in the unit. The format of the advice will be determined by the tenure granting unit's plan of organization. If the input is in the form of a vote, the vote may not include input from those eligible to vote on the candidate at the Department level elsewhere. The director's advisory letter should be available to faculty in the primary unit before they vote.

Appointment split between tenure home and a temporary appointment in a secondary unit.

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

Appointments to senior faculty ranks

New faculty appointments to the ranks of Professor and Principal Agent carry tenure and must be reviewed under the University APT process. New faculty appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor and Senior Agent may be with or without tenure. New appointments to the ranks of Associate Professor and Senior Agent with tenure require review under the University APT process. New appointments to these ranks without tenure may proceed for review and approval by the President based on a recommendation from the Provost, unless questions arise, in which case the President may

direct that the proposed appointment undergo an unofficial tenure review by University APT review committees prior to presidential consideration. No offer of appointment to the rank of Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent or Principal Agent (regardless of tenure status) is valid in the absence of presidential approval. New faculty appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor and Agent are not handled under the University APT process.

New appointments may be submitted at any time. All requests for new appointments must be accompanied by a separate memo that provides the information on the New Faculty Appointment Information Form (see Appendix), required for presidential approval of the appointment.

Dossiers for new appointments differ slightly from dossiers of candidates being promoted from within. They lack a Summary of Professional Achievements and Personal Statement. Additionally, the dossier for a new appointment is not required to include a teaching portfolio, though the creation of a teaching portfolio is recommended. Such dossiers should, however, contain as much information as possible on the candidate's performance or potential performance as a teacher, mentor and advisor, as well as on the candidate's scholarship. External letters of evaluation should be solicited from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from reviewers suggested by the Department. For tenure cases, it is essential that the question of tenure be addressed, both in the APT reports and in external letters. Letters soliciting recommendations for a new tenured appointment should pose the question of whether the candidate merits tenure.

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

Expedited Appointments

In cases where a unit has identified a potential faculty hire it has reason to believe is highly competitive and warrants an expedited review (sometimes referred to as a "target of opportunity" appointment), the review process can be streamlined. It is anticipated that there would be relatively few appointments of this nature. To qualify for this streamlined process, candidates would be nominated by both the Chair and the Dean and approved by the Provost's Office. Such candidates normally would hold tenure and the comparable rank at another institution. The streamlined process could also be used for scholars considered for administrative positions. Appointments at this level for consideration of tenure could substitute three evaluative letters from the search process for the three external reviewers nominated by the candidate, and the candidate's CV submitted in connection with the search may be used, and need not be signed. The review process would proceed as follows: (1) the first-level review would take place per current practice in that unit; (2) a review by a three-person ad-hoc committee formed by the Dean (composed of current College APT Review Committee members); (3) a review by the College Dean; and (4) a review by the Provost and final decision by the President. For non-departmentalized Colleges, the review at the campus level should include a review by an ad-hoc committee formed by the Provost

with a minimum of three persons drawn from members of the current University APT Review Committee.

Steps in the Review of Faculty

	Dept. APT Review Committee *	Dept. Chair *	College APT Review Committee	Dean	Campus APT Review Committee	Provost	President
Promotion or New Appt. Assoc. & Full Prof, Sr. & Principal Agents w/ or w/o Tenure; Coll. Park Profs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Emerita/us	*	*		*		*	*
Reappointment College Park Professor		*		*		*	*
New Appt. Prof. of the Practice	*	*		*	Assoc. Provosts	*	*
Reappointment Prof. of the Practice		*		*	Assoc. Provosts	*	*

* Note: In non-departmentalized colleges the review originates with the eligible voting faculty and the Dean of the College, and then proceeds to the Campus APT Review Committee (where appropriate) and then the Provost and President.

Department APT Review Committee Members

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

- Choosing external evaluators and requesting their evaluations
- Evaluating the candidate's publications and preparing a report on the reputation of publication outlets
- Gathering reports of peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching and summarizing them
- Creating the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements
- Evaluating the candidate according to the Department Promotion Criteria

External Evaluators

The Review Committee shall solicit letters of evaluation from at least six widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that shall include individuals nominated by the candidate. The expectation is that the external evaluators will be full professors or equivalent. Among the letters requested, at least three and at most one-half must be from persons nominated by the candidate (**APT Policy Section IV.A.2**). The Chair of the Department APT Review Committee should receive suggestions of potential external evaluators from the candidate. The Committee should select evaluators from the candidate's

list and must also choose evaluators from their own list. If the candidate has a joint appointment, the Secondary Department or Unit must be consulted on the choice of external evaluators, which is also recommended for faculty who have agreements for modified unit criteria. Also see the section on **Considerations for interdisciplinary, non-traditional, or emerging scholarship** and **Information about Joint Appointments**.

*APT Review Committees at all levels question the credibility of letters from the candidate's mentors and collaborators, and heed closely the comments of evaluators from highly ranked institutions and, where appropriate, evaluators holding the rank of professor. The committee will also heed closely the comments of evaluators who are documented as among the outstanding leaders in the field. It is suggested that, at a minimum, six of the letters be selected from evaluators who are not the candidate's mentors and collaborators. Up to two additional letters (for a total of at least eight) may be from a mentor or collaborator as long as sufficient explanation is provided by the Chair of the APT Review Committee and/or Department Chair. An allowable exception is the case where an appropriately small number of the six letter writers have had a one-time or temporally distant collaboration. In some circumstances, a greater proportion of letters from collaborators may be needed in order to provide a complete, equitable, and thorough evaluation of the contributions of the candidate. Such letters may be allowed if justification is provided by the Unit undertaking the evaluation (e.g., in cases of very large collaborations where coauthors number in the tens to hundreds). **It is recommended** that the list of external evaluators and their credentials, as well as justification for including a greater proportion of collaborators³ be vetted by the Dean's office prior to solicitation of letters, in order to identify possible inadequacies in the overall list. The Committee should solicit letters well in advance of their deadline. Initial contact shall be made via email to establish whether the evaluator is available to provide a letter within the required time frame. The email should include an explicit deadline for reply in order to determine the need for contacting additional evaluators. The goal is to establish a consistent protocol for initiating contact and to minimize the receipt of uninformed comments prior to an external evaluator's assessment of the candidate's complete portfolio. Once the evaluator has agreed, a formal packet of materials should be distributed. A reminder email shall be sent within one week of the deadline if the letter is still outstanding at that time. Example text of such emails is provided in the appendix; all such correspondence shall be recorded in the letter log.*

The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal must be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted, and any prejudicial discussion regarding

³ Collaborators are here defined as a coauthor on any peer-reviewed work, the candidate's advisor or advisee, or candidate's mentor. The following persons would not be considered collaborators: an editor of a volume in which the candidate has a chapter, or vice versa; persons who have served on the same committee, taskforce, or council for professional or other organizations; co-organizer of a workshop; member of a former Department of the candidate with whom there were no co-authored projects or committee memberships.

declines or non-answers is discouraged. In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review). A template for the letter log is available on the Faculty Affairs website (copied in the Appendix) providing the appropriate format. Because all APT review committees should have access to the same external letters, late arriving letters should not be included in the dossier, nor be used for evaluative purposes during deliberations. Unsolicited letters are not included in the dossier and should not be relied on for evaluative purposes during deliberations.

The letter log should indicate which evaluators are collaborators with, or mentors of, the candidate. A justification of their inclusion should be provided in the credentials document. Once the list of external evaluators is finalized, their credentials should be summarized with a paragraph for each evaluator. CVs of the evaluators should not be included. It is helpful if the order of the credentials paragraphs mirrors the order of letters in the dossier.

It is important for the Department APT Review Committee to justify the choices of evaluators and to indicate the type and quality of the institution or program with which the evaluator is associated.

An excessive number of letters (e.g., 10 or more) should be avoided. Should an insufficient number of letters be received in a timely fashion, the case may still go forward. However, Units should be aware that the absence of the requisite number of letters weakens the case for the candidate.

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:

- All letters received in response to solicitation must be included in their entirety if the letters arrive in time for consideration by the Department APT Review Committee.
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation.
- The bookmark for each letter should clearly indicate whether the evaluator was nominated by the candidate, or by the committee.

Committees and candidates should take into account the following issues in selecting their evaluators.

- *An evaluator who is the candidate's dissertation advisor, former teacher, co-author, or student should be avoided, unless special circumstances are explained by administrators.*

- *When a candidate is re-reviewed, as in the case of someone coming up for Professor shortly after being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor, new evaluators should be chosen unless there are strong justifications for repeated selection.*
- *The prestige of the evaluators' institutional affiliations and their accomplishments should be taken into account in selecting them. Evaluators should ordinarily hold the rank of Professor or its equivalent at peer institutions. However, evaluations from recognized experts in the field should always be sought, regardless of institutional affiliation. Some examples may include those outside the academy, scholars in emerging fields, or experts who have not yet achieved the rank of Professor. In these cases, the rationale for choosing these evaluators shall be provided by the Unit's APT Review Committee in the external evaluator credentials section of the dossier.*

Candidates should be informed of the University's perspective on appropriate evaluators and the right of the Department to select from the candidate's nominations those that the APT Review Committee deems appropriate. Candidates should also be informed about University rules of confidentiality.

