

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
DEPARTMENT PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

Last revised and approved by a vote of the faculty advisory committee June 24, 2022

Table of Contents

Purpose and Mission	3
Membership in the Department	3
Membership in the Faculty Advisory Committee	3
Governance	3
a. Department Faculty Advisory Committee	3
i. Executive Sessions	3
ii. Voting Rights	4
iii. Quorum	4
b. Chair of the Department	4
Committees	4
a. Awards Committee	4
b. Admissions Committee	4
c. Graduate Affairs Committee	5
d. Undergraduate Teaching Committee	5
e. Human Relations Committee	5
f. Qualifying Exam Committees	5
g. Paternoster Memorial Lecture and Kimchi Memorial Graduate Awards Committees	5
h. Ad-Hoc Committees	5
Tenure and Promotion	5
a. Ranks	6
iv. Tenure-Track Faculty	6
v. Other Related Ranks	7
b. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion for Tenure-Track Faculty	8
i. Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor	9
ii. Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Professor	10
iii. Provisions Relating to Formal Promotion and Tenure Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty	12
iv. Promotion and Tenure Review for Tenure-Track Faculty	12
Guidelines for Professional Track Faculty	21
a. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Instructional Faculty	21
vi. Search Procedures	23
vii. Written Contracts:	23
viii. Support for Instructional Faculty:	23
ix. Instructional Faculty Role in Departmental Governance:	23
x. Mentoring and Additional Training for Instructional Faculty:	24
xi. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Instructional Faculty:	24
xii. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Part-Time and Adjunct Instructional Faculty:	24
xiii. Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation:	24
xiv. Procedures for Promotion:	25
xv. Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturer to Principle Lecturer (Full Time Only)	31

b.	Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Research Faculty	32
i.	Search Procedures	34
ii.	Written Contracts	34
iii.	Support for Research Faculty	34
iv.	Research Faculty Role in Departmental Governance	34
v.	Mentoring and Additional Training for Research Faculty	35
vi.	Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Research Faculty:	35
vii.	Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation:	35
viii.	Procedures for Promotion:	36
ix.	Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions from Assistant Research Professor to Associate Research Professor and Associate Research Professor to Research Professor (Full Time Only)	39
c.	Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Faculty Specialist Ranks	40
i.	Search Procedures	41
ii.	Written Contracts	41
iii.	Support for Faculty Specialists	42
iv.	Faculty Specialist Role in Departmental Governance	42
v.	Mentoring and Additional Training for Faculty Specialist	42
vi.	Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Faculty Specialist	42
vii.	Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation	43
viii.	Procedures for Promotion	43
ix.	Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions (Full Time Only)	46
	Appendix A: Process Guidelines for Paternoster and Kimchi Awards	
	Appendix B : CCJS APT Guidance	47
a.	Consideration of Books in APT Process	47
b.	Department Journal Rankings	48
	Appendix C: Departmental Graduate Student Grievance Process	49
a.	Existing University Policies	49
b.	Informal Process	50
c.	Formal Departmental Process	51
i.	Phase 1	51
ii.	Phase 2	52
iii.	Phase 3	53
	Appendix D : CCJS Faculty Mentorship Guidelines	54
a.	Assignments	54
b.	The Relationship	55
	Adoption and Amendment of Plan of Organization	55

Purpose and Mission

The purpose of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice is to provide an organizational and administrative basis for the interests and activities of the University, its faculty and students, in the general areas of crime and delinquency, criminal justice, policing, juvenile justice, criminology, courts, and corrections. The Department promotes study and teaching concerning crime and delinquency and their prevention and control by offering and coordinating academic programs in criminology and criminal justice, and through managing research in these areas.

Membership in the Department

All Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, and Maryland Data Analysis Center faculty members, instructors/lecturers, research associates, research assistants, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate majors will be members of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. They will constitute the assembly of the Department.

Membership in the Faculty Advisory Committee

The Faculty Advisory Committee will be the policy-making body of the Department. Membership in the Faculty Advisory Committee will include all tenure -track faculty with appointments in the Department, a representative of the graduate students, a representative of the professional track faculty, and a representative of the Department's staff. Graduate student, professional track and staff representatives will be elected by the groups they represent.

Governance

a. Department Faculty Advisory Committee

Regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee will be held at scheduled times as announced by the Department Chair. Special meetings and executive sessions may be held at the request of the Chair or may be convened by a majority of Faculty Advisory Committee members through a written request to the Chair. Faculty Advisory Committee meetings will be open to all members of the Department. The Chair of the Department will preside and set the agenda at all meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee. Individual members should submit items to the Chair for inclusion in the meeting agenda.

i. Executive Sessions

Executive sessions may be called by the Chair, or by a majority of the faculty members of the Faculty Advisory Committee. Executive sessions are required to discuss faculty welfare matters such as tenure, promotion, and retention; and may be called to discuss budgeting; student and other personnel matters; or any other matters designated by the Chair, or a majority of the faculty members of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

Students and staff may attend Executive sessions solely by invitation of the party calling the meetings.

ii. Voting Rights

All Faculty Advisory Committee members have voting rights, except during executive sessions when voting rights are restricted to members of the tenured/tenure-track faculty. Written proxies are permitted provided they pertain to specific items or issues. However, written proxies for faculty hiring decisions are permitted only from members of the Faculty Advisory Committee who have actively participated in the search process, that is, met with the majority of the candidates or heard their presentations. Unless otherwise stated, a simple majority will prevail.

iii. Quorum

A quorum will consist of half of the persons eligible to vote.

b. Chair of the Department

The Chair of the Department serves as the administrative officer of the faculty. As such s/he will provide program and policy leadership for the Department and its programs. S/he will act in the interest of the Department, the University, and the people of the State of Maryland. Every five years or at other times as designated by the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Chair will be evaluated by the Dean.

Committees

The Standing Committees of the Department will be as follows:

a. Awards Committee

The Awards Committee (a) reviews applications by graduate students for Department and University financial assistance and determines the order in which assistance will be offered, (b) reviews policies related to graduate student admissions and awards, and (c) recommends to the Faculty Advisory Committee ways to improve admissions and awards procedures in the Department. The Committee will consist of at least three tenure-track faculty members selected by the Chair for one-year terms. Generally, the Chairperson of the Committee will be the CCJS Director of Graduate Studies. The Chair will follow the orderings of the Committee in awarding Departmental assistance.

b. Admissions Committee

The Admissions Committee (a) reviews applications for graduate admissions and (b) makes admissions recommendations to the CCJS Director of Graduate Studies. The Committee consists of the whole tenure and tenure-track faculty,

chaired by the Director of Graduate Studies.

c. *Graduate Affairs Committee*

The Graduate Affairs Committee will address issues and concerns raised by graduate students and faculty, as well as potential policy-related items that fall outside the traditional charge of the graduate admissions and funding committee. The Graduate Affairs Committee will consist of at least two tenure-stream faculty members, graduate coordinator, graduate representative, and one professional-track faculty member selected by the Chair for three-year terms. Generally, the Chairperson of the Committee will be a former CCJS Director of Graduate Studies. At least one member of the committee should also serve on the Human Relations Committee.

d. *Undergraduate Teaching Committee*

The Teaching Committee will review teaching effectiveness in the Department, recommend to the Faculty Advisory Committee nominees for teaching awards, review the curriculum, and recommend to the Faculty Advisory Committee ways to improve teaching effectiveness in the Department. The Teaching Committee will consist of at least one tenure-track faculty member and one professional-track faculty member selected by the Chair for three-year terms. Generally, the Chairperson of the Committee will be the CCJS Director of Undergraduate Studies.

e. *Human Relations Committee*

The Human Relations Committee addresses issues related to social relations within the Department and campus. It monitors the climate for interpersonal relations in the Department using various means, including surveys, focus groups, and discussions. The Human Relations Committee communicates policies and activities related to diversity goals, sexual harassment, equity, and related topics to members of the Department. The Human Relations Committee facilitates discussions about the need for, and plans and implements if needed, interventions to promote productive and respectful human relations within the Department. The Committee will consist of at least two tenure-track faculty members and one professional track faculty member selected by the Chair for one-year terms. When needed, graduate students selected by their peers or the Chair of the Department will join the committee on an ad hoc basis. The Chairperson will be appointed by the Chair of the Department.

f. *Qualifying Exam Committee*

The doctoral qualifying exam committee is comprised of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are assigned to one of two subcommittees upon appointment to the Department. The exam subcommittees are responsible for creating exam content across core issues related to theory, the justice system, criminal justice policy, and research methods. Service on the committee

includes writing exam questions and grading the qualifying exam, which is given in January of each year. For each exam, there is a rotating schedule of which member will be responsible for organizing each subcommittee, soliciting questions from committee members, and submitting questions for the doctoral qualifying exam.

g. Paternoster Memorial Lecture and Kimchi Memorial Graduate Awards Committee

In memory of the lives and accomplishments of Dr. Ray Paternoster and Dr. Anat Kimchi, the Paternoster Memorial Lecture and Kimchi Memorial Graduate Awards Committee will (1) identify and recommend an outstanding scholar to deliver the Ray Paternoster Memorial Lecture and (2) select Kimchi Memorial award recipients from among graduate student applicants in Criminology and Criminal Justice whose research is related to racial inequality, recidivism, social justice, or the study of formal institutions of social control and who have applied for award consideration. The Committee will include three CCJS tenured/tenure track faculty and one CCJS graduate student. Current members of the committee are ineligible to receive these awards. See Appendix A for process details.

h. Ad-Hoc Committees

Ad-Hoc Committees may be created by the Chair (e.g., Internal Review Committees for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, Teaching Peer Review Panels, Other Evaluation Committees).

Tenure and Promotion

The procedures spelled out in this document for tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty review specify three levels of review below the President's office. For CCJS faculty members these are the Department, the College, and the Campus levels. The initial review conducted by the Department, is referred to as a “first-level” review. Higher levels of review are referred to as “second-level” and “third-level.”

a. Ranks

iv. Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Assistant Professor

The appointee will have qualities suggesting a high level of teaching ability in the relevant academic field, and will provide evidence of potential for superior research and scholarship. Because this is a tenure-track position, the appointee will at the time of appointment show promise of having, at such time as he or she is to be reviewed for tenure and promotion, the qualities described under "Associate Professor" below. The doctorate will be a requirement for

appointment to an Assistant Professorship. Although the rank normally leads to review for tenure and promotion, persons appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor after the effective date of this policy will not be granted tenure in this rank.

2. Associate Professor

In addition to having the qualifications of an Assistant Professor, the appointee will have a high level of competence in teaching and advisement in the relevant academic field, will have demonstrated significant research and scholarship and will have shown promise of continued productivity, will be competent to direct work of major subdivisions of the primary academic unit and to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research, and will have served the campus, the profession, or the community in some useful way in addition to teaching and research. Promotion to the rank from within confers tenure; appointment to the rank from outside may confer tenure.

