

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

(With revisions approved 1998, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2018)

General Statement	2
Positions in the Department	
Assistant Professor	2
Associate Professor	2
Professor	3
Emeritus	3
Procedures for Search Committees for New Appointments	3
Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Decisions	4
Committee Structure and Voting Procedures	4
1. Candidacy for Promotion	4
2. APT Subcommittees	4
3. Emeritus Advisory Subcommittee	5
Evaluation of Candidates	
1. Pre-tenure Review	5
2. Promotion and Tenure	5
3. Emeritus	7
The Reports	
1. Promotion and Tenure, and Pre-tenure Review	7
2. Emeritus	9
Procedures on Confidentiality in Department of History APT Searches	9
Procedures for Forwarding Decisions to the Next Level of Review	10
The Appeals Process	10
Procedures for the Third-Year Review of Untenured, Tenure Track Faculty	10
Policy on Periodic Review of Faculty Teaching	12
Revision of Guidelines	13
Distribution to New Faculty	13
Appendices	14

GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
(May 1983; revised 1984, 1988, 1991, 1993, 1998, 2005, 2008, 2018)

General Statement

Decisions regarding tenure and promotion are a test of the History Department's adherence to excellence in scholarship and teaching and an exercise of its self-government. When the Department votes for tenure, it asks the University to make a permanent commitment to an individual. There is no more effective or sure way to shape the future of the Department, the fields of study and research that it offers, and the students it will attract than through such decisions. This is, then, a serious task that requires the utmost sensitivity to the various communities served by the Department: the undergraduate and graduate students, the community around the University, the state, and the historical profession. All of these groups will benefit from the development of high standards of teaching and research, and the national reputation that is accorded to the Department.

The elusiveness of this goal presents a challenge. Teaching and scholarship can be measured by numbers of students taught or articles and books produced, but the value and importance of such efforts are far more difficult to assess. Specialization of some fields of history may be so marked as to make comparison with other fields obscure at best. Consequently, there cannot be one set of specific expectations for all sub disciplines of history. The form of scholarship and the modes of teaching will often vary from field to field. This does not mean, however, that standards of quality should vary. The judgment of merit may be difficult, but it is similar to the essential task of the historian that is to measure and weigh the importance of facts and the relevance of ideas and convey them to others. Similarly, identification of quality and transmission of intellectual standards to future generations of students are the chief aims of tenure and promotion.

In setting its standards, the Department also asserts its commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action. It views both of these commitments as positive aids in achieving quality and diversity, which are among the most important goals of higher education. All tenure track positions for historians should be advertised in the American Historical Association's newsletter *Perspectives* and in other appropriate publications.

All proceedings of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee and its subcommittees are to be regarded as strictly confidential. Such proceedings are to be conducted as set forth in the Human Relations Code or the Faculty Handbook without violation of the rights of candidates, with all specified channels of recourse to apply.

Positions in the Department

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

The assistant professorship is a tenure-track position requiring the completion of the Ph.D. degree. Most often, assistant professors will have little teaching experience and few publications. Thus the Department encourages persons of this rank to demonstrate a commitment to excellence in teaching and scholarship activities. Since this is a position of relative longevity and importance, the assistant professor will be expected to share in administrative and committee duties of the Department.

As stated in the Faculty Handbook (and in the University Policy on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure), each untenured tenure-track faculty member meets annually with the Department Chair for a review of his/her performance. The Department Chair shall prepare a written report on this meeting, including especially an evaluation of progress toward tenure. This report should be sent to the candidate and is available to the APT Committee when the person is evaluated for contract renewal, promotion, or tenure. The candidate should sign a copy of the report to acknowledge the candidate's receipt of the report, and the signed copy should be returned and kept by the Department Chair.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

This rank is awarded by the University acting upon advice of the Department that a candidate has demonstrated excellence in scholarship and teaching, and shows promise of continued growth in these areas. The Department will not vote for tenure without promotion. Of greatest importance in making this recommendation is the intellectual and professional achievement of the candidate as revealed in scholarship. The measure of this is contribution to general historical knowledge, importance and innovativeness in a field, and solidity of fact and interpretation--in short, the highest standards of the historical profession. Some evidence must be presented that the person has achieved a national reputation in his or her field of research. Normally the candidate will be expected to have a scholarly book (generally a monograph) published or accepted for publication, but scholarly excellence may also be demonstrated in a series of substantial and influential articles or in an edition of documents as specified below under "Promotion and Tenure." The candidate should demonstrate promise of continued growth of thought and research beyond the dissertation. The associate professor will also be a recognized teacher of merit and committed to the pedagogical goals of the Department and the University. Furthermore, the associate professor shall through service to the Department and the University demonstrate his or her willingness to share in administrative duties.