Sample Letter to External Evaluators

The letter used to solicit external evaluations is usually sent by the Chair of the Department APT Review Committee, or from the Chairs of both committees if the candidate has a joint appointment. The letter should be neutral, asking for an honest evaluation rather than for support for the candidate's promotion. It should ask if the reviewer is a co-author or collaborator. The letter should ask the evaluator to comment on:

- *the nature of the evaluator's professional interactions with the candidate;*
- *the candidate's ranking among his or her professional peers (or cohort);*
- *the candidate's qualifications for promotion based on the Unit's promotion criteria, noting expressly that information on this point is an important consideration;*
- *the impact of the candidate's work on the field;*
- *clarification of the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in his/her field;*
- *the quality of the candidate's teaching, if known.*

(Departments 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.)

Departments have the option of sending teaching portfolios including syllabi, examinations and other instructional material to external reviewers for their evaluation. Reviewers may be asked to comment on the scope and currency of the instructional materials and their appropriateness to the discipline and to the level of the course. Attachments to the letter should include the criteria for promotion, any agreement of modified unit criteria for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate's CV and Personal Statement and a list of scholarly and teaching materials being sent, or made available, to the evaluator. The attachments should be listed within the sample letter.

Reputation of Publication Outlets

The Department 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. Indicate whether peer review is required for each publication outlet. Departments should develop a standard, stable, credible method of rating journals and should present these ratings and, when possible, the rate of acceptance to the journal 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

Departments must engage in systematic and periodic peer review of teaching based on classroom visits by tenured faculty colleagues. Beyond this requirement, peer evaluation could also include evaluation of the candidate's mentoring and advising. Documentation of the candidate's teaching record should begin during the first year of the candidate's initial appointment and should include the outcomes of periodic peer evaluations as well as any response from the candidate to those evaluations, which could be included in the candidate's personal statement or teaching portfolio. Peer evaluation should proceed according to a rubric established at the unit level that is common to all candidates for promotion and to all evaluators. The candidate will sign and date the peer evaluations included in the dossier, a single sheet indicating that he or she has reviewed all the peer evaluations included, or initial the applicable box on the signed Candidate Verification Page.

Peer evaluation should include evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, and other instructional material by members of the Department or external evaluators, and discussions of curriculum development, introduction of innovative uses of technology, special contributions to the teaching mission of the Department or to special programs, and teaching awards received by the candidate. Additional information about peer evaluations is available on the Faculty Affairs website. Reports provided only months ahead of the APT review (as opposed to those based on systematic visitation) tend not to be given much credence by higher levels of review.

Departments must require a teaching portfolio from the candidate, as described in the Teaching Portfolio section of Information for the Candidate. This portfolio must be uploaded to the APT website along with other candidate review materials.

Summary Statement of Professional Achievements

This summary report is often written by an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly called Initial Review Committee, or IRC)—whose members should be identified—or its representative. 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 accomplishments in: research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; and service. If a tenure delay has been granted, insert the following language: "Dr. XXX has received an extension of the tenure clock per University of Maryland policy, which states that faculty members shall not be disadvantaged in promotion and tenure proceedings because they have elected to extend the time for

tenure review in accordance with this policy.” The Summary Statement of Professional Achievements is not to be sent to external reviewers. It should place the candidate’s accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the discipline, and the candidate’s professional achievements in service and teaching in the context of the responsibilities of the Department, the College, the University and the community. In addition, citation counts should be included. Entrepreneurial efforts leading to technology transfer and public engagement activities also may be considered in these contexts. 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, Student Evaluations and Peer Reviews of Teaching, the Record of Mentoring/Advising/Research Supervision, the Department’s promotion criteria, any approved agreement of modified unit criteria relevant to the candidate, and the sample letter sent to external evaluators (with any evaluators’ names redacted) at least two weeks before the Department deliberates about the candidate’s case. In some cases, these elements all may be contained in the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements. Candidates must certify in writing that they have seen these document(s) (which may be achieved by signing and dating the individual document(s) or a Candidate Verification Page), and must be allowed to draft a Response if he/she deems it appropriate before the documents are used by the Department APT 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. If there is a Response, the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements must acknowledge the existence of the Response (**APT Policy Section IV.A.6**).

To facilitate production and “certification” of the report, Departments should inform candidates in advance of deadlines for reviewing the Summary Statement, Reputation of Outlets, Student Evaluations and Peer Reviews of Teaching, and the Record of Mentoring, Advising/Research Supervision and for return of the signed document(s) with any Response.

Report of the Department APT Review Committee

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

The first part is the Department APT Review Committee Meeting Report, describing the decision meeting. This report is ordinarily written by the Chair of the APT Review Committee or a designee. The discussions and the exact vote should be presented, as well as any departmental rules about the number of votes required for a positive recommendation. The report should contain the meeting date and be signed by its author.

The second part is the Evaluative Report. The Department may form an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly called Initial Review Committee, or IRC), whose members should be identified, to complete this part of the report (**APT Policy Section IV.A.1**). The Evaluative Report evaluates the candidate's research or creativity, service, mentoring and teaching contributions in light of the departmental standards. Some of the elements of the report will be based on data provided in greater detail in other sections of the dossier. In this instance, bear in mind that the purpose of this report is evaluative, and try to avoid repeating information.

It is helpful to address the following questions when preparing the Evaluative Report:

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

This information is particularly helpful in areas with distinctive expectations for promotion. It is crucial to consider the audience to whom this report will be addressed, which includes faculty and administrators outside the unit.

The following are suggestions for summarizing and evaluating faculty performance:

Research, Scholarly, Creative and/or Professional Activities

An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the work should be provided, including a description of the influence of the work in the field. The bases for the evaluation should be made explicit.

Where the primary activities of the candidate consist of performance or practice, the Department should develop methods and procedures to obtain outside evaluation of the candidate. Submissions of published reviews of books and performances, samples of extension publications, etc., are strongly recommended. For journal publications, where appropriate, the citation rates and other quantitative factors should be included. Similarly, for extension agents whose scholarship is directed toward producers or consumers, a thorough evaluation of the quality, quantity and impact of these publications is essential.

When a candidate works in collaborative teams, ascertaining his or her role in those teams is important.

Teaching, Advising and Mentoring

Dossiers should contain data from the campus-wide standardized course evaluations, normally for the last five years. An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching, advising and mentoring should be provided. Detailed analyses of the data and student comments should be included in the dossier in the Student Evaluation Data section.

If a particular instructor's teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses, or if there was a particularly significant event in a given semester that may have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known.

Evaluations of teaching will take into account the candidate's teaching portfolio. Judgments of teaching could include an assessment of: instructional materials, the rigor and scope of examinations, incorporation of instructional aids, etc. Also to be considered is the development of techniques or modes of instruction and the substantial revision of or development of courses. Feedback of colleagues and students include: 1) surveys of student opinions, 2) awards, 3) peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching, and 4) evidence of effective learning by the candidate's students, such as may be shown by student performance on learning outcome assessments.

Demonstrations of effective mentoring/advising include: 1) number and caliber of students guided in research and their placement in academic positions, postdoctoral labs, graduate programs, etc.; 2) development of or participation in bridge or summer programs; 3) service on awards and mentoring committees, or as an advisor for student groups or clubs, or as a mentor for other faculty; 4) organization of professional seminars for students on article or grant submission, etc.; 5) job placement in notable academic positions or professional practice.

Service

Service contributions should be evaluated, particularly in those areas where service is a major component of a candidate's activities, such as extension appointments. The report should do more than list committees or activities; it should, to the extent possible, evaluate the performance of these activities. Evaluation may be sought from supervisors or clients in organizations for which the candidate has rendered service. Service awards help to document and evaluate service activities. Disciplinary service to editorial boards, national and international organizations, etc., is evidence of good citizenship and stature in the profession.

The Report of the Department APT Review Committee may also include a minority report. Members of the Department APT Review Committee who do not think that the APT Review Committee Report adequately represents their views may write a signed minority APT report that will become part of the dossier (**APT Policy Section IV.A.7**). A minority APT report is intended to be employed for major disagreements, not for presenting minor variations in wording.