3. Professor

In addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, the appointee will have established a national and, where appropriate, international reputation for outstanding research and scholarship, and a distinguished record of teaching. There also must be a record of continuing relevant and effective professional service. The rank carries tenure.

v. Other Related Ranks

1. Distinguished University Professor

The title, Distinguished University Professor, will be conferred by the President upon a limited number of members of the faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park in recognition of distinguished achievement in teaching; research or creative activities; and service to the University, the profession and the community. College Park faculty who, at the time of approval of this title, carry the title of Distinguished Professor, will be permitted to retain their present title or to change to the title of Distinguished University Professor. Designation as Distinguished University Professor will include an annual allocation of funds to support his or her professional activities, to be expended in accordance with applicable University policies.

2. College Park Professor

This title may be used for nationally distinguished scholars, creative

or performing artists, or researchers who would qualify for appointment at the University of Maryland, College Park at the level of Professor but who normally hold full-time positions outside the University. Holders of this title may provide graduate student supervision, serve as principal investigators, and participate in departmental and college shared governance. Initial appointment is for three years and is renewable annually upon the recommendation to the Provost by the Unit Head and the Dean. This is a non-paid non-tenure-track title, which may be used exclusively at the University of Maryland, College Park.

3. Visiting Appointments

The prefix "Visiting" before an academic title, e.g., Visiting Professor, will be used to designate a short-term appointment without tenure. This appointment requires an affirmative vote from the faculty.

4. Professor Emerita, Professor Emeritus

The word "Emerita" or "Emeritus" after the academic title Professor or Associate Professor will designate a faculty member who has retired from full-time employment of at least 10 years in the University of Maryland at College Park at the academic rank of Professor, Research Professor, Associate Professor, or Research Associate Professor after meritorious service to the University in the areas of teaching, research, or service.

5. Professor of the Practice

This title may be used to appoint individuals who have demonstrated excellence in the practice as well as leadership in specific fields. The appointee will have attained regional and national prominence and, when appropriate, international recognition of outstanding achievement. Additionally, the appointee will have demonstrated superior teaching ability appropriate to assigned responsibilities. As a minimum, the appointee will hold the terminal professional degree in the field or equivalent stature by virtue of experience. Appointees will hold the rank of Professor but, while having the stature, will not have rights that are limited to tenured faculty. Initial appointment is for periods up to five years, and reappointment is possible. This title does not carry tenure, nor does time served as a Professor of the Practice count toward achieving tenure in another title.

b. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion for Tenure-Track Faculty

The criteria for appointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of

Criminology and Criminal Justice will reflect the educational mission of the University of Maryland at College Park: to provide an undergraduate education ranked among the best in the nation; to provide a nationally and internationally renowned program of graduate education and research, making significant contributions to the sciences; and to provide public service to the state and the nation.

The criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions fall into three general categories: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of students; (2) performance in research and scholarship; (3) performance of professional service to the Department, university and the profession. Each of these categories will be considered in every decision. The criteria for appointment to a faculty rank or tenure will be the same as for promotion to that rank.

Upon appointment, each new faculty member will be given by the Chair a copy of the CCJS Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion and the Chair will discuss the criteria with the faculty member. Each faculty member will be notified promptly in writing by the Chair of any changes in CCJS Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion.

Decisions on promotion of tenured faculty members will be based on the academic merit of the candidate as evaluated using the relevant criteria. It is not required that faculty demonstrate excellence on all of the individual criteria. Rather, the determination of a faculty member's qualifications in each category will be based on the totality of their performance across the criteria. Decisions on the renewal of untenured appointments and on promotion decisions involving the granting of tenure will be based on the academic merit of the candidate as evaluated using the relevant criteria and on the academic needs of the Department.

i. Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor

1. *Teaching, Advisement, and Mentoring*

Superior teaching and academic advisement are essential criteria in appointment and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The faculty member will be engaged regularly and effectively in teaching and advisement activities of high quality and significance. The evaluation will be based in the opinions of students and colleagues. Specifically, faculty members will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- i. Student and peer evaluations of classroom instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- ii. New course development.
- iii. Participation on thesis and dissertation committees.
- iv. Advisement, mentoring, and supervision of graduate students relating to publications and other professional

activities.

2. *Research and Scholarship*

A persistent record of excellence in research and scholarship in the field of criminology and criminal justice is required for appointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Specifically, faculty members will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- i. Publication of research results in scholarly books (the significance of which is determined by press quality, external reviews, and evaluators' assessments; see Appendix A for guidelines), top peer-reviewed journals (determined by Departmental journal ranking or by relevant organizations outside of criminology and criminal justice), research monographs, prestigious edited volumes, or handbooks.
- ii. Evidence of the ability to work independently, for example, by taking leadership in publication and presentation of research or by developing an externally funded research program through the submission and award of grants, - contracts, and/or fellowships.
- iii. National recognition for a specific area of research as evidenced by citations, book and article awards, and/or other honors and awards.
- iv. Presentation of research results at national and international conferences.

3. *Service*

A candidate for promotion and tenure to the rank of Associate Professor should have established a commitment to the University and the profession through participation in service activities. Service activity is expected of the faculty member, but service will not substitute for teaching and advisement or for achievement in research or scholarship. Service activity will not be expected or required of junior faculty to the point that it interferes with the development of their teaching and research. Specifically, faculty members will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- i. Service to professional societies.
- ii. Service on editorial boards, review of articles, grant proposals, or conference proposals.
- iii. Participation in national, regional, or state activity related to criminology and criminal justice.
- iv. Participation in department, college, and/or university-wide committees.

ii. Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Professor

1. *Teaching, Advisement, and Mentoring*

Superior teaching and academic advisement at all instructional levels are essential criteria in appointment and promotion to the rank of Professor. The faculty member will be engaged regularly and effectively in teaching and advisement activities of high quality and significance. The evaluation will be based in the opinions of students and colleagues. Specifically, faculty members will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- i. Student and peer evaluations of classroom instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- ii. New course development.
- iii. Participation on thesis and dissertation committees.
- iv. Supervision to completion of theses and Ph.D. dissertations by advisees.
- v. Advisement, mentoring, and supervision of graduate students relating to publications and other professional activities.
- vi. Mentoring junior faculty.
- vii. Successful placement of graduate students in positions relevant to their degree.

2. *Research and Scholarship*

A persistent record of excellence in research and scholarship in the field of criminology and criminal justice is required for appointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Professor. Specifically, faculty members will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- i. Publication of research results in scholarly books (the significance of which is determined by press quality, external reviews, and evaluators' assessments; see Appendix A for guidelines), top peer-reviewed journals (determined by Departmental journal ranking or by relevant organizations outside of criminology and criminal justice), research monographs, prestigious edited volumes, or handbooks.
- ii. An established record of independent publication and presentation of research.
- iii. Peer recognition, evidenced by prestigious invited lectures, citations, book and article awards, and/or other honors and awards.
- iv. International and national recognition for a specific area of research.
- v. Presentation of research results at national and international conferences.

- vi. Externally funded research program through the award of grants, contracts, and/or fellowships.
- vii. Public outreach and translation of research findings to the public, policy-makers, and practitioners.

3. *Service*

A candidate for appointment, promotion, tenure to the rank of Professor should have established a commitment to the University and the profession through participation in service activities (including such activities as service to the University; to the profession and higher education; and to the community, school systems, and governmental agencies). Service activity is expected of the faculty member, but service will not substitute for teaching and advisement or for achievement in research or scholarship. Specifically, faculty members will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- i. Elected or appointed office in international, national, or state professional societies.
- ii. Editorships or membership on editorial boards of prestigious, peer-reviewed journals.
- iii. Chairing or membership on international, national, regional, or state commissions or panels.
- iv. Leadership role on department, college, and/or university-wide committees.
- v. Review of articles, grant proposals, or conference proposals.

iii. Provisions Relating to Formal Promotion and Tenure Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty

- i. Reviews for promotion and tenure will be conducted according to the duly adopted written policies and procedures of the University. These procedures are published in the Faculty Handbook.
- ii. Faculty review committees are a part of the review process at each level.
- iii. Each review by a faculty committee and each review by the CCJS Chair will be focused on the evaluation of the candidate using the CCJS Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. Each review will be based on materials that must include the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, the candidate's Personal Statement, the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements, the Candidate's Response to the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements (if one is written), the letters from external evaluators, teaching evaluations, and the other prescribed elements in the University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual. At the second and third levels of review, these promotion materials include the promotion committee reports and the letters from academic unit administrators.
- iv. A faculty member eligible to vote on the promotion recommendation

on a candidate of an academic unit may not participate in a review of that candidate or vote on that candidate at a higher level of review. Because they provide an independent evaluation, Department Chairs, Academic Deans, and the Provost are ineligible to vote at any level.

- v. Candidates will have the right to appeal negative promotion and tenure decisions.

iv. Promotion and Tenure Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are responsible for providing the Department an accurate CV detailing their academic and professional achievements. Candidates will also make a written Personal Statement advocating their case for tenure and/or promotion based on the facts in their CV on the applicable Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion, and on their perspective of those achievements in the context of their discipline. Both the CV and the Personal Statement will be presented in the form required by the University Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual by the June preceding the academic year in which a formal review for tenure and/or promotion will occur. These two documents will be included with each request for external evaluation and will be included in the promotion dossier reviewed at each level within the University. Nominations for possible external reviewers should be submitted by the candidate to the Chair by the April preceding the academic year in which a formal review for tenure and/or promotion will occur. The Chair will also nominate names for possible external reviewers at the same time.

The burden of evaluating the qualifications and suitability of the candidate for tenure and promotion is greatest at the first level of review. Greater weight will be given at the higher levels of review to the judgments and recommendations of lower-level review committees and to the principle of peer review.

The decision whether or not to award tenure or promotion will be based primarily on the candidate's record of accomplishment in each of the three areas of teaching and advisement, research and scholarship, and service, and the anticipated level of future achievements as indicated by accomplishments to date. Considerations relating to the present or future programmatic value of the candidate's particular field of expertise, or other larger institutional objectives, may legitimately be considered in the context of a tenure decision; but in no case will the year of the tenure review be the first occasion on which these considerations are raised. The faculty and the Unit Chair or Dean are responsible for advising untenured faculty on any and all programmatic considerations relative to the tenure decision, and conveying such information to the candidate at the earliest opportunity during annual

assessments of progress towards tenure.

When the President has completed his or her review of the tenure or promotion case and informed the candidate of the decision, the list of members of the Unit, College, and Campus committees will be made public.