PROFESSOR

This rank is recognition of substantial and continuing achievement in the historical profession. The professor may best be defined as one who has made and continues to make important contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The professor has completed a second scholarly book (generally a monograph) or its equivalent in the time since becoming associate professor and has demonstrated a continuing commitment to teaching excellence. In addition to achieving stature in the larger historical profession, a professor assumes responsibility within the Department for constructive participation in committees, advising of students, and interaction with colleagues, demonstrating the responsible exercise of power. A professor, in other words, serves to represent for junior faculty the highest standards of professionalism and collegiality.

EMERITUS

Associate professors or professors who have been members of the faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park for ten or more years, and who give their Chair or Dean proper written notice of their intention to retire, are eligible for nomination to emeritus standing. Only in exceptional circumstances may professors with fewer than ten years of service to the institution be recommended to emeritus standing. Emeritus standing shall be awarded primarily on the candidate's record of accomplishment in the areas of teaching and advisement, research, and service.

Procedures for Search Committees for New Appointments

The Chair shall appoint Search committees from permanent members of the Department who normally will be at or above the rank of the appointment. Under unusual circumstances, he/she may appoint to a Search Committee someone with special qualifications at or above the rank of the appointment from another department at the University.

All searches should be conducted in accordance with the document, "Procedures and Guidelines for Conducting Faculty and Staff Searches at UMCP," and the Department's "Affirmative Action: Principles and Policies" (See also "University Procedures Governing the Search Process for Permanent Faculty, Associate Staff, and Academic Administrators," approved February 1989). The College Equity Officer meets with the Search committee before it begins its work. The Department's EEO officer meets with the Search committee before it creates a short list of candidates and before it writes its final report to the Department, and submits a brief report that accompanies the committee's report.

All applications should be acknowledged; the Department is required to send an EEO card to every applicant, and a letter indicating which materials have been received should accompany this. Candidates

should also be informed if and when they have not been selected for the short list, and unsuccessful candidates on the short list should be informed when the appointment is made.

Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Decisions:

The following guidelines to be used in consideration of tenure and promotion are designed to ensure the maintenance of high scholarly and pedagogical standards in the Department as well as to accord fairness to the candidates.

SCHEDULE OF CONSIDERATION

- 1) Assistant professors without tenure. The Chair of the Department will notify assistant professors without tenure at the end of the 5th year of service at the University of Maryland in this rank that they are to be considered for promotion the following academic year. The Department may choose to promote a candidate before the 6th year even if he or she was originally appointed immediately after gaining the Ph.D.
- 2) Assistant professors with tenure. There is no specific promotion schedule for this position since tenure already exists. Persons of this rank, however, are encouraged to make rapid progress toward qualifying for associate professorship.
- 3) Associate professors without tenure. This position is available only to individuals hired from outside the Department at the associate professor level. University requirements note that associate professors without tenure shall be considered for tenure no later than one year before the end of their 3-year appointment.
- 4) Associate professors. The Department, in recommending tenure and promotion, voices its confidence and hope that each associate professor will progress to the position of professor.
- 5) Emeritus professors. The prospective emeritus professor should consult with the Chair directly after giving written notice to the University of his/her intention to retire in order to conform to the University schedule for the proceeding.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND VOTING PROCEDURES

1. Candidacy for Promotion

Each fall, the Department elects a Standing Nominating Committee, as described in the Plan of Organization (V.D.3). This Committee shall survey all potential candidates for promotion. Individual members of the Department may place their own or a colleague's name in nomination. The Committee shall make its nominations for consideration for promotion by April 1. The Committee should inform candidates whether they have been nominated. Self-nominations and individual nominations may also be made to the APT Committee by April 10. (This is the deadline for any "re-nominations" or "appeals" by aggrieved candidates.) The APT Committee shall meet no later than May 1 to vote on which candidates shall be considered for promotion.