Voting at the Department Level

Mandatory abstentions often arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice, e.g., at the College and Department levels. In these cases, the faculty member is permitted to vote only at the lower level. If a faculty member is eligible to vote within two Departments (because both the candidate and the voter have similar joint appointments), the voting faculty member may only vote in his or her tenure home and

must abstain from voting in the second unit (**APT Policy Section III.D.4; Section IV.B.1; Section IV.C.1**). A mandatory abstention may arise for other reasons, such as when a faculty member is the candidate's partner.

As a general matter, voluntary abstentions are to be discouraged. Higher-level APT review committees depend on the reasoning and expertise of the lower level committees; voluntary abstentions result in an absence of crucial input on a candidate's dossier. Abstentions of 50% or more of the relevant faculty mean that the decision (negative or positive) does not represent a majority opinion, and could give rise to grounds for an appeal.

Only tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is to be promoted or appointed may vote on that candidate's case (**APT Policy Section IV.A.1**).

Secondary Unit: If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in a secondary unit, the Chair or Director of the secondary unit provides a written recommendation to the Chair of the primary unit. If a candidate has a permanent joint appointment in a secondary unit with eligible voters, the secondary unit records the votes of the secondary unit (if this is required by the secondary unit's plan of organization) and provides a written recommendation to the Chair of the primary unit.

The Department APT Review Committee's Responsibilities:

- Gathering information and documents from the candidate.
- Drafting the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and presenting it to the candidate for approval two weeks prior to the time it will be distributed to the faculty and ensuring its prompt return. (**APT Policy Section IV.A.6**)
- Requesting at least six external evaluations (with at least three names selected from the candidate's list), using the candidate's input to gather the sample of material for evaluators to evaluate, and providing a brief summary of the qualifications of the evaluators. (**APT Policy Section IV.A.2**)
- Obtaining documentation on teaching, including peer reviews, student evaluations, and information on the candidate's mentorship record.
- Obtaining available information on the candidate's service record.
- Evaluating journals and other outlets in which candidate's scholarship is disseminated.
- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service (**APT Policy Section IV**), based on the candidate's CV, personal statements, external letters, scholarly and teaching materials and internal reports.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion (**APT Policy IV.A.1**).
- The APT Review Committee Chair has the responsibility of ensuring that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Writing reports on: (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and its justification, and the date of the meeting; and (b) a separate evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions (**APT Policy Section**

IV.A.7). This latter report is often prepared by an advisory committee and is available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.

- Reviewing the Chair's summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy (**APT Policy Section IV.D**). *(Usually done by APT Review Committee Chair)*
- Representing the Department APT Review Committee's perspective to higher levels of review, if the need emerges (**APT Policy Section IV.B.4**).

Department Chair

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. The APT Policy calls for the administrator of the academic unit that will become the candidate's tenure home to (a) meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the current APT Manual and promotion criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated (**APT Policy Section II; Section IV**) and (b) appoint one or more senior faculty mentors. (**APT Policy Section IV.A.3**) The Chair should give a copy of the Guide for Mentors and Mentees (available at http://www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/mnt_ndx.html) to each mentor and mentee, which outlines expectations for each party. It is suggested that the mentors be mutually agreed upon between the Chair and the candidate. A list of new tenure-track faculty and their mentors is due in the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs by March 1.

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

The review for tenure and promotion is the University's primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university. Candidates are expected to demonstrate accomplishment in three areas: (1) research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service (**APT Policy Section II; Section IV**). Colleges and Departments must have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these areas. These criteria must be included in requests for external evaluations and in the dossier after the letter written by the Department Chair. Upper-level APT review committees and administrators rely on the criteria to assess fitness for appointment or promotion equitably. Reviewers at all levels must keep these criteria in mind as they review individual cases.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure implementation of the unit's plan for peer evaluation of teaching for every candidate. It is recommended that peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching be conducted periodically by tenured faculty members (it is advisable to conduct these reviews annually). Peer evaluation should proceed according to a rubric established at the unit level that is common to all candidates for promotion and to all evaluators. These periodic reports should be made available to the candidate, and any response by candidates should be filed in the Chair's office for inclusion in the APT dossier. Evaluations done only in the months preceding review tend not to be given much credence by higher levels in the review process.

Chair's Letter

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

An explanation should be provided for negative votes and voluntary abstentions. For joint appointments, the head of the secondary unit should also provide a letter that is inserted immediately following the Department Chair's letter.

The Chair's letter is most useful when it places the performance of the candidate in the context of the Department or discipline, and it comments on the APT Review Committee's report. It is particularly useful for informing the Committee about the criteria used to evaluate the candidate and the Chair's assessment of the candidate with respect to those criteria. These criteria, and any approved agreement of modified unit criteria relevant to the candidate, should be appended to the Chair's letter. While the letter may summarize the basic information about the case, APT Review Committees expect the Chair's interpretation of the information about the candidate: an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of a Department APT Review Committee, it is crucial to provide reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative faculty votes and abstentions when they are known. If the candidate filed an objection to an external evaluator who was subsequently chosen by the unit, the Chair's Letter should note this objection.

Denial at the Department Review

If both the Department APT Review Committee's and the Chair's recommendation are negative, the Chair must inform the candidate by letter sent by certified mail within two weeks of the date of the decision by the Chair. The letter should state the faculty decision and the administrator's decision and summarize briefly in general terms the reason for the denial. This letter should include the APT vote (APT Policy IV.D; see Appendix for examples).

The Department forwards the case only to the Dean. The Dean will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If not, the Dean will remand the case

to the Department to reconsider. If no error has occurred, the Dean must write a letter to the candidate, copying the unit head, (a) stating that the case has been reviewed to ascertain that there was no violation of substantive or procedural due process, and (b) where appropriate, specifying the date of termination of employment (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**). The letter must be sent by certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. The Office of Faculty Affairs is available for consultation or advice in matters pertaining to this process. For examples of possible wording for notification letters, see 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 Chair's Responsibilities

- Ensuring that the APT 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.
- Writing a letter to the administrator at the next higher level making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case, and including the Department's promotion criteria (**APT Policy Section IV.A.8**).
- Notifying candidates in writing, summarizing the Chair's and Department APT Review Committee's decisions and reasoning, and the numeric vote within two weeks of the Chair's decision (**APT Policy Section IV.D**; See example in Appendix). In cases of new appointments, inclusion of the vote count is not required. A copy of this summary letter should be available for faculty who participated in the deliberations who wish to see it, and it should be included in the dossier. The Chair of the Department APT Review Committee may review and, if necessary, correct the information in the summary letter. In the event that the Chair of the Department APT Review Committee and the Chair are unable to agree on the appropriate language and contents of the summary letter, each shall write a summary letter to the candidate. A copy of all materials provided to the candidate shall be added to the tenure or promotion file as the case proceeds through higher levels of review. If both the Department APT Review Committee and Chair vote to deny tenure and/or promotion, the letter must be sent by certified mail (**APT Policy Section IV.F.6**).
- Inspecting dossiers for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- For new appointments, including the length of appointment year, start date, and projected salary in a separate memo (see Appendix) accompanying the appointment request. If the appointment is accepted, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- Sending the dossier to the next level of review, and if the candidate does not pass the initial review, providing sufficient information for the administrator at that level (Dean or Provost) to determine that the review was conducted appropriately (**APT Policy IV.A.5**).
- Answering questions putatively posed by upper-level review committees (**APT Policy Section IV.B.4**; **Section IV.C.2**).
- If candidates withdraw from the process, forwarding a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**).

- Reviewing the Department's Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the conduct of reviews, and that the review conforms to the guidelines.
- Being aware of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and disseminating these changes to the faculty. The Office of Faculty Affairs web page should be consulted for updates: www.faculty.umd.edu/policies.
- The Chair should give a copy of the Guide for Mentors and Mentees (available at <http://www.faculty.umd.edu/faculty/mentoring.html>) to each mentor and mentee, which outlines expectations for each party.
- Meeting with new tenured and tenure-track faculty to provide APT information, such as Department and University policies, this Manual, and Department promotion criteria. Subsequently, administrators should notify faculty in writing of changes to the criteria (**APT Policy Section II; Section IV**).

College APT Review Committee Members

The College APT Review Committee report must include the date of the meeting and the names of Committee members. The report should include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation (**APT Policy Section IV.B.5**). It should address the same areas as the Department APT report described above.

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

The College APT Review Committee's Responsibilities

- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.
- The College APT Review Committee Chair has the responsibility of ensuring that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Meeting with lower level APT representatives when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing shall be provided in advance (**APT Policy Section IV.B.4; Section IV.C.2**).
- Writing a report with an evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee's recommendation and its justification, the membership of the Committee, and the date of the decision meeting (**APT Policy Section IV.B.5; Section IV.C.3**).
- For the College Review Committee, when either the Dean or the Committee makes a negative recommendation, ensuring that the Dean's summary letter notifying the candidate of the negative recommendation accurately reflects Committee deliberations.