1. *First-level Review*

- i. Review Committee: At the first level the review committee will consist of all eligible members of the CCJS faculty. Eligible members of the first-level faculty are those full-time permanent members, excluding the Chair, who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion or appointment. The vote of the entire eligible faculty participating in the review process will be considered the faculty recommendation of the first-level academic unit. The Chair will submit a recommendation separately; the recommendation of the Chair will be considered together with all other relevant materials by any reviewing committee at a higher level. The Chair will appoint an eligible member of the first-level faculty who will chair the review committee and serve as spokesperson for the committee. Requests for information from higher level review units will be transmitted to both the faculty spokesperson and the CCJS Chair.
- ii. Evaluation Letters: The committee will solicit letters of evaluation from six or more widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that will include individuals nominated by the candidate. At least three letters and at most one-half of the requested letters will be from persons nominated by the candidate.
- iii. Mentoring: CCJS will provide for the mentoring of each Assistant Professor and of each untenured Associate Professor by one or more members of the senior faculty other than the Chair. Mentors will encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Mentors will also provide frank and honest assessments regarding progress toward fulfilling the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Following appropriate consultations with members of the CCJS faculty, the Chair will independently provide each Assistant Professor and each untenured Associate Professor annually with an informal assessment of his or her progress. Favorable informal assessments and

positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

- iv. Progress Reports: CCJS will perform a formal intermediate review of the progress towards meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion in the third year of an Assistant Professor's appointment. CCJS will perform a formal intermediate review of the progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor in the fifth year of a tenured Associate Professor's appointment and every five years thereafter. An Associate Professor may request an intermediate review earlier than the five years specified. The purposes of these intermediate reviews are to assess the candidate's progress toward promotion, to inform the reviewed faculty member of that assessment, to inform the faculty members more senior to that faculty member who will eventually consider him or her for promotion of that assessment, and to advise the candidate and the Chair of steps that should be taken to improve prospects for promotion. These intermediate reviews will not involve external evaluations of the faculty member.
- v. Formal Review Requests: A tenure-track or tenured faculty member may request a formal review for tenure or promotion.
- vi. Case Progression: The tenure or promotion case will go forward to the next level of review if 50% of the faculty vote cast is favorable (or such higher percentage as may be established by procedures or guidelines of the first-level unit) or if the recommendation of the Chair is favorable. If both faculty and Chair recommendations are negative, the case will be reviewed at the next level only by the Dean. The Dean will review the case to ensure that the candidate has received procedural and substantive due process. If the Dean believes that the candidate has not received due process, he or she will direct the Unit to reconsider. The candidate may withdraw from his or her review at any time prior to the President's decision.
- vii. Summary Report: The CCJS review committee will prepare a concise Summary Statement of Professional Achievements on each candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The Summary Statement will place the professional achievements of the candidate in scholarship

and research and/or extension in the context of the broader discipline. It will place the candidate's professional achievements in teaching and in service in the context of the responsibilities of the Unit, the College or School, the University, and the greater community. The Summary Statement will be factual and objective, not evaluative. The Summary Statement will be reviewed by the candidate at least two weeks before the meeting at which the academic unit begins consideration of its recommendation on tenure and/or promotion. If the candidate and the committee cannot agree on the Summary Statement, the candidate has the right and the responsibility to submit a Response to the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements for the consideration of the voting members of the review committee and the academic unit must note the existence of the Response in the Unit's Summary Statement. The purpose of the Summary Statement is to set the candidate's work in the context of the field for each level of review within the University and it is not to be sent to external evaluators or others outside the University.

- viii. **Evaluative Report:** The chair of the first-level review committee will prepare a written report stating the committee's vote and recommendation on whether or not to grant tenure or promotion, and explaining the basis for the faculty's recommendation insofar as that basis has been made known in the discussions taking place among the members of the committee. This letter will be provided to the CCJS Chair for his or her information and for forwarding to higher levels of review.

Faculty participating in the Unit's deliberation who wish to express a dissenting view are free to do so, and any such written statement will be included in the materials sent forward to the next level of review.

- ix. **Chair's Recommendation:** The recommendation of the CCJS Chair will likewise be in writing. This recommendation will be transmitted to the second-level review and will be made available to all eligible members of the first-level faculty.

2. Second-level Review

- i. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion and tenure from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity

with the approved bylaws of the College.

- ii. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review.

3. *Third-level Review*

- x. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion have been met.
- xi. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a written justification through the Provost to the President, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost and the President will confer about the case, and the Provost will transmit his or her recommendation and a written justification to the President.

4. *Notification to Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion*

Upon completion of the first-level review, the CCJS Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision: (1) inform the candidate whether the recommendations made by the faculty committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative (including specific information on the number of faculty who voted for tenure and/or promotion, the number who voted against, and the number of abstentions), and (2) prepare for the candidate a letter summarizing in general terms the nature of the considerations on which those decisions were based. At higher levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever either or both faculty and administrator recommendations are negative. The chair of the faculty committee will review the summary letter prepared by the Unit administrator in order to ensure that it accurately summarizes the considerations regarded as relevant by the faculty committee at that level. Both letters will be made available for review in the office of the Chair (Dean or Provost) by any member of the faculty committee at that level. In the event that the chair of the faculty committee and the Unit administrator are unable to agree on the appropriate language and contents of the summary letter, each will write a summary letter to the candidate. A copy of all materials provided to the candidate will be added to the tenure or promotion file as the case proceeds through higher levels of review.

5. Presidential Review

Full-time appointments or promotions to the ranks of Associate Professor or Professor require the written approval of the President, in whom final authority resides for promotion and granting of tenure to faculty. Final authority for any appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor cannot be delegated by the President.

6. Termination of Faculty Appointments for Cause

If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member whose appointment the campus administration seeks to terminate for cause requests a hearing by a hearing officer, the hearing officer will be appointed by the President from a college or school other than that of the appointee, with the advice and consent of the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate. If the appointee requests a hearing by a faculty board of review, members of the board of review will be appointed by the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate from among tenured Professors not involved in administrative duties.

7. The Appeals Process for Tenure-Track Faculty

When a candidate for promotion and/or tenure receives notification from the President, Dean or Chair that promotion or tenure was not awarded, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting that the President submit the matter to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the President because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that, should the President accept the request and refer the appeal to the Campus Appeals Committee, these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

i. Grounds for Appeal

The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion and tenure decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A

decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for tenure and/or promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

ii. Standard of Proof

An appeal will not be granted unless the alleged grounds for appeal are demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence.

8. *Post-tenure Review*

Tenured faculty will be reviewed on a rotating basis every five years to assess their productivity as scholars, teachers and citizens of the Department and university. Faculty with less than full time appointments will be evaluated after the equivalent of five years of full time service. The review will be conducted by a three-person committee chosen by the Chair from among the tenured faculty at the rank of the faculty member being evaluated or higher. The committee will evaluate the tenured faculty member on the same criteria used to determine promotion to their current rank. The committee will prepare a report on the faculty member and submit that report to the chair who will discuss it with the faculty member

being evaluated. The report will be sent to the Dean's office with a memorandum from the chair endorsing or dissenting from the committee's assessment. A copy of the report and memorandum will be kept on file in the Department.

9. Procedures for Granting Emerita/Emeritus Status

- i. Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors, Professors of the Practice, Research Professors and Principal Lecturers, who have been members of the faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park for the equivalent of 10 or more years of full-time service, and who give to their Chair or Dean proper written notice of their intention to retire, are eligible for nomination to emerita/emeritus status (see "I.F.12 Emerita, Emeritus" in the University's Policy and Procedures). Only in exceptional circumstances may faculty with fewer than the equivalent of 10 years of full time service to the institution be recommended for emerita/emeritus status.
- ii. The decision whether or not to award emeritus standing shall be based primarily on the candidate's record of significant accomplishment in any of the three areas of (1) teaching and advisement, (2) research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activity, and (3) service.
- iii. If a faculty member gives notice of intention to retire before March 15, the first-level tenured faculty shall vote on emeritus standing within 45 days of the notice. If notice is given after March 15, the vote shall be taken no later than the 45th day of the following semester. The result of the vote shall be transmitted in writing to the candidate and to the administrator of the Unit no later than 10 days after the vote is taken. A faculty member who has not been informed of the decision concerning his or her emeritus standing within the time limits specified, shall be entitled to appeal the action as a negative decision in accordance with section V.B.1. in the University's Policy and Procedures.
- iv. The review committee of the first-level unit shall consist of all eligible members of the faculty. Eligible members of the faculty are all full-time tenured Associate and Full Professors, as appropriate, excluding the Chair or Dean. The vote of the entire eligible faculty shall be considered

the recommendation of the faculty. The Chair or Dean shall submit a recommendation separately; the recommendation of the Chair or Dean shall be considered together with all relevant materials by administrators at higher levels.

- v. An emeritus case shall go forward to the next level of review if the Department Chair's recommendation is positive or the faculty vote is at least 50% favorable.
- vi. The Chair of the first-level committee will be appointed by the Department Chair and shall prepare a written report, stating the committee's vote and recommendation on whether or not to award emeritus standing and explaining the basis for the faculty's recommendation insofar as that basis has been made known in the discussions taken place among the members of the committee. This letter will be forwarded to the Chair or Dean for his or her information and for forwarding to higher levels of review. Faculty participating in the Unit's deliberations who wish to express a dissenting view are free to do so, and any such written statement shall be included in the materials sent forward to the next level of review.
- vii. The recommendation of the first-level administrator shall also be in writing. The administrator's recommendation shall be transmitted to the second level of review and a copy shall be made available for review by any member of the faculty participating in the Unit's review deliberations.
- viii. Second-level review of recommendations of emeritus standing shall be conducted by the appropriate Dean. Second-level reviews of recommendations from non-departmentalized schools and colleges shall be conducted by the Provost. The second-level recommendation of the Dean or the Provost, together with all other relevant materials, shall be transmitted to the President.
- ix. The President shall make the final decision on the award of emeritus standing.

10. Merit Pay Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty

When merit pay is available, all of the tenure-track faculty will provide up-to-date, signed CVs. All tenure-track faculty will review each CV, and rank each individual as “exceeding expectations,” “meeting expectations,” or “performing below expectations” based on the work

completed since the last time merit pay increase was provided. The Chair will use these rankings as advisory when determining merit pay increases. Eighty percent of the merit funds should be allocated with deference to the peer evaluations and 20% of the pool can be allocated at the Chair's discretion to redress equity issues within the faculty.

Guidelines for Professional Track Faculty

Professional track faculty include Instructional Faculty as well as non-tenure-track research faculty and faculty specialists.

a. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Instructional Faculty

Instructional Faculty at the University of Maryland have four ranks: Junior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer. These ranks do not carry tenure. The appointment and promotion criteria for these ranks are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Minimum Credentials for Each Instructional Faculty Rank.

