

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
DEPARTMENT PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Purpose and Mission | 2 |
| Membership in the Department | 2 |
| Membership in the Faculty Advisory Committee | 2 |
| Governance | 2 |
| a. Department Faculty Advisory Committee | 2 |
| i. Executive Sessions | 3 |
| ii. Voting Rights | 3 |
| iii. Quorum | 3 |
| b. Chair of the Department | 3 |
| Committees | 3 |
| a. Awards Committee | 3 |
| b. Admissions Committee | 4 |
| c. Teaching Committee | 4 |
| d. Human Relations Committee | 4 |
| e. Comprehensive Exam Committees | 4 |
| f. Ad-Hoc Committees | 5 |
| Tenure and Promotion | 5 |
| a. Ranks | 5 |
| i. Tenure-Track Faculty | 5 |
| ii. Other Related Ranks | 6 |
| b. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion for Tenure-Track Faculty | 7 |
| i. Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor | 8 |
| ii. Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Professor | 9 |
| iii. Provisions Relating to Formal Promotion and Tenure Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty | 11 |
| iv. Promotion and Tenure Review for Tenure-Track Faculty | 11 |
| Guidelines for Professional Track Faculty | 21 |
| a. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Instructional Faculty | 21 |
| b. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Research Faculty | 31 |
| c. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Faculty Specialist Ranks | 40 |
| Adoption and Amendment of Plan of Organization | 46 |

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. 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.

d. 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 will join the committee on an ad hoc basis. The Chairperson will be appointed by the Chair of the Department.

e. Comprehensive Exam Committees

There are two comprehensive exams, theory and general, which each have their own committee. This comprehensive exam process is only relevant to doctoral students admitted prior to 2016 (a new curriculum began in 2016). All tenure-track faculty are assigned to one of the committees upon appointment to the Department. Service on the committee includes writing exam questions and grading the exams, which are given in January and June of each year. For each exam, there is a rotating schedule of which member will be responsible for organizing the exam, proctoring the tests and collecting the grades.

f. 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

i. 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.

ii. 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 books, 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 books, 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.

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

- i. 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.

- ii. 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 fulltime 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). |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Professional Experience</p> | <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> |
| <p>Contract Terms</p> | <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> |

i. *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.

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 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.

iii. *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.

iv. *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 representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Instructional Faculty.

v. *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.

vi. *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.

vii. *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](#).

viii. *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](#).

ix. *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 |
|--------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------|
|--------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Course Materials (e.g. syllabi, learning outcomes, assignments, student work, etc.)</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that includes the following:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that includes the following:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> <p>Sample of student work with your feedback</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that demonstrates a history of:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> <p>Sample of student work with your feedback</p> | <p>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:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> <p>Sample of student work with your feedback</p> |
| <p>Assessments (e.g. peer review, course evaluation summary, learning outcomes assessment, etc.)</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> <p>A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> <p>A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)</p> <p>Peer reviewed instruction and evaluation of teaching</p> | <p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> <p>A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)</p> <p>Peer reviewed instruction and evaluation of teaching</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 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. |

x. *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 Merit Increase.*

When merit funds are available, PTK Instructional Faculty will be assigned to one of three merit categories by the Department Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies according to their teaching evaluations (and performance in any other duties described in their contract): “exceeding expectations,” “meeting expectations,” or “performing below expectations.” The time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the of the last merit increase. The Departmental Chair will allocate available merit based on these rankings. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and increase in a formal letter from the Chair.

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.

ii. 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.

iii. 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.

iv. 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.

v. *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](#).

vi. *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.

vii. *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.

viii. *Guidelines for Merit Increase.*

When merit funds are available, PTK research faculty will be assigned to one of three merit categories by the Department Chair and their direct supervisor according to a review of their CV: "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," or "performing below expectations." The time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the of the last merit increase. Available merit will be allocated based on these rankings and the available funding. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and increase in a formal letter from the Chair.

ix. *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.

x. *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 [campus policy](#)

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.

xi. 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.

1. Guidelines for Merit Increases

When merit funds are available, PTK Faculty Specialist will be assigned to one of three merit categories by the Department Chair and their direct supervisor according to a review of their CV: "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," or "performing below expectations." The time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the of the last merit increase. Available merit will be allocated based on these rankings and the available funding. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and increase in a formal letter from the Chair.

2. 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.

3. Eligibility for College Awards

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

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 approved on February 2, 2017.