Dean

Dean's Letter

This letter should state the Dean's personal assessment of the reasons the candidate merits or does not merit promotion (**APT Policy Section IV.B.5**).

The letter should start with a specific description of the candidate's area of expertise. It should contain an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of the Department APT Review Committee, College APT Review Committee, or the Department Chair, the reasons underlying the dissent must be explained. Negative votes or abstentions at the College level must be explained. The Dean can provide a context for evaluating the candidate through characterizing the strengths of the Department, its role in the College and the role of the candidate in enhancing the excellence of the Department. The letter should also discuss the expectations of the College and Department for promotion.

Dean's Notification to Candidate

When either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean make a negative recommendation, the Dean must: (1) write a brief letter to the candidate summarizing the nature of the considerations on which the negative decision was based, (2) allow the Chair of the College APT Review Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information in the summary letter, and (3) include this letter in the dossier directly following the Dean's letter (**APT Policy Section IV.D, page 71**). Members of the College APT Review Committee may see the Dean's letter. A summary is not necessary if both College-level recommendations are positive.

The Dean's Responsibilities

- Reviewing the College's Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the appointment of a College Review Committee and the role of the Dean with respect to the Committee.
- Ensuring that the review conforms to those guidelines.
- Reviewing and approving College and Department promotion criteria.
- Recommending appointees to the Campus APT and Campus Appeals Committee (**APT Policy Section IV.C.1; Section V.A.1**).
- Informing Chairs of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and discussing with Chairs their evaluation of the preceding year's APT process and outcomes.
- Preparing a schedule for submission of dossiers to the Departments in the College, and informing them of that schedule in a timely manner.
- When candidates are denied tenure and/or promotion at a lower level of review, certifying the procedural and substantive appropriateness of the review, and writing a letter sent by certified mail to the candidate within two weeks of the decision that informs the candidate of the outcome, appropriateness of the review, and the consequences of this denial (**APT Policy Section**

IV.A.5). Copies should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained.

- Appointing members of the College APT Review Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization (**APT Policy Section IV.B.1**).
- Providing staffing for the College APT Review Committee and ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted, and that discussion and evaluation of the candidate is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Reviewing recommendations of the prior level of review and the College APT Review Committee, and writing a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case (**APT Policy Section IV.B.3; Section IV.B.5**).
- If either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean makes a negative recommendation about the candidate's case, writing a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Review Committee summarizing the outcome of the College APT Review Committee's and Dean's deliberations, and the rationale behind it. This summary letter should be available to members of the College APT Review Committee who can decide to amend it, and the letter should be included in the dossier (**APT Policy Section IV.D**; also see Table on Candidate Notification in Appendix).
- Inspecting the dossier for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Forwarding an electronic file to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- Meeting with the University APT Review Committee to address questions they may raise (**APT Policy Section IV.C.2**).
- For new appointments, including in a separate memo accompanying the dossiers, the terms of appointment, start date and projected salary in appointment requests (See Appendix). If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.

OTHER TYPES OF CASES

New Appointments of Professors of the Practice, Emeriti Faculty, College Park Professors, and University of Maryland Professors

Professor of the Practice

(SEE APT POLICY SECTION I.F.14) APPOINTMENT: The material needed for Professor of the Practice is the same as for any new appointment, except that teaching evaluations may not be available. Letters from the Chair and Dean must address the professional credentials of the candidate and the candidate's role in fulfilling the mission of the Department. Appointments may be for as long as 5 years and contracts are renewable (see below).

The approval route starts with review by the Department APT Review Committee including input from the Chair, and then requires evaluations by the Dean (but not the College APT Review Committee), a committee composed of five Associate Provosts representing the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, Academic Planning and Programs, Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs, and then the Provost and the President.

REAPPOINTMENT: Requires presidential approval based on letters of endorsement from the Chair, Dean and committee of the five Associate Provosts in the preceding paragraph. No Department vote or solicitation of outside letters is required. These recommendations and supporting material, such as CV and teaching evaluations, should be forwarded (in abbreviated dossier format with material assembled in the order listed in the table in the Appendix) through the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for approval by the Provost and President. As with other contracts, the renewal review should be conducted in the year before the year the contract expires.

Emerita/Emeritus Status

(SEE APT POLICY SECTION I.F.7) Associate/Full Professors and Principal/Senior Agents who have been faculty members for ten years are eligible for nomination to Emerita/Emeritus status.

Recommendations for Emerita/Emeritus status will only be considered after the faculty member has submitted a letter of resignation and retirement or an approved retirement agreement, plus a memo from the Benefits Office confirming that the faculty member has met with them. (Refer to <http://www.faculty.umd.edu/emeraliti/retire.html> for more information.) The review is ordinarily conducted during the candidate's last semester of employment (**APT Policy Section IV.G.3**). Faculty at or above the candidate's pre-retirement rank are entitled to vote on Emerita/ Emeritus status (**APT Policy Section IV.G.4**). Candidates for Emerita/Emeritus status are not reviewed by faculty committees beyond the Department APT Review Committee. Reviews beyond the Department are conducted by the Dean, Provost, and President (**APT Policy Section IV.G.8**). Materials submitted for emeriti appointments should include a copy of the documentation of retirement and other materials mentioned in table in the Appendix.

Dossiers for Emerita/Emeritus candidates may be submitted at any time, and the date on which Emerita/Emeritus status is to become effective must be specified.

College Park Professor

(SEE APT POLICY, SECTION I.F.10) This title is conferred on nationally distinguished scholars, creative or performing artists or researchers who would normally qualify for appointment as a Professor within the University, but who typically hold full time positions elsewhere. Initial appointment (for a period of three years) must follow the procedures for any appointment for new tenured professor (see above). Renewal of an appointment for an additional three (3) years is based on recommendations by the Chair and Dean to the Provost in the form of brief evaluative communications, forwarded through the Office of Faculty Affairs.

University of Maryland Professor

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

Appointing University of Maryland Baltimore Faculty as University of Maryland Professors

The following guidelines represent a modified University of Maryland Professor appointment process for University of Maryland Baltimore faculty moving forward, summarized in Table 1. Approved by the Provost and President, this modification applies only to University of Maryland Baltimore University of Maryland Professor appointments.

Departmentalized Colleges (New Appointments)

The dossier must include:

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

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

Non-Departmentalized Colleges (New Appointments)

The dossier must include:

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

The dossier is reviewed by the Associate Provosts (representing the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, Academic Planning and Programs, Academic Affairs, and Faculty Affairs), who make a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost then provides a recommendation to the President, who makes the final decision.

Reappointments

For reappointment, the dossier includes:

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

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

Steps in Review Process

		New UMD Professor Appointment (<i>Departmentalized College</i>)	New UMD Professor Appointment (<i>Non- Departmentalized College</i>)	Reappointment of UMD Professor
Nomination by		Department Chair	Associate Dean	Department Chair or Associate Dean
Reviewed by	Dept. APT Committee	✓		
	College APT Committee	✓	✓	
	Dean	✓	✓	✓
	Campus Level		Associate Provosts	Associate Provosts
	Provost	✓	✓	✓
	President	✓	✓	✓

FINAL DECISIONS, CONCERNS THAT ARISE AND APPEALS

Denial at the Department Review

If both the Department APT Review Committee's and the Chair's recommendation are negative, the Chair must inform the candidate by certified mail within two weeks of the date of the decision. The letter should state the faculty decision and the administrator's decision and summarize briefly in general terms the reason for the denial. This letter should include the APT vote (**APT Policy IV.D**; see Appendix for examples).

The Department forwards the case only to the Dean. The Dean will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If not, the Dean will remand the case to the Department to reconsider. If no error has occurred, the Dean must write a letter (a) stating that the case has been reviewed to ascertain that there was no violation of substantive or procedural due process, and (b) where appropriate, specifying the date of termination of employment (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**). The letter should be sent by certified mail. This concludes the review process of the case. The Office of Faculty Affairs is available for consultation or advice in matters pertaining to this process. For examples of possible wording for notification letters, see Appendix.

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.

Moving Through Higher Levels of Review

As long as there is one positive recommendation at the Department level (from either the APT Review Committee or the Chair) the case will proceed to all subsequent levels for review (**APT Policy Section IV.A.5**). That is, the case will proceed through the College and University faculty committees and administrator reviews.

During higher levels of review, questions may arise regarding a recommendation from a lower level of review. In such cases, the College or University APT Review Committee shall meet with the APT Review Committee Chair(s) and Administrator(s) from the lower levels. A written list of questions will be provided to the lower level representatives in advance to serve as a basis for discussion (**APT Policy Section IV.B.4**; **Section IV.C.2**).