Titles	Junior Lecturer	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
Academic Degree	The normal minimum requirement is a Master's degree or ABD. Exceptions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.	The normal minimum requirement is a Master's degree; PhD (or equivalent) preferred.	The normal minimum requirement is a Master's degree; PhD (or equivalent) strongly preferred.	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).

Professional Experience	<p>Created for graduate students finishing their programs beyond their Graduate Assistantship.</p> <p>At a minimum, appointees should have at least two semesters experience as a Teaching Assistant or equivalent.</p>	<p>The title Lecturer is used to designate appointments of persons serving primarily in a teaching capacity.</p> <p>Appointees will have a proven record of effective teaching within the discipline and at least one-year of instruction (or its equivalent) or at least five years experience practicing within the discipline.</p>	<p>In addition to having the qualifications of a Lecturer, the appointee shall have an exemplary teaching record over the course of at least five years of full-time instruction or its equivalent as a Lecturer (or similar appointment at another institution) and shall exhibit promise in developing additional skills in the areas of research, service, mentoring, or program development.</p>	<p>In addition to the qualifications required of the Senior Lecturer, the appointee shall have an exemplary teaching record over the course of at least five years full-time service or its equivalent as a Senior Lecturer (or similar appointment at another institution) and/or the equivalent of five years full-time professional experience as well as demonstrated excellence in the areas of research, service, mentoring, or program development.</p>
Contract Terms	<p>Appointments to this rank are typically one-year and are renewable for a maximum of six years.</p>	<p>Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable.</p>	<p>Appointments to this rank are typically one to five years and are renewable.</p>	<p>Appointments are typically made as five-year contracts. Appointments for additional five-year terms can be renewed as early as the third year of any given five-year contract.</p>

vi. Search Procedures

Competitive, posted searches will be conducted for full-time Instructional Faculty teaching positions and are strongly encouraged for 50% FTE or greater. All searches will follow campus procedures & policies and regular departmental practices.

vii. Written Contracts:

Contracts shall follow campus procedures for issuing these contracts. Contracts will stipulate the terms of employment, the salary, assignments and expectations, notification date about renewal or non-renewal, resources, and performance/ evaluation criteria and timeline. When a professional track faculty member's duties include administration, service, and/or research in addition to teaching, then the contract letter stipulates the range of expectations in addition to teaching, and the % FTE dedicated to each of the domains will be included in the contract. As with other BSOS departments, CCJS will use the University's online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources.

viii. Support for Instructional Faculty:

In accordance with campus policy and in the best interest of students, all Instructional Faculty members should be provided with the necessary and appropriate department or unit support for the execution of their duties. These resources should conform to departmental practices for faculty with respect to assistance with course preparation, provision of teaching supplies, and staff support. Care should be taken to ensure that students can have access to both full-time and part-time faculty members through mailboxes, appropriate spaces for meetings, email, etc. and where appropriate and feasible, professional development of full-time and part-time PTK should be encouraged and supported.

ix. Instructional Faculty Role in Departmental Governance:

All Instructional Faculty are considered members of the Department. Accordingly, they may attend regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee (i.e., faculty meetings). They are not members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, however, and therefore cannot vote on matters of curriculum or the appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenure-track faculty. Instructional faculty will have a chair designated representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Instructional Faculty.

x. Mentoring and Additional Training for Instructional Faculty:

The Department shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. At the time of hiring, or within the first semester, the Department will provide each new faculty members with a copy of the Department's criteria for performance evaluation and review for promotion. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.

xi. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Instructional Faculty:

Ongoing evaluations and reviews for promotion will account for and assess all departmental duties as described in the appointment letter. The specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's efforts, as indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the Unit's specific criteria for such rank. Evaluation and promotion review will be conducted at both departmental and college levels based on all of the duties (and percentages of time allotted for each) articulated in the current faculty contract.

xii. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Part-Time and Adjunct Instructional Faculty:

Instructional Faculty appointed at less than 100% FTE will be reviewed and promoted on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. For example, in a department where eight courses per academic year represent a full workload for 100% FTE, Instructional Faculty teaching two courses per year are eligible for promotion at $\frac{1}{4}$ the pace of full-time counterparts.

Further clarification on UM Adjunct Faculty Policy and eligibility for Adjunct II status can be found [Here](#).

xiii. Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation:

All Instructional Faculty will have formal reviews of their performance. Formal evaluations will be completed at: the midpoint of initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Junior Lecturers; the midpoint of initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Lecturers; the midpoint of initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Senior Lecturers; and, the midpoint of initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Principal Lecturers. This timeline is for full-time Instructional Faculty; formal evaluations of part-time Instructional Faculty will occur on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. These reviews will assess whether the faculty member is successfully meeting obligations and provide

a commentary on progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the next rank. The review will be completed by members of the Departmental Teaching Committee (of which the Director of Undergraduate Studies is a member). Formal evaluations shall be kept on record in a promotion file and shall be consulted when decisions are made about rank, salary, and contract renewal. All faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it in accordance with [campus policy](#).

xiv. Procedures for Promotion:

1. There is an expectation that individuals will fulfill at least the length of their initial contract terms before seeking promotion. However, individuals can request an expedited review for promotion to the next higher rank. Waivers of the usual timelines will be considered on a case-by-case basis for individuals who demonstrate performance at that higher level within a shorter timeframe.
2. Individuals seeking promotion will write a formal request letter to her/his Department Chair outlining the relevant points supporting a promotion. The letter should address the criteria listed in Table 1 and in other sections of this document.
3. The candidate will provide the Department Chair with the following no later than October 1st of the academic year in which the review will take place:
 - i. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
 - ii. A teaching portfolio following campus faculty guidelines
 - iii. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)
4. The Department Chair will form a committee of at least three members, assigning a committee chair, and faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. At least one member will be a tenure-track faculty member and at least one committee member will be a professional track faculty. If there are no professional track faculty in the Department at or above the rank sought by the candidate, the Departmental chair will ask the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to recruit someone from another department.
5. The committee chair will submit the following package to the Department Chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee summary report, which includes a recommendation regarding promotion.
6. Upon completion of the first-level review by the committee, the CCJS Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision inform the

candidate in writing whether the recommendations made by the review committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative. If either the Department Chair or the review committee supports promotion, the materials will be forwarded to the Dean. If neither the Department Chair nor the review committee supports promotion, the case will not be forwarded to the Dean and the Chair will explain the reasons for the negative decision in his letter to the candidate. For review or promotion from Junior Lecturer to Lecturer or from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, the review process will end at the level of the Dean.

The promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer has a somewhat different procedure. If the Chair and/or committee supports promotion, the case will progress to the second level of review. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity with the approved bylaws of the College. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's standards for promotion have been met. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a written justification to the Provost, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost will transmit his or her recommendation and a written justification to the President.

At the College and University levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever recommendations are negative. For a positive decision, candidates will be informed of the decision at the conclusion of the review process. Once granted, a promotion cannot be rescinded.

7. In the case of a negative outcome at any level, the candidate for promotion can reinitiate this process in future years. In other words, a negative decision for promotion does not preclude renewal of the existing appointment.

Candidates have the right to appeal a negative decision. The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for

promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

For faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, the candidate can appeal to the Department. Within two weeks of receiving the appeal, the Department Chair must form an Appeals Committee consisting of three faculty members at or above the rank of the promotion who had not served on the initial review committee. The Committee then has four weeks to consider the written appeal, meet with the candidate and any other relevant individuals, and send a written decision to the chair and the candidate. If the appeal is successful, then a new promotion review will be conducted, correcting the deficiencies of the prior one. If the outside letters were not the subject of the appeal, then they will serve as the outside letters for the new review.

If the appeal is denied, the candidate is not promoted and the chair of the review committee sends the candidate a letter explaining the grounds on which the appeal was denied. The candidate can appeal that decision to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The Dean, either alone or with the advice of an Ad-Hoc Committee that s/he forms for this purpose, can reverse the Departmental Appeals Committee's decision on the grounds that (a) procedures were not properly followed or (b) the evaluation criteria were inadequate or improper. This decision is final and not subject to further appeal.

For candidates seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting that the case be submitted to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the Provost because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals

Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

8. With the exception of Junior Lecturers, individuals may choose to stay at a given rank indefinitely (i.e., are not required to seek promotion within any specific timeframe).
9. Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment and one or more secondary appointments. When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for promotion, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows
 - i. If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the Chair or director of the secondary unit.
 - ii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from a review committee in that unit. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the Unit's Plan of Organization.
 - iii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized school, then there shall be a review committee established and a formal recommendation provided in a manner consistent with that unit's policies.

Table 2: Guidelines for Preparing the Promotion Review Report for Instructional Faculty

Titles	Junior Lecturer	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
Course Materials (e.g. syllabi, learning outcomes, assignments, student work, etc.)	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that includes the following: A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes Examples of pedagogically supported student	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that includes the following: A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes Examples of pedagogically supported student	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that demonstrates a history of: A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes Examples of pedagogically supported student	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that represents a true commitment to the scholarship of the teaching. Evidence may be provided through: A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes

	assignments or activities	assignments or activities Sample of student work with your feedback	assignments or activities Sample of student work with your feedback	Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities Sample of student work with your feedback
Assessments (e.g. peer review, course evaluation summary, learning outcomes assessment, etc.)	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A record of positive teaching evaluations	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A record of positive teaching evaluations A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A record of positive teaching evaluations A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses) Peer reviewed instruction and evaluation of teaching	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A record of positive teaching evaluations A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses) Peer reviewed instruction and evaluation of teaching
Instructional Advancements & Innovations	If applicable	If applicable	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: Examples of course/assignment/exam redesigns and/or modifications Proposals for newly created courses or formats	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: Examples of course/assignment/exam redesigns and/or modifications Proposals for newly created courses or formats

Other Evidence of Instructional Accomplishments (e.g. teaching philosophy, awards, training, research/scholarship in teaching/learning, etc.)	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Evidence of having completed a teacher training workshop or seminar	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Any evidence of teaching awards or scholarship	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Any evidence of teaching awards or scholarship Evidence of mentorship, service, or leadership	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Any evidence of teaching awards or scholarship Evidence of mentorship, service, or leadership
Summary	Record of teaching experience or Teaching Assistantship and a willingness to improve skills through training and mentorship.	Record of effective teaching and at least one-year of full-time instruction (or equivalent) or a combined five years of practical experience.	Record of significant contribution to the Unit's undergraduate instructional mission by excellence in instruction and/or student mentorship and service.	Outstanding and continuous record of contribution to the Unit's undergraduate instructional mission by excellence in instruction, student mentorship, and/or campus leadership and service.

xv. Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturer to Principle Lecturer (Full Time Only)

Although neither mandated nor guaranteed, a salary increase from the BSOS Dean for promotions from full-time Lecturer to full-time Senior Lecturer or from full-time Senior Lecturer to full-time Principal Lecturer, can be negotiated by the Chair if it is matched by the Department. The amount can be augmented above the match if consistent across all candidates of the same rank in a given year within a department. The College will determine the minimum salary increases for promotion annually. Note that raises associated with promotion are independent of merit increases.