2. APT Subcommittees

The Department Chair, in consultation with the chair of the Standing Nominating Committee, shall appoint all promotion subcommittees by May 15. Candidates have the right to consult with the Department Chair on the composition of the subcommittee. Normally, the chair of the subcommittee should be a professor, with two other faculty chosen from the APT Committee membership. All faculty members of APT subcommittees must be tenured, and at least two of the three faculty members must be at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered. At the request of the candidate, the Department Chair may add to the subcommittee an additional professor from another department within the University of Maryland, to assist in the evaluation of research in a field unfamiliar to History Department faculty. This subcommittee member will be a non-voting member of the APT Committee. **In the case of an APT Search Sub-committee, other members include one graduate student selected by the Search**

Sub-committee. The Chair of the Department should notify the officers of the Graduate Student Association each year of the names of all faculty members who may be candidates for promotion during the following two years so that data on teaching evaluations will be available even if the candidate is on leave. Faculty members of the subcommittee for each candidate (regardless of whether students serve on the subcommittee) will be primarily responsible for judging the teaching effectiveness as well as the research and service of the candidate.

In addition to gathering documentary evidence, the subcommittee will meet with the candidate to help the subcommittee understand the fullest significance of the candidate's work, teaching, and service. If, in the course of its investigation, the subcommittee encounters additional information not previously discussed with the candidate, it shall meet with the candidate again to discuss the additional information. Should that information concern violations of the Human Relations Code such as the "Statement on Sexual Relationships and Professional Conduct," the subcommittee should not investigate that information but rather refer it to the Department Chair and (if appropriate) to the EEO Officer for action by the adjudication procedures established by the University.

The same procedures should be followed in first appointments, and in renewal of contracts for assistant professors after the first two years of service.

The subcommittee for each candidate shall prepare a descriptive report and a draft evaluative report for the APT Committee's use. These reports must be available one week in advance of the APT Committee meeting to discuss the candidate's promotion and/or tenure.

In drafting his or her own report and in making subcommittee reports available to the candidate, the Chair of the Department will be guided by University policy as set out in the document "Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty". The Plan of Organization for the History Department of the University of Maryland, College Park Campus, determines the composition of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each member of the APT Committee has one vote. Votes must be tabulated and reported by the rank of the eligible members. Eligible members of the APT Committee are those full-time faculty, excluding the Chair or Dean, who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion or appointment.

3. Emeritus Advisory Subcommittee

As soon as possible after an eligible faculty member gives notice of his/her intention to retire, the Chair will appoint an Emeritus Advisory subcommittee composed of professors to consider appointment to emeritus status.

EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES

1. Pre-tenure review

1) The initial appointment is normally for three years, subject to termination at the end of the first year (see Faculty Handbook or University Policy on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure). The assistant professor is reviewed at the end of the second year for renewal to a second three-year term (see above under "Candidacy for Promotion"). The review procedure is similar to that described below for promotion and tenure decisions, except that publication of a monograph or its equivalent is not required, and outside letters are not obtained.

2) If an associate professor is initially appointed to that rank (rather than promoted), the appointment may or may not carry immediate tenure. If it does not, then according to the Faculty Handbook, the appointment is for a period of three years and shall terminate at the end of that period unless the appointee is notified in writing that he or she has been granted tenure. An associate professor who is appointed without tenure shall receive a formal review for tenure which must be completed no later than one year prior to the expiration of the three-year appointment.

2. Promotion and Tenure

Upon notification, each candidate is encouraged to submit to the Promotion Advisory subcommittee all published and unpublished scholarly works, and any evidence of quality of teaching and University

service, in addition to that provided by departmental sources as described below. The candidate may also include his or her comments on those materials. These comments should include evidence as to the quality and standing of the journals and presses in which the candidate's publications have appeared, since this evidence will be needed by higher-level review committees (see Faculty Handbook). Committee members should place such materials on reserve in the departmental main office as early as possible for consideration.