Whenever either or both faculty and administrator recommendations are negative at higher levels of review, a letter must be sent to the candidate summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which those decisions were based (**APT Policy Section IV.D**). The College-level notification letter should be included in the dossier file appended to the Dean's letter and should be sent by certified mail.

Awarding or Denial of Tenure and/or Promotion

Final authority for any appointment that confers tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Agent, or Principal Agent resides solely with the President (**APT Policy Section IV.E**). The President

will inform the candidate of the final disposition of the case in writing. If the decision is negative, the President will inform the candidate by certified mail. Determination of the time limits for filing an appeal is based on the date of the candidate's receipt of the President's letter. **(APT Policy Section IV.F.6)**

When Issues Arise During the Review Process

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

The faculty member who believes that a violation has occurred during the review process is responsible for objecting at that time and asking for a resolution of the problem. Individuals in that position must inform the Department Chair, the Dean, or the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs of the perceived difficulty (University Senate Review of Appeals No. 99-00-13).

Appeals Process for Denial of Promotion

Grounds for Appeals

The two bases for appeal are: violation of substantive due process or violation of procedural due process. Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g., upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected First Amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was 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 APT review: (1) to take a procedural step or (2) to fulfill a procedural requirement established in APT Policy or review procedures of a Department or College. Violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.b)**.

The Appeals Process

A request for an appeal must be made in writing to the President within 60 calendar days of notification of the decision not to grant tenure, promotion, reappointment, or emeriti status **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.a)**. The request must detail the basis for the appeal and evidence to support the claims. The grounds for the appeal must be within the purview of those identified in the University APT Policy **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.b)**. Faculty members with questions regarding this process should contact the Office of Faculty Affairs. The President will determine whether to grant the request for an appeal based on the criteria stated above.

If an appeal request is granted, an Appeals Committee is formed **(APT Policy Section V.A)**. The appellant has an additional 60 days in which to submit materials related to the case to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

The appellant should be aware that these materials will be shared with the Appeals Committee, and with parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.a)**.

The Committee will meet with the Appellant, and other parties, and investigate the case, as it deems appropriate **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.d.3)**. If there were any objections to evaluators submitted by the appellant during the process of selection of external reviewers, this information may be requested. The Committee may not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review.

The Committee makes a recommendation to the President who makes the final decision **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.d.4)**. When the President supports the findings of the APT Appeals Committee, and authorizes corrective action to be taken, the Provost has the responsibility for oversight and implementation of any such corrective action. **(APT Policy Section V.B.1.e.1)**

INFORMATION FOR STAFF

Overview

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

Inclusion of a teaching portfolio is required, and it must be submitted as a separate document from the main dossier. Representative pieces of scholarship may be submitted in addition to the dossier and teaching portfolio. These additions may be specified in the form of a URL (preferred for large documents) or they may be uploaded to the area on the APT website for supplemental materials. In unusual cases (e.g., for large, non-electronic pieces of scholarship) a hard copy may be forwarded as a supplement under separate cover. Colleges are responsible for returning all supplemental materials to candidates after the Campus APT Review Committee has finished its deliberations. Dossiers failing to conform to these guidelines will be returned to the College for corrective action before they are submitted for evaluation to the Campus APT Review Committee.

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

Gathering Materials for the Dossier

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


1. Transmittal Form. The transmittal form, besides providing the information used to record the candidate's new or changed appointment, serves as a summary of the first and second level meeting dates and votes, along with the evaluations of the Dean and Department Chair. The transmittal form is a PDF form, so you can open it from the Faculty Affairs website, enter the appropriate information, and then save it to your own computer for when you come back to add information to it. More information about completing the transmittal form is available in the Elements of the Dossier section below.
2. Promotion Criteria. The promotion criteria included must be current. Additionally, if the candidate has modified criteria for tenure or promotion, these must be included in the dossier.
3. Letter Log. The letter log constitutes a summary of the requests for external evaluation. Letters from external evaluators make up an important part of the dossier, so the log must show clearly who has been contacted, when, and what their response was.
4. Reputation of Publication Outlets. Though this information is likely to be prepared by members of the Advisory Subcommittee, it should be presented in a clear and consistent fashion, which may well mean it becomes the responsibility of a staff member.
5. Citation counts or similar such metrics.

Creating the Dossier

The electronic dossier must meet three essential criteria:


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

Bookmarks



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

To create a bookmark: navigate to the page you wish to bookmark. If the bookmarks pane is open, click the new bookmark button and enter the appropriate label. Labels need not match what's at the bottom of the transmittal form, though it is convenient if they do.



You can alter the text of the bookmark by right clicking the bookmark and choosing Rename from the menu. Another bookmark problem is that they sometimes go awry when pages are added or deleted. To edit the page a bookmark links to: right click the bookmark and then choose Properties. From the window that appears, choose the Actions tab, and then click in the Actions window to highlight "Go to a page in this document." Click the Edit button, and change the page number to whatever it should be.

Password Protection

The dossier must be password-protected to ensure the confidentiality of the materials within. The Faculty Affairs Office will let you know what the password should be at the beginning of each APT cycle. To add a password to the dossier, choose Properties from the File menu. Click on the Security tab, and choose "Password Security" from the dropdown Security Method list. You will then see the Password Security – Settings window. Check the box labeled "Require a password to open the document" and type the appropriate password in the "Document Open Password" field. Click OK, and then retype the password in the confirmation dialogue box that appears. Click OK to return to the Document Properties window.

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

Searchable Text

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

Candidate Verification Page

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

Elements of the Dossier

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

1. Transmittal Form (followed by Candidate Verification Page, if applicable)
2. Curriculum Vitae (signed & dated by candidate)
3. Reputation of Publication Outlets (signed & dated by candidate)
4. Personal Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
5. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (prepared by committee, signed & dated by candidate)
6. Optional Rejoinder from Candidate (signed & dated by candidate)
7. Promotion Criteria*
8. Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria (if applicable)*
9. Department APT Report (Vote & Evaluative Summary)
10. Optional Minority Report
11. Department Chair’s Letter
12. College APT Report
13. Dean’s Letter

14. Optional Teaching Statement (signed & dated by candidate)
15. Student Evaluation of Teaching Summaries (signed & dated by candidate)
16. Peer Evaluation Data (signed & dated by candidate)
17. Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision (signed & dated by candidate)
18. Credentials of External Evaluators
19. Responses of External Evaluators
20. Candidate Notification from Chair
21. Candidate Notification From Dean
22. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests
23. Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation* & Message Requesting Availability
24. Declines from Evaluators

* Must be made available to the candidate.

1. 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 Faculty Affairs Office when the dossier is uploaded to the APT website (See New Faculty Appointment Form).

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

UID No: Avoid disclosing Social Security Numbers by listing University ID number.

Citizenship: Tenure is granted to non-U.S. citizen candidates contingent on their possession of a visa status that permits continued employment by the University.

Summary of Votes: Record the number of: (1) positive votes, (2) negative votes, (3) mandatory abstentions, (4) voluntary abstentions, and (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc. The sum of the numbers in categories 1- 5, which will be automatically calculated on the transmittal form, should equal the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body. Numbers recorded on the transmittal form must match numbers reported in APT Review Committee Reports. When filling out contact information, be sure to include the Department for the College APT spokesperson.

2. Curriculum Vitae

The candidate's CV should be in the format required by the University. A template is available in the appendix. 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. The entire CV, including addenda, must be searchable.

3. Reputation of Publication Outlets

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%

4. Personal Statement

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.

5. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements

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 full Department APT meeting; the candidate must sign and date the report to indicate that he or she agrees with the contents.

6. Optional Rejoinder from Candidate

The candidate may wish to draft a rejoinder to the report, which would also be signed and dated, and would be included directly after the Summary Statement in the dossier.

7. Promotion Criteria

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

8. Agreement of Modified Unit Criteria (if applicable)

9. Department APT Report

The department APT report must include the date of the meeting and the exact vote. This report provides the evaluative summary of the candidate's record by the Department APT Review Committee. Make sure the report matches what is on the transmittal form. The text of the report must be searchable.

10. Optional Minority APT Report

If such a report is included, it must be signed by its authors.

11. Department Chair's Letter

The Chair should perform an independent assessment of the candidate, separate from that of the Department APT Review Committee. The inclusion of quotations from external evaluators' letters and the Department APT Review Committee report should be avoided. Make sure the date on the letter matches the date on the transmittal form. Remember that the text of the letter must be searchable.

12. College APT Report

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

13. Dean's Letter

The Dean should perform an independent assessment of the candidate, separate from that of the College APT Review Committee. The inclusion of quotations from external evaluators' letters and the College APT Review Committee report should be avoided. Make sure the date on the Dean's letter agrees with the date on the transmittal form. Also, remember that the text of the Dean's letter must be searchable.