1. Guidelines for PTK Faculty Merit Increase (Approved April 2022)

The policy and procedures on annual merit reviews for PTK Faculty in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice are developed according to University requirements and guidelines. A copy of this policy and procedures will be made available to every PTK Faculty member upon hire.

General Policy

In keeping with University policies, the Chair of the department, with the approval of the Dean, has the authority and responsibility to determine merit increases for PTK Faculty. It is, however, the responsibility of the Chair to follow the procedures developed in this document and approved by a majority vote of the PTK Faculty. These procedures call for participation by a PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee in evaluation of PTK Faculty performance, and for distribution of available merit pool monies according to agreed-upon proportions for specified dimensions of professional activity. All PTK Faculty with a total FTE of 50% or greater are eligible for merit pay in the department, though any merit award may be proportional to the department's contribution to the faculty member's overall salary or % FTE in the department. The department's review will not consider the PTK Faculty member's role and performance in the other unit.

Each year, the Department Chair will announce to the department any available funds for PTK Faculty merit increases, and will regularly evaluate the salary structure of the department and work with the Dean to address salary compression or salary inequities. Merit monies are distinct from COLA and promotion increases. Merit is based on the faculty member's performance. Of any merit pool available to PTK Faculty in a given year, 20% is available for the Department Chair to assign as they see fit to account for special circumstances or equity issues not addressed by the regular committee procedures, including recognizing past performance in a year with little or no merit money. The Chair may also use some of this 20% amount to build up salaries attached to vacant lines. The remaining 80% of the merit pool will be distributed according to the evaluation ratings assigned by the PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee.

Composition and Role of the PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee

CCJS uses a PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee to advise the chair on merit pay and evaluative reviews for all PTK faculty. The PTK Review Committee will be comprised of 2 elected members of

the 50% FTE PTK faculty and a member of the Tenured faculty. Members are nominated (including self-nomination) for committee membership and elected by secret ballot of all eligible PTK faculty. The Director of Undergraduate Studies will serve as chair of the committee and coordinate the committee's work. All committee members (including the Chair) are voting members of the committee. The Chair will work to encourage reasonable representation of PTK Faculty diversity on the Faculty Merit Review Committee, reassessing and proposing adjustments to the committee's membership as necessary every three years.

Merit Review Process

PTK faculty have different roles in the department and thus will be assessed within the broad dimensions of (a) research, (b) service—inclusive of within and outside-University service, and (c) teaching. Each component will be weighted for each individual according to their primary job responsibilities as established in their contract (for example, for some PTK Faculty involved solely in teaching/service, the teaching component may account for up to 80% of their assessment with service making up the remaining 20% (0% for research); the distribution will be substantially different for PTK Faculty hired for research and/or administrative service. The primary source material for evaluations will be an up-to-date CV, annual faculty activity reports, course evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, list of professional activities including publications, conference papers and posters, grant proposals (submitted and funded), awards/recognitions, and any other documentation of activities. For PTK faculty primarily on research or service assignments, the committee will request information about the faculty member's performance from that individual's supervisor, which will form the basis of the committee's assessment.

Based on these criteria, PTK faculty will be judged as exceeding expectations; meeting expectations; and performing below expectations. If merit pay is available, the time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the time of the last merit increase (up to three years) or when the person was hired (if more recent than the last merit increase). There will be no penalty for periods during the preceding three years when a PTK Faculty member was not employed by the University. The Departmental Chair will allocate available merit based on the mean of these rankings as a percentage of current salary. While 80% of the merit pool is to be allocated according to the mean ratings of the PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee and 20% can be allocated by the Chair directly, the Chair will report to the committee their final salary determinations. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and

increase in a formal letter from the Department Chair. The guidelines for merit increases will be circulated to all PTK faculty with at least 50% FTE for their comments and approval. The letter will inform the faculty member that they may request a meeting with the Department Chair to receive an explanation of the merit pay determination.

Appeals Process

If a PTK Faculty member, after consulting with the Department Chair, remains aggrieved at the merit determination, they can appeal in writing to the PTK Merit Review Committee within two weeks of the receipt of the Chair's letter. The PTK Merit Review Committee can either confirm the previous judgment or adjust the mean ratings awarded in any dimension (teaching, service, or research).

Evaluation Guidelines for Rating Performance

Each member of the PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee is expected to independently arrive at a preliminary rating for each faculty on the four dimensions in which merit is allocated. Each member may be assigned special responsibility for an in-depth review of a portion of the faculty being reviewed. When the committee meets to conduct its reviews, each faculty member will be discussed individually, and final ratings and a mean rating will be recorded.

Each member of the committee should use their professional judgment in assessing the value of various contributions, the most common of which are listed below.

1. In the evaluation and rating of **teaching performance**, the following facets of teaching are suggested for consideration if present: overall quality of teaching); extent of writing essay exams, term papers) required in classes; innovations in teaching methods or courses); peer and student assessments; unusually high numbers of students or courses; advisory work on thesis or dissertation committees; and mentoring activity for either undergraduate or graduate students.
2. In the evaluation and rating of **research performance**, the following activities are suggested for consideration if present: books; refereed articles; book chapters; reviews; and reports; grants and grant proposals, and translational opportunities. The prestige and quality of the publication outlet can be taken into account, as well as the quality of the work itself. Textbooks (unless they represent innovative integration of a specialty area in

the discipline) should not be counted as much as substantive monographs.

3. In the evaluation and rating of **service performance**, the following campus activities are suggested for consideration if present: minor or routine department, campus, or University committee work; major or extraordinary department, campus, or University committee work; and program, department, campus, or University administrative positions. In addition, off-campus service may include: committee work for local, regional, or national professional associations; elected positions in local, regional, or national professional associations; editorships; review work for journals or grant agencies; and speeches or consulting for local or national agencies.

Evaluation and Modification of this Policy and Procedures

Periodically, or when requested by a majority of the PTK Faculty, the PTK Faculty Merit Review Committee will review its procedures and make recommendations to the Faculty Advisory Committee for any needed modifications. For the modifications to be accepted, they must first be approved by a majority vote of the PTK Faculty in a secret ballot and then reviewed and approved by the office of the Dean of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

2. Guidelines for Termination

All campus instructional contracts include standard language for termination prior to end of appointment for both the University and the employee. Reasons for the University to terminate a contract prior to the end of appointment can be for reasons of performance or unit financial circumstances.

3. Eligibility for College Award

Instructional faculty can be nominated for the Excellence in Teaching Award, Excellence in Teaching and Mentorship Award, Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion Award and/or the Excellence in Service Award.

b. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Research Faculty

Research Faculty at the University of Maryland have several ranks, which are listed below along with their criteria for appointment and promotion. These ranks do not carry tenure.

Table 3. Minimum Credentials for Each Research Faculty Rank.

Titles	Faculty Assistant	Post-Doctoral Associate	Assistant Research Professor	Associate Research Professor	Research Professor
Academic Degree	The normal minimum requirement is a baccalaureate degree.	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).
Professional Experience	The appointee shall be capable of assisting faculty in any dimension of academic activity and shall have the ability and training adequate to the carrying out of the particular techniques required, the assembling of data, and the use and care of any specialized techniques.	The appointee shall have been trained in research procedures, shall be capable of carrying out individual research or collaborating in group research at the advanced level, and shall have had the experience and specialized training necessary for success in such research projects as may be undertaken.	This rank is generally parallel to Assistant Professor. Appointees shall have demonstrated superior research ability and potential for contributing to the educational mission through teaching or service. Appointees should be qualified and competent to direct the work of others (such as technicians, graduate students, other research personnel).	This rank is generally parallel to Associate Professor. In addition to the qualifications required of the Assistant Research Professor, appointees shall have extensive successful experience in scholarly or creative endeavors, the ability to propose, develop and manage major research projects, and proven contributions to the educational mission through teaching or service.	This rank is generally parallel to Professor. In addition to the qualifications required of the Associate Research Professor, appointees shall have demonstrated a degree of proficiency sufficient to establish an excellent reputation among regional and national colleagues. Appointees should have a record of outstanding scholarly production in research, publications, professional achievements or other distinguished and creative activity, and exhibit

					excellence in contributing to the educational mission through teaching or service.
Contract Terms	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable for up to three years. After three years in rank, appointees who have performed satisfactorily should be eligible for appointment to an appropriate faculty position or encouraged to apply for a staff position.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable, provided the maximum consecutive service in this rank does not exceed six years. After six years in rank, appointees who have performed satisfactorily should be eligible for appointment to an appropriate faculty position.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to five years and are renewable.	Appointments to this rank are typically five years and are renewable.

i. Search Procedures

Competitive, posted searches will be conducted and all searches will follow [campus procedures & policies](#) and regular departmental practices.

ii. Written Contracts

Contracts shall follow campus procedures for issuing these contracts. Contracts will stipulate the terms of employment, the salary, assignments and expectations, notification date about renewal or non-renewal, resources, and performance/ evaluation criteria and timeline. When a professional track faculty member's duties include administration, service, and/or teaching in

addition to research, then the contract letter stipulates the range of expectations in addition to research, and the % FTE dedicated to each of the domains will be included in the contract. As with other BSOS departments, CCJS will use the University's online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources.

iii. Support for Research Faculty

In accordance with [campus policy](#), all research faculty members should be provided with the necessary and appropriate department or unit support for the execution of their duties. These resources should conform to departmental practices for faculty with respect to provision of supplies and staff support. Faculty members will have access to mailboxes, appropriate spaces for meetings, email, etc. and where appropriate and feasible, professional development will be encouraged and supported.

iv. Research Faculty Role in Departmental Governance

All research faculty are considered members of the Department. Accordingly, they may attend regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee (i.e., faculty meetings). They are not members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, however, and therefore cannot vote on matters of curriculum or the appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenure-track faculty. Research faculty will have a representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of research faculty.

v. Mentoring and Additional Training for Research Faculty

The Department shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. At the time of hiring, or within the first semester, the Department will provide each new faculty member with a copy of the Department's criteria for performance evaluation and review for promotion. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.

vi. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Research Faculty:

Ongoing evaluations and reviews for promotion will account for and assess all departmental duties as described in the appointment letter. The specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's efforts, as

indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the Unit's specific criteria for such rank. Evaluation and promotion review will be conducted at both departmental and college levels based on all of the duties (and percentages of time allotted for each) articulated in the current faculty contract.

vii. Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation:

All research faculty will have formal reviews of their performance. Formal evaluations will be completed: at the midpoint of the initial term and the midpoint of any renewed term for Faculty Assistants; at the midpoint of initial term and the midpoint of any renewed term for Post-Doctoral Associates; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Assistant Research Professors; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Associate Research Professors; and, the midpoint of initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Research Professors. Formal evaluations of part-time research faculty at the rank of Assistant Research Professor and higher will occur on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. These reviews will assess whether the faculty member is successfully meeting obligations and provide a commentary on progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the next rank. The review will be completed by a committee chaired by the Research Faculty's direct supervisor. Ideally, this committee will include at least one PTK faculty member. Formal evaluations shall be kept on record in a promotion file and shall be consulted when decisions are made about rank, salary, and contract renewal. All faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it in accordance with [campus policy](#).

viii. Procedures for Promotion:

1. Faculty assistants and Post-Doctoral Associates are not eligible for promotion. After a certain amount of time demonstrating satisfactory performance (see Table 3), they may be eligible for appointment to a different rank or position. Assistant Research Professors may be promoted to Associate Research Professor and Associate Research Professors may be promoted to Research Professor. Therefore, the following procedures refer to these ranks.
2. There is an expectation that individuals will fulfill at least the length of their initial contract terms before seeking promotion. However, individuals can request an expedited review for promotion to the next higher rank. Waivers of the usual timelines will be considered on a case-by-case basis for individuals who demonstrate performance at that higher level within a shorter timeframe.
3. Individuals seeking promotion will write a formal request letter to her/his Department Chair outlining the relevant points supporting a

promotion. The letter should address the criteria listed in Table 3 and other sections of this document.