1) Scholarship: In evaluating a candidate for promotion and tenure, scholarship is given the highest priority. There are many justifications for the predominance of this criterion. The standards of the historical profession are based upon scholarship. The international community of historians is bound together primarily by research and publication. Insofar as the members of the Department reflect the highest traditions of the profession, they bring credit to the University, which in turn aids in recruiting outstanding students and faculty. Moreover, intellectual achievement is often a good index to teaching. To convey the excitement of research and discovery is part of the responsibility of an excellent teacher.

The purpose of scholarship is the advancement and diffusion of knowledge. The Department affirms this purpose. For promotion to the rank of associate professor the Department expects the candidate to have made a substantial contribution to historical knowledge and to demonstrate promise of continued growth of thought and research beyond the Ph.D. dissertation.

The major criterion for promotion to associate professor with tenure is scholarly achievement, and the demonstration (or the clear potential for) prominence and recognition in the candidate's field. Candidates for promotion must have established or be well along towards establishing a national reputation. Especially for historians working in non-U.S. fields, the Department may deem significant evidence of recognition abroad, particularly in the candidate's country or region of study.

Because the normal form of publication of research in history is the book-length monograph, candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor will usually be expected to advance knowledge in this form. In some cases a body of substantial scholarly articles may be an alternative to the monograph. In such instances, candidates for promotion shall submit to the Promotion Advisory subcommittee evidence for the influence of their work. Scholarly editions of documents may also be an alternative, provided that such works constitute substantial contributions to scholarship and are in the highest traditions of scholarly endeavor in their methods of selection, authentication of text, and annotation. As with the monograph, evidence is needed that the documentary edition or body of articles represents a substantial contribution to knowledge. Edited anthologies or proceedings of meetings, textbooks, compilations of data, or bibliographies may be significant scholarly contributions but will not be considered equivalent to research monographs. A collaborative work shall be evaluated in consultation with co-authors and/or the publisher and the candidate credited in proportion to his/her contribution.

Firsthand acquaintance with a candidate's scholarship is the responsibility of every member of the APT Committee. The judgment of members of the subcommittee and other members of the Department shall be given greatest weight in evaluating a candidate's scholarship, but evidence is also needed from scholars outside the Department. Sometimes, the Department may solicit signed readers' reports from publishers, and, in accordance with University guidelines, the subcommittee must solicit letters of evaluation from four or more leading scholars in the field, chosen from a list that includes at least two letters from persons nominated by the candidate. Not more than one-half of the letters shall be from persons nominated by the candidate.

Promotion to professor is of a different order from that to associate professor. No arbitrary timetable forces a decision on this change in rank, which permits the Department to require the fullest possible evidence of achievement in scholarship, teaching, and service. While the promotion to associate professor rests partly on the promise of the candidate, the candidate for professor must demonstrate the fulfillment of that promise in all areas of professional life.

Promotion to professor requires significant publications beyond the standards set for the associate professor, usually including a book-length study or its equivalent as defined above. The publication of additional scholarship, however, is not automatically considered sufficient for promotion. In keeping with University guidelines, a candidate for promotion to professor must demonstrate a national reputation for scholarship. This reputation may be established in part by letters from leading scholars in the field, published reviews and/or reprintings of the candidate's work, prizes, grants and fellowships, offices in

professional organizations, invitations to serve on peer review committees for organizations outside the University, invited presentations, and the like.

The Promotion Advisory subcommittee shall solicit letters of evaluation from four or more widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that includes individuals nominated by the candidate. At least two letters and at most one-half of the requested letters shall be from persons nominated by the candidate. Candidate-solicited letters of recommendation should not be permitted in the evaluation process. If the candidate has done substantial work involving specialized information and/or methods from other disciplines, the Promotion Advisory subcommittee shall, on request of the candidate, obtain the opinion of additional referees in the discipline(s) involved. Referees will be asked only to evaluate the quality of scholarship and the standing of this work in the field. These letters should accompany the final reports of the Promotion Advisory subcommittee, but they cannot be considered decisive in granting tenure and promotion. That decision rests clearly with the Department. In requesting outside letters, it should be made clear to what extent these can be kept confidential under current University policies and applicable laws.