14. Optional Teaching Statement

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

15. Student Evaluation of Teaching Data

These evaluation scores are an important indicator of teaching ability. They must be clearly presented so that they can be easily evaluated at all levels of review. The document must be shared with the candidate and indicated by signature and date. An Excel spreadsheet template is available from the Faculty Affairs website, or you may wish to create your own. However, there are some elements that are essential:

- a) Course numbers and terms when the course was taught must be clearly marked.
- b) Include the number of students completing the evaluation.
- c) Include the college mean for courses at the same level as the course being summarized.
- d) Include a calculation of the average for the candidate and for the College, for each course, and for each semester the course was taught. The spreadsheet template will calculate these averages automatically.

Please do not include the raw output from the Course Evaluation website in this dossier. If the candidate wishes to include it, it may be added to the teaching portfolio. If your College does not use the university standard course evaluation system, there should also be an explanation of the rating system that is used, as well as a sample questionnaire.

16. Peer Evaluations of Teaching

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.

17. Mentoring, Advising & Research Supervision

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

18. Credentials of External Evaluators

Credentials of the external evaluators should be briefly summarized in a single document under this bookmark. Each evaluator's credentials should be provided in a paragraph. Remember that this document must be searchable.

19. Responses of External Evaluators

Organize the external evaluator responses according to the requestor. So, the letters from evaluators requested by the unit would come first, and those suggested by the candidate would come second. Give each letter a separate bookmark that includes a C for candidate or a U for unit (e.g., C – Smith; U – Jones). It is also helpful if the letters are included in alphabetical order by last name within each of these subcategories.

20. Candidate Notification from Chair

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

21. Candidate Notification from Dean

If either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean makes a negative recommendation about the candidate's case, the Dean must inform the candidate of the second-level APT Review Committee's decision and the Dean's decision within two weeks of the date of the decision by the Dean. This letter is included in the dossier.

22. Letter Log of Evaluation Requests

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. Some evaluators are suggested by the candidate and others are identified by the Department APT Review Committee, and this must be indicated on the letter log. In addition, the letter log should indicate the dates of requests for availability and formal evaluation, an evaluator's availability, if an evaluator declined to write a letter after initially expressing availability, or did not respond to the request. There is a letter log template available on the Faculty Affairs website, or you can create your own, as long as all the requisite information is included.

23. Sample Requests for Availability and Evaluation with Supporting Materials

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.

24. Declines from Evaluators

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 now a required part of the candidate's dossier. It is a separate PDF that must be searchable, be bookmarked, and be 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.

There are no specifically required elements in the teaching portfolio, but there are several recommended elements:

1. Personal Teaching Statement. If the candidate prepares a teaching statement, it should be signed and dated. You should also include a copy of the candidate's teaching statement in the candidate review materials.
2. Course-related Materials. This includes syllabi, innovative assignments, etc.
3. Assessments. Includes information observations of teaching (not the peer evaluations that are included in the candidate review materials), self-evaluation of courses, student comments or letters, etc.
4. Awards and Invitations.
5. Training Taken (i.e., professional development) and Given
6. Instructional Advancements and Innovation.

We suggest the broad categories listed above be used as the major bookmarks of the teaching portfolio, while the individual items in a given category are sub-bookmarks. More information about the teaching portfolio is included in the Appendix. A mockup of a portfolio that shows how the bookmarks might be arranged is available here: <http://faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/mockup.pdf>.

Uploading the Dossier and Teaching Portfolio

To upload a dossier and teaching portfolio to the Faculty Affairs website, go to <http://faculty.umd.edu/apa> and login with your university login. You will see a list of the candidates from

your College; choose upload dossier and upload teaching portfolio for the appropriate candidate and follow the on-screen instructions. There is no need to notify the Faculty Affairs office when you upload a dossier or a teaching portfolio; we receive an automatic notification.

Creating the Supplemental Dossier

The supplemental dossier might include additional pieces of scholarship and other materials submitted by the candidate. The contents of the supplemental dossier should be bookmarked to show what they are. The supplemental dossier must also have a password, and be set to open with the bookmarks panel visible and the page zoomed to the full width of the screen.

APPENDIX

CV Template

For more information about details to include on the CV, check with your department and download the CV Template from the Faculty Affairs website. To aid review committees, the CV should include the following information, in the order shown:

Personal Information

List name, Department (joint appointments indicating percentage of each), current rank, year of University appointment to current rank, educational background (including institutions, dates and degrees), and employment background (in chronological order or its inverse).

Research, Scholarly, Creative and / or Professional Activities

1. Books.
2. Chapters in books.
3. Articles in Refereed Journals. Full citation, inclusive of all authors in the order of publication and page numbers. Review articles and invited articles should be so identified.
4. Published Conference Proceedings.
5. Conferences, Workshops, and Talks.
6. Professional and Extension Publications.
7. Book Reviews, Notes and Other Contributions.
8. Completed Creative Works.
9. Significant Works in Public Media.
10. Sponsored Research and Programs (*Administered by Office of Research Administration*).
11. Gifts and Funded Research (*Not Administered by ORA*)
12. Centers for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
13. Patents
14. Entrepreneurial, Technology Transfer, and Public Engagement Activities.
15. Other Research / Scholarship / Creative Activities.
16. Research Fellowships, Prizes and Awards.

Teaching, Mentoring and Advising

1. Courses taught in the last five years. Indicate enrollments and unusual formats.
2. Teaching Innovations.
3. Advising: Research or Clinical.
4. Mentorship.
5. Advising (other than directed research).
6. Professional and Extension Education.
7. Contribution to learning outcomes assessment.
8. Other Teaching Activities.
9. Teaching Awards.

Service and Outreach

1. Editorships, Editorial Boards, and Reviewing Activities.
2. Committees, Professional & Campus Service.
3. External Service and Consulting.
4. Non-Research Presentations.
5. Media Contributions.
6. Community & Other Service.
7. Service Awards and Honors.

Other Information

Letter Log

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

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

New Faculty Appointment Information

Provide the following information for the Candidate:			
Candidate's Name			
Mailing Address			
Type of Appointment	9 month <input type="checkbox"/>	12 month <input type="checkbox"/>	
Unless otherwise indicated, the following start dates should be inserted: <i>For 9-month appointments, August 23</i> <i>For 12-month appointments, July 1</i>			
Expected Start Date			
Salary	\$	(State Supported)	
	\$	(External Funding)	
If joint appointment, provide a breakdown of salary (by percentage or dollar amount):			
Primary Department			
Secondary Department			

Candidate Notification of APT Decision

Department Level:

Type of Case	Letters From	Contents of Letters	Placement in Dossier	Deadline / Delivery Method	Who May Review the Letter
Both Chair & Committee vote negatively	Dept. Chair & Dean	Dept. Chair: Votes, decision, rationale of Committee & Chair	Front of Dossier. Send entire dossier to Faculty Affairs	Chair's: Required within 2 weeks of Chair's decision, certified mail	Chair's: <i>Required: Comm. Chair</i> <i>Optional: Comm. Members</i>
		Dean: Confirm review was conducted appropriately; promotion denied		Dean's: Suggested within 1 month, certified mail	Dean's: No one
Either / both vote(s) positively	Dept. Chair	Dept. Chair: Votes, decision, rationale of Committee & Chair	In Dossier	Required within 2 weeks of Chair's decision	N/A

College Level:

Type of Case	Letter From	Contents of Letter	Placement in Dossier	Deadline / Delivery Method	Who May Review the Letter
Either / both vote(s) negatively	Dean	Decision & rationale of Committee & Dean	In Dossier	within 2 weeks of Dean's decision	<i>Required: Comm. Chair</i> <i>Optional: Comm. Members</i>
Both are positive	Dean (Optional)	Votes, decision, rationale of Committee & Dean	In Dossier	within 2 weeks of Dean's decision	N/A

Campus Level:

Type of Case	Letter From	Contents of Letter	Placement in Dossier	Deadline / Delivery Method	Who May Review the Letter
All Cases	Associate Provost	Decision	Before President's Letter	Following decision of the President	N/A

President:

Type of Case	Letter From	Contents of Letter	Placement in Dossier	Deadline / Delivery Method	Who May Review the Letter
Decision is negative	President	Decision (if mandatory case, termination date)	Front of dossier [Dossier placed in candidate's personnel file]	Suggested within 2 weeks of President's decision, certified mail	N/A
Decision is positive		Decision and effective date of promotion		Suggested within 2 weeks of President's decision	



TRANSMITTAL FORM

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Candidate's Name		UID No.	
Primary Unit		Secondary Unit	
College		Date to Present Rank	
Present Rank		Proposed Rank	
Mandatory Review	Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/>	Citizenship	
New Hire	Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/>	Type of Appt:	9-month

Primary Unit

		Vote Summary		Abstentions			
Tenure Home	Meeting Date	Yes	No	Vol.	Man.	Absent	Sum
Dept. APT Committee							0
Department Chair							0
College APT Committee							0
Dean							0

Secondary Unit

		Vote Summary		Abstentions			
Joint Appointment	Meeting Date	Yes	No	Vol.	Man.	Absent	Sum
Dept. APT Committee							0
Department Chair							0
College APT Committee							0
Dean							0

Contact Information

	Name	Phone	Email	Address
Dean				
College APT Spokesperson				
Dept. Chair				
Dept. APT Spokesperson				

Items to be Included in the Dossier

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

†Signed and dated by candidate |
|--|---|--|

(UPDATED JUN-16)

CANDIDATE VERIFICATION

Name:

Dept:

I have seen the following components of my dossier:

	Initials	Date
Summary Statement of Professional Achievements		
Reputation of Outlets of Publication		
Student Evaluation Scores		
Peer Review(s) of Teaching		
Record of Mentoring / Advising / Research Supervision		
Department Promotion Criteria		
Agreement of Modified Criteria (if applicable)		
Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation		

Signature

Date

*Please note that the CV and personal statement must be signed **on those documents**
Signing this page **does not** replace those two signatures.*

What's in the Dossier for Different Cases?