4. The candidate will provide the Department Chair with the following no later than October 1st of the academic year in which the review will take place:
 - i. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
 - ii. A personal statement, following campus faculty guidelines, that discusses the demonstrated record of achievement in research and/or professional activity
 - iii. Examples of research (e.g., articles, technical reports, books)
 - iv. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)
5. The Department Chair will form a committee of at least three members, assigning a committee chair, and faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. At least one member will be a tenure-track faculty member and at least one committee member will be a professional track faculty. If there are no professional track faculty in the Department at or above the rank sought by the candidate, the Departmental chair will ask the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to recruit someone from another department.
6. The committee chair will submit the following package to the Department Chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee summary report.
7. Upon completion of the first-level review by the committee, the CCJS Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision inform the candidate in writing whether the recommendations made by the review committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative. If either the Department Chair or the review committee supports promotion, the materials will be forwarded to the Dean. If the neither the Department Chair nor the review committee supports promotion, the case will not be forwarded to the Dean and the chair will explain the reasons for the negative decision in his letter to the candidate. For review or promotion from Assistant to Associate Research Professor, the review process will end at the level of the Dean.

The promotion from Associate Research Professor to Research Professor has a somewhat different procedure. If the chair and/or committee supports promotion, the case will progress to the second level of review. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity with the approved bylaws of the College. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and

the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's standards for promotion have been met. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a written justification to the Provost, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost will transmit his or her recommendation and a written justification to the President.

At the College and university levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever recommendations are negative. For a positive decision, candidates will be informed of the decision at the conclusion of the review process. Once granted, a promotion cannot be rescinded.

8. In the case of a negative outcome at any level, the candidate for promotion can reinitiate this process in future years. In other words, a negative decision for promotion does not preclude renewal of the existing appointment.

Candidates have the right to appeal a negative decision. The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

For faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Research Professor, the candidate can appeal to the Department. Within two weeks

of receiving the appeal, the Department Chair must form an Appeals Committee consisting of three faculty members at or above the rank of the promotion who had not served on the initial review committee. The committee then has four weeks to consider the written appeal, meet with the candidate and any other relevant individuals, and send a written decision to the chair and the candidate. If the appeal is successful, then a new promotion review will be conducted, correcting the deficiencies of the prior one. If the outside letters were not the subject of the appeal, then they will serve as the outside letters for the new review.

If the appeal is denied, the candidate is not promoted and the chair of the review committee sends the candidate a letter explaining the grounds on which the appeal was denied. The candidate can appeal that decision to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The Dean, either alone or with the advice of an Ad-Hoc Committee that s/he forms for this purpose, can reverse the departmental Appeals Committee's decision on the grounds that (a) procedures were not properly followed or (b) the evaluation criteria were inadequate or improper. This decision is final and not subject to further appeal.

For candidates seeking promotion to Research Professor, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting that the case be submitted to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the Provost because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

9. With the exception of Faculty Assistant and Post-Doctoral Associate, individuals may choose to stay at a given rank indefinitely (i.e., are not required to seek promotion within any specific timeframe).
10. Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment and one or more secondary appointments. When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for promotion, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows:
 - i. If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary

unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the Chair or director of the secondary unit.

- ii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from a review committee in that unit. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the Unit's Plan of Organization.
- iii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized school, then there shall be a review committee established and a formal recommendation provided in a manner consistent with that unit's policies.

ix. Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions from Assistant Research Professor to Associate Research Professor and Associate Research Professor to Research Professor (Full Time Only)

Although neither mandated nor guaranteed, a salary increase from the BSOS Dean for promotions from full-time Assistant Research Professor to full-time Associate Research Professor or from full-time Associate Research Professor to full-time Research Professor, can be negotiated by the Chair if it is matched by the Department. The amount can be augmented above the match if consistent across all candidates of the same rank in a given year within a department. The College will determine the minimum salary increases for promotion annually. Note that raises associated with promotion are independent of merit increases.

4. *Guidelines for Merit Increase.*

The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJS) conducts annual reviews for PTK faculty in defined processes that are separate from T/TT merit processes. Any PTK faculty member whose total FTE across all appointments is 50% or greater will be eligible for merit as long as the faculty member has an appointment in the department. The faculty member will be given an annual review. The amount of the merit award can be prorated based on the FTE percentage within the department. These annual reviews will be conducted even in years when there will not be merit increases, and can be included in evaluations for years in which merit increases are available.

Post-Docs, Faculty Assistants, and other specialized PTK faculty: CCJS currently conducts individual reviews, with close involvement of the PI. The department feels that the job duties of these faculty vary greatly, and the PI is in some cases the only individual who understands the job duties of the faculty member and whether they are meeting expectations.

5. *Guidelines for Termination*

All campus instructional contracts include standard language for termination prior to end of appointment for both the University and the employee. Reasons for the University to terminate a contract prior to the end of appointment can be for reasons of performance or unit financial circumstances.

6. *Eligibility for College Awards*

Research faculty can be nominated for the Excellence in Research Award, Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion Award and/or the Excellence in Service Award.

c. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Faculty Specialist Ranks

Faculty Specialists at the University of Maryland have several ranks, which are listed below along with their criteria for appointment and promotion. These ranks do not carry tenure.

Table 4. Minimum Credentials for Each Faculty Specialist Rank

Titles	Faculty Specialist	Senior Faculty Specialist	Principal Faculty Specialist
Academic Degree	The normal minimum requirement is a BS/BA.	The normal minimum requirement is an MA/MS or a BA/BS plus three years' experience.	The normal minimum requirement is an MA/MS plus three years' experience or a BA/BS plus five years' experience.
Professional Experience	The appointee shall be capable of data collection and processing, assisting with data analysis, contributing to presentations, and assisting with project management activities.	The appointee shall have demonstrated an ability to fulfill the duties of faculty specialist, as well as contribute to grants and/or research reports and/or articles, supervise students or junior faculty specialists and demonstrate a potential for leadership.	The appointee shall have demonstrated an ability to fulfill the duties of senior faculty specialist, as well as write grant proposals, serve as lead on projects, presentations and papers, mentor students and faculty specialists, manage project budgets, coordinate multiple projects and demonstrate leadership.

Contract Terms	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable. Whenever possible, faculty will be given progressively longer contracts.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable. Whenever possible, faculty will be given progressively longer contracts.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to five years and are renewable. Whenever possible, faculty will be given progressively longer contracts.
-----------------------	--	--	---

i. Search Procedures

Competitive, posted searches will be conducted and all searches will follow [campus procedures & policies](#) and regular departmental practices.

ii. Written Contracts

Contracts shall follow campus procedures for issuing these contracts. Contracts will stipulate the terms of employment, the salary, assignments and expectations, notification date about renewal or non-renewal, resources, and performance/ evaluation criteria and timeline. When a professional track faculty member's duties include administration, service, and/or teaching in addition to research, then the contract letter stipulates the range of expectations in addition to research, and the % FTE dedicated to each of the domains will be included in the contract. As with other BSOS departments, CCJS will use the University's online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources. All new hires will receive a copy of the CCJS Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Faculty Specialist Ranks, along with the College's evaluation and promotion policy.

iii. Support for Faculty Specialists

In accordance with [campus policy](#), all professional track faculty members should be provided with the necessary and appropriate department or unit support for the execution of their duties. These resources should conform to departmental practices for faculty with respect to provision of supplies and staff support. Faculty members will have access to mailboxes, appropriate spaces for meetings, email, etc. and where appropriate and feasible, professional development will be encouraged and supported.

iv. Faculty Specialist Role in Departmental Governance

All Faculty Specialists are considered members of the Department. Accordingly, they may attend regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee (i.e., faculty meetings). They are not members of the Faculty

Advisory Committee, however, and therefore cannot vote on matters of curriculum or the appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenure-track faculty. Faculty Specialists will have a representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Faculty Specialist.

v. Mentoring and Additional Training for Faculty Specialist

The Department shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. At the time of hiring, or within the first semester, the Department will provide each new faculty member with a copy of the Department's criteria for performance evaluation and review for promotion. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.

vi. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Faculty Specialist

Ongoing evaluations and reviews for promotion will account for and assess all departmental duties as described in the appointment letter. The specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's efforts, as indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the Unit's specific criteria for such rank as well as the duties specified in the individual's contract. Evaluation and promotion review will be conducted at both departmental and college levels based on all of the duties (and percentages of time allotted for each) articulated in the current faculty contract.

vii. Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation

All faculty specialists will have formal reviews of their performance. Formal evaluations will be completed: at the midpoint of the initial term and the midpoint of any renewed term for Faculty Specialists; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Senior Faculty Specialists; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Principal Faculty Specialists. Formal evaluations of part-time will occur on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. These reviews will assess whether the faculty member is successfully meeting obligations and provide a commentary on progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the next rank. The review will be completed by a committee chaired by the Faculty Specialist's direct supervisor. Ideally, this committee will include at least one PTK faculty member. Formal evaluations shall be kept on record in a promotion file and shall be consulted when decisions are made about rank, salary, and contract renewal. All faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it in accordance with

viii. Procedures for Promotion

1. Individuals seeking promotion will write a formal request letter to her/his Department Chair outlining the relevant points supporting a promotion. The letter should address the criteria listed in Table 4 and other sections of this document.
2. The candidate will provide the Department Chair with the following no later than October 1st of the academic year in which the review will take place:
 - i. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
 - ii. A personal statement, following campus faculty guidelines, that discusses the demonstrated record of achievement in research and/or professional activity
 - iii. Examples of work/research products
 - iv. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)
3. The Department Chair will form a committee of at least three members, assigning a committee chair, and faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. At least one member will be a tenure-track faculty member and at least one committee member will be a professional track faculty. If there are no professional track faculty in the Department at or above the rank sought by the candidate, the Departmental chair will ask the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to recruit someone from another department. A single committee can evaluate multiple applicants if necessary.
4. The committee chair will submit the following package to the Department Chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee summary report.
5. Upon completion of the first-level review by the committee, the CCJS Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision inform the candidate in writing whether the recommendations made by the review committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative. If either the Department Chair or the review committee supports promotion, the materials will be forwarded to the Dean. If the neither the Department Chair nor the review committee supports promotion, the case will not be forwarded to the Dean and the chair will explain the reasons for the negative decision in his letter to the candidate. For review or promotion from Faculty Specialist to Senior Faculty Specialist, the review process will end at the level of the Dean.

The promotion from Senior Faculty Specialist to Principal Faculty Specialist has a somewhat different procedure. If the chair and/or committee supports promotion, the case will progress to the second level of review. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity with the approved bylaws of the College. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's standards for promotion have been met. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a written justification to the Provost, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review.

At the College and University levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever recommendations are negative. For a positive decision, candidates will be informed of the decision at the conclusion of the review process. All transmittals of decisions to the candidate should be in writing. Once granted, a promotion cannot be rescinded.

6. In the case of a negative outcome at any level, the candidate for promotion can reinitiate this process in future years. In other words, a negative decision for promotion does not preclude renewal of the existing appointment.

Candidates have the right to appeal a negative decision. The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment

freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

For faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Faculty Specialist, the candidate can appeal a negative promotion decision to the Department. Within two weeks of receiving the appeal, the Department Chair must form an Appeals Committee consisting of three faculty members at or above the rank of the promotion who had not served on the initial review committee. The committee then has four weeks to consider the written appeal, meet with the candidate and any other relevant individuals, and send a written decision to the chair and the candidate. If the appeal is successful, then a new promotion review will be conducted, correcting the deficiencies of the prior one. If the outside letters were not the subject of the appeal, then they will serve as the outside letters for the new review.

If the appeal is denied, the candidate is not promoted and the chair of the review committee sends the candidate a letter explaining the grounds on which the appeal was denied. The candidate can appeal that decision to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The Dean, either alone or with the advice of an Ad-Hoc Committee that s/he forms for this purpose, can reverse the departmental Appeals Committee's decision on the grounds that (a) procedures were not properly followed or (b) the evaluation criteria were inadequate or improper. This decision is final and not subject to further appeal.

For candidates seeking promotion to Principal Faculty Specialist, the candidate may appeal a negative decision by requesting that the case be submitted to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the Provost because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

7. Individuals may choose to stay at a given rank indefinitely (i.e., are not required to seek promotion within any specific timeframe).
8. Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment and one or more secondary appointments. When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for promotion, the primary

appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows:

- i. If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the Chair or director of the secondary unit.
- ii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from a review committee in that unit. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the Unit's Plan of Organization.
- iii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized school, then there shall be a review committee established and a formal recommendation provided in a manner consistent with that unit's policies.

ix. Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions (Full Time Only)

Although neither mandated nor guaranteed, a salary increase from the BSOS Dean for promotions from full-time Faculty Specialist to full-time Senior Faculty Specialist or from full-time Senior Faculty Specialist to full-time Principal Faculty Specialist, can be negotiated by the Chair if it is matched by the Department. The amount can be augmented above the match if consistent across all candidates of the same rank in a given year within a department. The College will determine the minimum salary increases for promotion annually. Note that raises associated with promotion are independent of merit increases.

7. *Guidelines for Merit Increases*

The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJS) conducts annual reviews for PTK faculty in defined processes that are separate from T/TT merit processes. Any PTK faculty member whose total FTE across all appointments is 50% or greater will be eligible for merit as long as the faculty member has an appointment in the department. The faculty member will be given an annual review. The amount of the merit award can be prorated based on the FTE percentage within the department. These annual reviews will be conducted even in years when there will not be merit increases, and can be included in evaluations for years in which merit increases are available.

Post-Docs, Faculty Assistants, and other specialized PTK faculty: CCJS currently conducts individual reviews, with close involvement of the PI. The department feels that the job duties of these faculty vary greatly, and

the PI is in some cases the only individual who understands the job duties of the faculty member and whether they are meeting expectations.

8. *Guidelines for Termination*

All campus contracts include standard language for termination prior to end of appointment for both the University and the employee. Reasons for the University to terminate a contract prior to the end of appointment can be for reasons of performance or unit financial circumstances.

9. *Eligibility for College Awards*

Faculty Specialist can be nominated for the Outstanding Development/Administration Awards, Excellence in Service Award, and Excellence in Research Award.

Appendix A: Paternoster and Kimchi Award Processes

a. The Paternoster Memorial Lecture recipient will be determined each fall semester and invited to deliver a lecture the following spring or a mutually convenient time.

The Committee will solicit names of potential speakers from the faculty and in consultation with the Paternoster family. The committee will identify and recommend three rank-ordered finalists to the faculty for final determination.

b. The Kimchi Memorial Graduate Student Awards will be announced each spring semester. Award winners will be announced for the upcoming academic year (and may include summer). Award priorities and outcomes will follow the agreed upon processes:

- The department will approach the family ahead of time to discuss awards priorities from the various options in the gift agreement.
- Department and family will agree together on the wording of the call for applications; the wording should adhere to the endowment and gift language and ideas. The final call will be sent to the family for final approval before sending it out.
- The department will share detailed timelines with family, so the family will know when to expect the de-identified applications, and when to be prepared to meet with the award committee.
- Family will be given at least 10 days to review the de-identified applications.
- Family will meet with the committee to give their impressions of the applications.
- Committee will meet without the family present.
- The family will receive the committee decisions about who gets the awards, with written summary of their meeting and justifications. The family will be able to talk with the committee to ask questions before the awardees receive the decision.
- The family will be in touch with awardees following established development protocols.

Appendix B : CCJS APT Guidance

a. Consideration of Books in APT Process

Adopted by the Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice, UMD on May 29, 2020

Books that are to be considered in our tenure and promotion process are products of a long stream of research, which can be qualitative, quantitative, or both. Books should count as much as several peer reviewed journal articles and should stand on their own to indicate high-quality research (i.e., they are not just a collection of published journal articles). Having said this, journal articles are often incorporated into books, but are substantially different. Also, some journal articles come from the same body of research that was published in the book. It is up to the candidate to explain how the journal articles and the book relate and how they differ.

Book manuscripts that are accepted (i.e., the book is in press) will be considered as part of the candidate's record. In addition to published and accepted manuscripts, the department considers an advanced contract as an important step in the publication process for books. The extent to which the candidate will be credited for an advanced contract for a book manuscript depends on the contract and how it specifies the likelihood of publication. The candidate for tenure/promotion should discuss this explicitly in their candidate statement. Particularly important is whether the book has received the approval of the press' editorial board, and if not, at what stage is the book manuscript at the time of tenure/promotion consideration.

Given the potential for long gestation periods, the department recognizes that a book might be finished near the end of the tenure clock. This leaves little time for reviews to be published or for its results to be discussed in the literature. Here are some guidelines for assessment.

Quality of Press: As with journals, there is a meaningful prestige difference among academic presses that is a reasonable signal of quality. Examples of prestigious presses include, but are not limited to, University of California Press, Cambridge University Press, University of Chicago Press, Columbia University Press, Cornell University Press, Harvard University Press, MIT Press, University of Michigan Press, University of Minnesota Press, NYU Press, Oxford University Press, Princeton University Press, and Yale University Press.

Reviews: Not all books are reviewed, and an unreviewed book should not be assumed to be of lesser quality or rigor. However, when available critical reviews are helpful for evaluations.

Citations: Citations sometimes come very slowly for books, because some books get published first in hardcover and only later in softcover when they get more widely disseminated. It could take several years for a book to make a splash. Also, books published close to the assessment period will have few citations. Therefore,

a low citation count is not evidence against the book. However, citation counts can be compared to those for other books that were published at the same time.

b. Department Journal Rankings

Tier 1

Criminology

Journal of Quantitative Criminology

Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency

Justice Quarterly

Tier 2

Annual Review of Criminology

British Journal of Criminology

Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Crime and Justice

Criminology & Public Policy

European Journal of Criminology

Journal of Experimental Criminology

Law and Human Behavior

Tier 3

Crime and Delinquency

Criminal Justice and Behavior

Punishment and Society

Theoretical Criminology

Homicide Studies

Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology

International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology

Journal of Criminal Justice

Journal of Interpersonal Violence

Appendix C : Departmental Graduate Student Grievance Process

The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJS) is a scholarly community whose aim is to create an environment conducive to learning. This is accomplished through the promotion of responsibility and encouragement of honesty, integrity, and respect among students, faculty and staff ensuring that all act in accordance with our behavioral standards while supporting individual rights. We are committed to the principles of truth, objectivity, fairness, honesty, and free inquiry, which includes the freedom to express careful and reasoned criticism of data and opinion. As a citizen of the academic community, each member of CCJS is expected to assume the obligations of responsible citizenship.

It is the policy of CCJS to uphold conduct standards in a fair, respectful, and equitable manner. We are committed to serving as an advocate for, and resource to, student victims of crimes, harassment and other traumatic experiences. Per University policy, we are obligated as “Responsible University Employees”, which includes all University administrators, supervisors in nonconfidential roles, faculty members, campus police, coaches, athletic

trainers, resident assistants, and non-confidential first responders, to promptly notify the Title IX Officer in the Office of Civil Rights and Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM) of any report of sexual misconduct brought to our attention.

A graduate student grievance refers to treatment that is unethical, grossly unjust, uncivil, or otherwise creates a hostile learning or working environment from a faculty member, a staff member, or another student. If the nature of the grievance falls under the purview of existing University policies, the student should follow the relevant policy in section 1. If not, then the student should consult options detailed in section II and/or section III.

a. Existing University Policies

It is the policy of the University and CCJS to maintain the campus as a place of work for faculty, staff and students, free from all forms of harassment. Harassment in the workplace or the educational environment is unacceptable conduct and will not be tolerated. The University has established policies and reporting processes that address Title IX, sexual misconduct and discrimination. These policies can be found:

- Sexual Misconduct Policy
- Non-Discrimination Policy

The University has established policies and grievance processes for students who believe that their academic performance has been unfairly evaluated. For graduate students, the policy/process can be found:

- Arbitrary and Capricious Grading Policies

The CCJS Human Relations Committee (HRC) will act as the committee to hear grievances on arbitrary and capricious grading. If any member has a conflict of interest (i.e., named in the complaint), the chair of the Department will designate replacements. Per graduate school policy, a second graduate student will be added to the committee as designated by the Chair of the Department.