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

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

*Not needed for renewal.

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

† Recommendation letters, as for a job application.

Sample Letter to External Evaluator

Dear Dr. XXXXXX:

Dr. XXXX XXX is due to be reviewed for Associate Professor with tenure in academic year YYYY-YYYY. I am writing to request your confidential evaluation of the qualifications of Dr. XXX for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of XXXX with tenure.

If a tenure delay has been granted, insert the following language:

Dr. XXX has received an extension of time for review for tenure and/or promotion in accordance with University of Maryland policy. University policy expressly provides that faculty shall not be disadvantaged upon review as a result of such an extension. Please evaluate Dr. XXX's dossier as if it were completed in the ordinary period for review, which is in the xxth year of appointment.

In accordance with Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy and Guidelines adopted by the University of Maryland, College of XXXX and Department of XXXX at College Park, I am required to indicate the criteria for promotion and request your evaluation of the following:

- The quality and impact of the candidate's research and creative activity, including the quality of the candidate's publications, exhibitions, or performances; the quality of the journals, presses, or outlets in which the candidate has published, exhibited, or performed; and the candidate's potential for future contributions;
- The candidate's teaching and mentoring (to the extent you are able to do so);
- The candidate's service to the profession; and
- How the candidate compares to others in the field at a comparable stage in their careers.

Please evaluate the candidate's qualifications for promotion based on the criteria and materials provided. Based on your evaluation, please indicate whether you would or would not recommend this candidate for promotion at the University of Maryland. If applicable, please comment on the nature of your professional interaction with the candidate and also on the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in his/her field.

To assist in your evaluation, I am enclosing the following information: Dr. XXX's latest curriculum vitae and personal statement, copies of the [X number of] sample works listed below selected by Dr. XXX, and a brief summary of the promotion criteria. With respect to teaching and mentoring, we do not expect external reviewers to comment on how the candidate meets these criteria unless they are able to do so.

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. XXX's credentials will be greatly appreciated and will constitute an important element in the overall evaluation. I would be very grateful if you could respond to us in writing no later than..... If possible, would you send your reply electronically toumd.edu as an attachment?

Sincerely,

XXXX X. XXXXXX
Chair, APT 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 October 25, 2012 to consider your case for promotion. The vote to endorse your promotion was X yes and Y no with Z mandatory abstentions. This vote, to deny your promotion, reflected concerns about your low scholarly productivity and failure to obtain external funding. Regrettably, I concur with the decision. I am forwarding your dossier to the Dean for review of the evaluative procedures.

Sample Language for Letters of Review for Adherence to Due Process

As you know, the faculty and Chair of the Department of ... have recommended against promoting you to the rank of ... The University APT Policy requires me, as Dean of the College of ..., to "review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process." I have carefully examined your case and find no evidence of procedural or substantive due process errors during the review.

For letters to Associate Professors:

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

For letters to Assistant Professors and untenured Associate Professors undergoing mandatory review:

I, therefore, accept the judgment of the Department APT Review Committee and the Department Chair that you not be (promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and) granted tenure. You will be granted an additional one-year contract and your appointment will terminate on ____.

Please accept my best wishes in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Dean

PLANNING FOR THE APT TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Guidelines for Assembling Artifacts

Assembling the teaching portfolio for a promotion dossier need not be daunting. Using the templates below as a guide, collect potential portfolio materials after every semester, ensuring you have the artifacts that may be needed for the final portfolio. The University provides access to data storage services (e.g., umd.box.com) or personal storage solutions may be used. Each of the templates below may be used to assist with organizing stored artifacts for later assembly. Faculty are encouraged to work with the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC) in the development of their portfolio, following department, school, or university guidelines. University APT guidelines are provided at faculty.umd.edu. Information about the effectiveness of portfolios is provided at the end of this document, as are additional resources useful in the development of portfolios.

Depending on the requirements or guidelines of the home unit, several organizational structures can be envisioned for the teaching portfolio. There is no one way to present a teaching portfolio because there is no one way to teach. The goal is to represent the breadth of your approaches and thinking about teaching while also showing enough depth to communicate what actually goes on in your classes. Typical organizational structures are outlined below, but are merely suggestions to make it easier for you to get started; faculty are free to develop personalized portfolio structures as long as they meet department requirements. Note that the fixed expectation is that the Personal Teaching Statement is the leading element in all of the organizational structures described below and should be the lead element in any portfolio.

Type 1: Chronological Portfolio Structure

Organized by semester or academic year, this structure is useful for showing progression of teaching activities and student learning over time. Especially if significant changes and improvements are being emphasized in the portfolio, evidence of such change can be shown through the progression of artifacts from the beginning to end of the time period included in the portfolio. Care should be taken to ensure the personal statement follows a similar structure and that the portfolio is easily organized to ensure easy review of materials.

Chronological Portfolio Elements:

Personal Teaching Statement outlining change and growth over time

Year 1

- Course-Related Materials (syllabi; learning outcomes; assignments; student artifacts; etc.)
- Assessments (peer reviews; course evaluation summaries; learning outcomes assessment, or LOA; etc.)
- Awards/Invitations
- Training Taken and Given (i.e., professional development activities)
- Instructional Advancements and Innovation

Years 2-5

- Repeat for each year

Type 2: Course-based Portfolio Structure

Some faculty will teach very few different courses during the period of promotion, repeating those offerings nearly every year. A portfolio structured around those courses may be useful in this case, such that each course is presented separately with relevant artifacts and elements. Chronological presentation of materials within each course is often recommended, demonstrating change and improvement in instruction and student learning over time.

Course-based Portfolio Elements:

Personal Teaching Statement

Course 1

- Course-Related Materials (syllabi; learning outcomes; assignments; student artifacts; etc.)
- Assessments (peer reviews; course evaluation summaries; learning outcomes assessment, or LOA; etc.)
- Awards/Invitations
- Training Taken and Given (i.e., professional development activities)
- Instructional Advancements and Innovation

Course 2...

- Repeat for each course

Type 3: Component/Theme Portfolio Structure

Teaching portfolios contain typical elements and a portfolio may be structured around those key elements, even across different course types. In this case, faculty may wish to outline instructional change and growth over time across these components or themes, rather than being specific to a course or seamlessly chronological. For example, changes in pedagogy and improvements in student learning may be evidenced across various courses over time and will be demonstrated through changes in course materials, student artifacts, assessments, etc. The following organizational structure may be useful for this approach.

Component/Theme Portfolio Elements:

Personal Teaching Statement

(The following elements may be presented in any order, but should coincide with the organization of the teaching statement. For each, provide exemplars for multiple courses, showing progression over time.)

- Course-Related Materials (syllabi; learning outcomes; assignments; student artifacts; etc.)

- Assessments (peer reviews; course evaluation summaries; learning outcomes assessment, or LOA; etc.)
- Awards/Invitations
- Training Taken and Given (i.e., professional development activities)
- Instructional Advancements and Innovation

THE VALUE OF PORTFOLIOS

The use of a teaching portfolio for describing and demonstrating teaching-related activities places a stronger emphasis on teaching quality and student learning than information provided simply from student course evaluations. The teaching portfolio provides an opportunity for faculty to document their teaching performance beyond these course evaluations or other metrics of teaching performance. The preparation of a portfolio also serves as an impetus to improve teaching, as it requires faculty to reflect on their practice, recognize weakness, and seek assistance for improvement. In that way, portfolios are best prepared in consultation with a teaching mentor and should be envisioned as a process that is pursued over time, allowing for reflection and improvement. Faculty are encouraged to begin assembling portfolio materials in their first year and engage closely with their teaching mentors, peer evaluators, and other faculty in the development of the portfolio over time.