In addition, the Graduate Council has established grievance policies and procedures for Graduate Assistants who believe that they have been unfairly treated in respect to their employment and/or duties as a Research, Teaching or Administrative Graduate Assistant. The policy/procedure can be found:

- Graduate Assistants Grievance Procedures

b. Informal Process

We believe that it is best to facilitate, with dignity, the resolution of disputes and concerns at the lowest level possible; it is best to attempt a resolution with the parties involved. A student can always approach an advisor or Director of Graduate Studies in a confidential and informal manner to seek guidance. The HRC is available for confidential consultation by appointment (no matter is too

small). To assist in informal mediation, you may wish to contact the Graduate Student Ombuds Officer (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/Ombuds/>).

As a reminder, per University policy, we are obligated as “Responsible University Employees” (includes all University administrators, supervisors in nonconfidential roles, faculty members, campus police, coaches, athletic trainers, resident assistants, and non-confidential first responders) to promptly notify the Title IX Officer in the OCRSM of any report of sexual misconduct brought to their attention, including campus law enforcement. This means that seeking informal guidance for experiences with sexual misconduct will initiate a formal process.

If a graduate student believes that they have experienced or witnessed treatment that is unethical, grossly unjust, uncivil, or otherwise creates a hostile learning or working environment from a faculty member, a staff member, or another student, the student should attempt to resolve the matters locally, collegially, and informally. Third parties can confidentially report a grievance to the HRC if an incident directed against another graduate student is disclosed directly to them. All persons involved in the reported incident will then be interviewed.

A successful resolution to the informal process is one in which the directly involved graduate student felt the process was fair and was satisfied with the outcome. If the issue has not been resolved to the satisfaction of that student or the treatment cannot be stopped through informal means, the graduate student may elect to file a formal grievance.

c. Formal Departmental Process

If you are unable to achieve a mutually satisfactory resolution informally, then the next step is to initiate the formal grievance process. This process, conducted within CCJS is strictly confidential. This confidentiality extends indefinitely.

The confidential process proceeds in three phases. All persons involved in the following three phases are members of the university community. In the instance that one of the parties involved in the grievance is a member of the Human Relations Committee, the Chair of the Department will replace that member (or those members). If the grievance involves the Chair of the Department, the student may file the grievance with the Dean of the College. If the Dean is a party to the grievance, the student may file the grievance directly with the Dean of the Graduate School.

i. Phase 1

The process begins with the filing of a formal grievance with the chair of the HRC:

1. The student shall provide in writing a request to initiate a formal grievance process. This request must contain a clear description of the facts giving rise to the grievance including the following elements: names of the parties involved; date(s), time(s) and

location(s) of the actions/incidents; names of witnesses, if applicable; and the desired resolution of the grievance. The request must be signed and sent to the HRC Chair.

2. The written grievance must be filed by an enrolled student within 60 calendar days from when the incident occurred. A grievant who has withdrawn or been dismissed has 30 calendar days from the date they left the university to file.
3. The HRC will conduct an investigation and provide a determination within 30 business days of the filing of the grievance. This investigation can include interviewing the parties involved and consulting with appropriate campus administrators (such as University Counsel). The decision shall be provided in writing to the parties involved.
4. If the decision is accepted by the parties, the matter is deemed settled. If not, then the decision by the HRC can be appealed in Phase 2 of the process.

ii. Phase 2

If the resolution proffered by the HRC is deemed unacceptable, the grieving party can file an appeal with the Department Chair as follows:

1. Either party may initiate the appeal process by sending a written appeal to the Chair of the Department within 30 calendar days of the announcement of the decision by the HRC.
2. The written appeal must be signed and include the original description of the facts, a clear explanation of why the party filing the appeal found the outcome(s) of the HRC's proceedings and decision(s) unsatisfactory, and a statement of the desired resolution/remedy.
3. The Chair will acknowledge receipt of the appeal within five business days of receipt of the written appeal.
4. The Chair will proceed with one of two options: *(Panel is optional for the unit)*
 - a. The Chair will meet with the parties involved before reaching a decision. The Chair can confidentially consult with the appropriate persons who may be knowledgeable about the policies, practices and issues involved. The Chair shall endeavor to convey a written decision and, where appropriate, the remedy, to the parties involved within 30 calendar days of receipt of the letter of appeal. The written decision of the Chair will contain a statement of the issues, the Chair's findings of fact, the controlling policy provisions, the Chair's assessment regarding the merits of the grievance, and a disposition of the grievance, including the remedy and/or disciplinary actions. Or

- b. The Chair will convene a panel of two graduate faculty members and one graduate student (or staff person if one of the parties is a member of the staff) to confidentially review the matter and make a recommendation to the Chair. The panel will conduct its review in an impartial and unbiased manner. The Chair will provide a copy of the letter of appeal and other documentation as appropriate. The panel will offer to meet with the parties involved before reaching a decision. The panel can confidentially consult with the appropriate persons who may be knowledgeable about the policies, practices and issues involved. The panel shall endeavor to convey a written decision and, where appropriate, the remedy, to the parties involved within 30 calendar days of receipt of the letter of appeal. The written report of the panel will contain a statement of the issues, the panel's findings of fact, the controlling policy provisions, the panel's assessment regarding the merits of the grievance, and a recommended disposition of the grievance, including a suggested remedy and/or disciplinary actions. The Chair shall endeavor to convey a written decision and, where appropriate, the remedy, to the parties involved within 15 calendar days of receipt of the panel's report.
5. If the decision is accepted by the parties, the matter is deemed settled. If not, then the decision of the Chair can be appealed in Phase 3 of the process.

iii. Phase 3

If the resolution proffered by the Chair of the department is deemed unacceptable, either party can file an appeal with the Dean of the College as follows:

1. Either party may initiate the appeal process by sending a written appeal to the Dean of the College within 30 calendar days of the announcement of the decision by the Chair of the Department.
2. The written appeal must be signed and include the original description of the facts, a clear explanation of why the party filing the appeal found the outcome(s) of both the HRC and Chair proceedings and decision(s) unsatisfactory, and a statement of the desired resolution/remedy.
3. The Dean of the College will acknowledge receipt of the appeal within five business days of receipt of the written appeal.
4. The Dean of the College (or designee) will proceed with one of two options:
 - a. The Dean or their designee will meet with the parties involved before reaching a decision. The Dean or their designee can confidentially consult with the appropriate persons who may be knowledgeable about the policies, practices and issues involved.

The Dean or their designee shall endeavor to convey a written decision and, where appropriate, the remedy, to the parties involved within 30 calendar days of receipt of the letter of appeal. The written decision of the Dean or their designee will contain a statement of the issues, the Dean's or their designee's findings of fact, the controlling policy provisions, the Chair's assessment regarding the merits of the grievance, and a disposition of the grievance, including the remedy and/or disciplinary actions. Or

- b. The Dean or their designee will convene a panel of two graduate faculty members and one graduate student (or staff person if one of the parties is a member of the staff) to confidentially review the matter and make a recommendation to the Dean or their designee. The panel will conduct its review in an impartial and unbiased manner. The Dean or their designee will provide a copy of the letter of appeal and other documentation as appropriate. The panel will offer to meet with the parties involved before reaching a decision. The panel can confidentially consult with the appropriate persons who may be knowledgeable about the policies, practices and issues involved. The panel shall endeavor to convey a written decision and, where appropriate, the remedy, to the parties involved within 30 calendar days of receipt of the letter of appeal. The written report of the panel will contain a statement of the issues, the panel's findings of fact, the controlling policy provisions, the panel's assessment regarding the merits of the grievance, and a recommended disposition of the grievance, including a suggested remedy and/or disciplinary actions. The Dean or their designee shall endeavor to convey a written decision and, where appropriate, the remedy, to the parties involved within 15 calendar days of receipt of the panel's report.
5. If the decision is accepted by the parties, the matter is deemed settled. If not, then the decision of the Dean can be appealed to the Dean of the Graduate School as set forth in graduate policy (as discussed in section I).

Remedies suggested by the filing party must be reasonable and within actions that can be taken in accordance with university policy and appropriate statutes. The Department will endeavor to reach a just and equitable resolution in each case.

Within limitations that govern an ordered intellectual community, the CCJS department accords its members freedom of inquiry, expression and action. Along with this freedom, is the obligation to do so responsibly. When that bond is broken, we are committed to addressing the issues and concerns as outlined above.

Appendix D : CCJS Faculty Mentorship Guidelines

The faculty mentor/mentee relationship is a crucial one for CCJS.

a. Assignments

1. The department chair assigns TTK/PTK full time faculty mentors to faculty mentees based on overlapping interests and availability after consulting with mentees.
2. A record of all faculty mentors/mentees is kept by the CCJS Coordinator so that current relationships are up-to-date.
3. Faculty members not in their top rank (e.g., Full Professor for TTK, Principal Lecturer for PTK) will be assigned a mentor who is ranked higher than them.
4. When a mentor leaves the department, their mentees will be assigned a new mentor.
5. If a mentee is promoted to the rank of associate professor/senior lecturer and their mentor is also an associate professor/senior lecturer, then they can request a new or additional mentor who is ranked as a full professor/principal lecturer.
6. If a mentee wants to select an alternative mentor, the department chair will reassign the mentee to the preferred mentor.

b. The Relationship

Mentee/mentor relationships are expected to develop naturally and informally over time. In order to assure mutual respect from the beginning, the following guidelines are encouraged.

7. At their first meeting, the faculty mentee and mentor should discuss parameters of their relationship that should include the following:
 - a. The expectations between them with regard to types of information shared and the types of communications between them;
 - b. The mentee's professional goals;
 - c. The importance of the mentee's independence and autonomy;
 - d. The boundaries around appropriate spheres for discussion (e.g., private versus professional life choices);
8. The faculty mentee and mentor should plan regular formal or informal meetings at an agreed upon frequency.
9. The faculty mentee and mentor should revisit these parameters at least once a year.

Adoption and Amendment of Plan of Organization

This Plan of Organization is adopted by the Department when approved by a majority of the votes cast at a meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

The Plan may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of assembly members at a regular meeting provided that all eligible voters have had at least two weeks' notice of the proposed amendment and the date upon which the amendment will be considered.

The Plan of Organization will be reviewed every three years by an Ad-Hoc Committee of three Faculty Advisory Committee members selected by the faculty.

This version was revised on XXX, 2022.