Seldin P. & Associates. (1993). Successful use of teaching portfolios. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Seldin, P., Annis, L., Zubizarreta, J. (1995). Answers to common questions about the teaching portfolio. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 6 (1).

Seldin, P. (1997). The teaching portfolio. A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Second edition. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Zubizarreta, J. (1994). Teaching portfolios and the beginning teacher. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Dec. 1994: 323-326.

Additional Resources:

The use of teaching portfolios is a common practice at many top research institutions. Beyond the resources provided by the University of Maryland, additional information on the use of portfolios can be found at the following websites:

- <http://cte.illinois.edu/resources/topics/portfolio.html>
- <https://cndls.georgetown.edu/media/documents/teachingportfolio.pdf>
- <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/teaching-portfolios/>

GUIDELINES FOR PEER/NON-STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Developed by the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center and the Office of Faculty Affairs

Overview:

Quality in teaching is an important evaluation criterion for promotion and job performance at the University of Maryland. Despite the importance of teaching, the procedures and guidelines for peer or non-student evaluation of teaching are often poorly articulated across campus. Student course evaluations are an important part of judging teaching effectiveness, but such evaluations are also recognized as limited in scope and can be biased by student performance (e.g., course grades) and other factors beyond the instructor's control (e.g., gender, race), so additional sources of information should be considered when evaluating teaching effectiveness.

The APT handbook has long emphasized the importance of "peer" (i.e., non-student) evaluation of teaching, yet specific procedures are not mandated given the variety of teaching models and administrative structures across campus. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC) have developed the following guidelines, best practices, and suggestions for the development of non-student evaluation procedures at the unit level. The goal is to assist Deans, Chairs, and other unit heads with the development of robust and meaningful evaluation procedures of teaching for various purposes, including: 3-yr review of junior faculty; APT dossiers for promotion to Associate or Full Professor; post-tenure review; evaluation and promotion consideration of professional-track faculty; etc. Peer evaluators for tenure track faculty must include tenured faculty, but may also include other tenure track or professional track faculty from within the unit, evaluators from outside the unit, current non-enrolled students (trained in evaluation), or former students/alumni not currently enrolled in courses.

Guidelines:

1. Effective non-student or peer evaluation of any instructor is best when performed early in the instructor's contract period. Having such evaluation occur in the final semester prior to promotion consideration will often do little to assist the instructor, and provides little information for the unit. Having the process of peer evaluation become part of the culture of the unit is important; an expectation for all instructors at all stages and ranks, but most especially important for instructors new to the unit. For tenure-track faculty, emphasize the importance of such evaluation as part of the 3-year review, which will ensure evaluation prior to the tenure evaluation.
2. Effective non-student or peer evaluation is best performed using repeated interactions with the course instructor over time, and should include more than classroom attendance and observation/evaluation. Direct evaluation of the teaching materials, syllabi, assignments, activities, assessments, etc., allows for appraisal of the quality and breadth/depth of the course content. Evaluation of classroom management, pedagogies, etc., is equally important, as junior

faculty often have little training in these techniques. As such, evaluations at multiple times within a course offering (e.g., reviewing materials and attending class sessions on more than one occasion), and evaluations of multiple course offerings can provide excellent information for the unit and instructor about teaching effectiveness and improvement over time.

3. Student course evaluations are an important part of evaluating teaching effectiveness and peer evaluators may want to review those evaluations with the instructor. Peer evaluators may be able to interpret student course evaluations, which may include mediocre ratings on certain course components. These poorer ratings could be "sour grapes", but they also may reflect inadequacies in course content (e.g., lack of depth) or poor instructor performance or class management. Conversely, very high ratings can indicate excellence, but may also reflect weaknesses in the course, especially if the course is "easy" and students receive high grades for little effort. Student course evaluations provide imperfect information on teaching effectiveness, but the peer evaluation process can allow for careful review and contextualization of these materials (both quantitative and qualitative student feedback) to help provide insight into teaching effectiveness. The comments generated by student evaluations (i.e., beyond the quantitative rankings) are especially helpful in this process.
4. Evaluation rubrics are recommended for peer evaluators, if only to assist evaluators with recognizing the various areas of instruction that should be considered in their evaluations. Peer evaluators can be trained in the review process either by their unit, school, or campus (e.g., TLTC). The use of rubrics allows for very specific feedback for the instructor under evaluation, as well as for clearer evidence of change in performance over time with repeated evaluation.
5. Evaluation of course content (e.g., learning outcomes, reading lists, activities, assignments, assessments) is best performed by a peer evaluator with expertise in the content area of the course. Moreover, for courses that provide foundational information for higher-level courses (e.g., 101 course that leads to 102 or 201), evaluation of the content as it relates to required skills/knowledge for those subsequent courses can be considered. Alignment of the learning outcomes of the course in relation to the program's degree competencies may also be considered in the evaluation. Such expert evaluation may come from experts off-campus at peer institutions; however, having such an evaluation come late in the promotion timeline and as a one-time review of course materials may be ineffective.
6. Where possible, evaluation of student learning can be a tremendous benefit to the evidence of teaching effectiveness. Student learning might be assessed within a course (e.g., performance on projects or examinations), or perhaps in student performance in later, related coursework. Incorporation of the unit's learning outcomes assessment procedures into the instructor evaluation can be an effective way to address student learning directly.
7. Evaluation of classroom management, pedagogies, presentation of course materials, etc., may be effectively performed by peer reviewers who are not expert with the content of the course, but who are well-versed (and possibly trained) in evaluating such components. Such evaluations can provide valuable insights for instructors to improve teaching performance and student learning beyond any adjustments to the course content. In fact, such a review is often useful for evaluation of student comprehension of challenging material, as a non-expert reviewer will be

able to reflect on the instructor's ability to teach challenging concepts and assess student knowledge and performance.

8. The instructor under evaluation, over the course of several semesters, is likely best served through review by 2-3 evaluators, rather than only one or by many. Repeated review by these evaluators will allow for several opportunities for feedback and suggestions for improvement, as well as for assessment of changes in teaching effectiveness over time. Recognize also that instructors will have different strengths/weaknesses and will take different paths toward improvement; one size does not "fit all" with regard to excellence in teaching and promoting student learning.
9. The teaching portfolio of any instructor being considered for promotion may include a summary letter of the evaluation processes performed as part of the peer evaluation process. Rather than submission of multiple evaluation rubrics, each peer evaluator may write a summary assessment of the process of evaluation, the number and type of interactions the evaluator had with the instructor and course, and an overall appraisal of the instructor's teaching effectiveness and response to the evaluation process. The peer evaluator is also in an excellent position to interpret and contextualize the student course evaluations in a summary letter.
10. Of note for junior tenure-track faculty: Junior tenure-track faculty whose teaching is peer-evaluated by tenured faculty within their unit have the potential for receiving a biased review, in that these tenured faculty will vote directly on their promotion and tenure application, and, by writing a letter of evaluation, will likely be contributing material directly to the teaching portfolio. Unit heads will want to give careful consideration to the selection of the peer evaluators for junior tenure-track faculty, and may choose to select tenured faculty evaluators with related expertise to the course content from outside the unit.

Template for Student Evaluation of Teaching

Student Evaluation Ratings

Course: UNIV100	F11			S12			F12		
	N	Mean	Course Level Mean*	N	Mean	Course Level Mean*	N	Mean	Course Level Mean*
The course was intellectually challenging.	19	3.05	3.26	39	3.08	3.29	27	3.05	3.26
I learned a lot from this course.	19	3.05	3.27	39	3.09	3.47	27	3.09	3.47
The instructor treated students with respect.	19	3.00	3.00	39	3.00	3.00	27	3.00	3.00
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	19	3.21	2.88	39	3.27	2.78	27	3.27	2.78
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	19	3.26	2.82	39	3.29	2.82	27	3.26	2.82
Average		3.11	3.05		3.15	3.07		3.13	3.07

* Average rating for all similarly leveled course sections (e.g., all 100-level courses sections) in that college in that semester.

Scaled 0-4: Strongly Disagree=0; Strongly Agree=4. N/A is not in the average.

The standards the instructor set for students were...			
	F11	S12	F12
Too Low	0%	5%	10%
Appropriate	89%	85%	80%
Too High	11%	10%	10%

How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?			
	F11	S12	F12
CORE Requirement	32%	29%	10%
Program Requirement	58%	61%	80%
Elective	11%	10%	10%

From the Faculty Affairs website, on the APT Forms & Templates page, you can download an Excel spreadsheet where you can enter student evaluation numbers for a single course. The sheet is formatted to fit on one page, and after you have completed it for the first course, you can save it as a PDF, then change the numbers for the second course, save it as a second PDF, and etc. When you are finished, all those PDF pages can be added to your dossier file using Acrobat.