The candidate is responsible for defining the subfield(s) of history in which his or her research should be evaluated, and for providing a list of four to six persons in that field who may be consulted for evaluation. The committee must use at least two of those names.

2) Teaching: The primary function of the History Department is instruction in the findings and methods of historical research. To qualify for promotion, a candidate should demonstrate high regard for this activity and give ample evidence of accomplishment. Although the measurement of teaching is difficult, there are established standards and procedures that may be of some help. These include departmental evaluation forms, H.U.A. evaluations, and graduate student surveys. Members of the Promotion Advisory subcommittee should also visit the classes and examine course structures, assignments, and readings.

The summary of student evaluations should include both the evaluations of the candidate and the averages of those of a comparable group of other faculty in the Department.

It must be recognized in making such evaluations that the popularity of an instructor may relate to elements of his or her personality, relation of a course to professional prerequisites, departmental requirements, or general accessibility of a field. Thus the quality of instruction and efforts of the candidate to improve his or her teaching should be decisive. Mediocrity in the classroom will be regarded as an obstacle to promotion.

3) Service: Each member of the Department is expected to participate in administration and governance. Increasingly this is a time-consuming job, and in fairness to all, it is an activity that everyone should share. With advancing rank, demonstrations of responsibility and collegiality become more important as members of the Department are required to exercise increased authority as committee members, graduate advisors and APT voters. Although administrative duties must not be considered adequate substitutes for scholarship in promotion and tenure decisions, the quality of service must be evaluated.

As outlined in University guidelines, service may take many forms. In addition to departmental service, a faculty member may provide valuable service to the larger institution; to the profession and higher education; or to the community, school systems, and governmental agencies. Moreover, the Faculty Handbook states: "Service activity shall not be expected or required of junior faculty to the point that it interferes with the development of their teaching and research."

3. Emeritus

The Emeritus Advisory subcommittee will consult departmental records to evaluate the candidate's record of accomplishment in the areas of teaching and advisement, research, and service.

THE REPORTS

1. Promotion and Tenure, and Pre-Tenure Review

University policy requires the departmental APT Committee to prepare two reports on each candidate for promotion or tenure or pre-tenure review. In addition, the Department's EEEO officer submits a brief report

accompanying each subcommittee report to the APT on decisions regarding promotion and tenure, in accordance with the Department's Affirmative Action: Principles and Policies document.

A. **Descriptive Report.** The first report should be descriptive, setting out in a factual way all of the candidate's activities and achievements in teaching and advisement, in research, scholarship and creative activity, and in service. It should always include details of the candidate's programmatic contribution in terms of, for example, advising and the number and nature of courses taught. Relevant details of the candidate's career in institutions other than the University of Maryland should be included. The Descriptive Report should take the form of a narrative in which the wording is precise and neutral.

In conformity with University policy, the Descriptive Report shall be shown to the candidate before the departmental APT Committee meets. The candidate has the right to correct factual errors in the Descriptive Report and to append an optional Personal Statement to the Descriptive Report that shall indicate any disagreement with the subcommittee's version of the facts and other such information that the candidate chooses to present before it is distributed to the APT Committee. The candidate should sign and date the Descriptive Report to signify that he or she has reviewed the report and been given an opportunity to comment on the information presented. All persons involved in the review process, if any, shall see both the Descriptive Report and the appended Personal Statement.

B. **Evaluative Report.** The second report is the Department APT Committee Report. In accordance with University policy, this report should include an evaluation of the candidate in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service, a record of the vote of the eligible voting members of the departmental APT Committee and the reasons for the recommendation. If the report is not unanimous, the report should discuss the reasons for the negative votes and abstentions. The second report must be evaluative. It should comprise a rigorous, balanced and comprehensive appraisal of all aspects of the candidate's professional contribution, together with a frank discussion of the criteria that the subcommittee applied and of the process by which it reached its conclusions. A draft of this report should be prepared by the APT subcommittee prior to the departmental APT Committee meeting to discuss the candidate. To facilitate significant, wide-ranging discussion in the APT Committee, this draft should not assume the role and tone of advocate until its conclusion. The draft report should be revised, as appropriate, to reflect the views of the eligible members of the departmental APT Committee.

The weight placed upon individual criteria may vary depending upon the level at which promotion is being considered, but the evaluative report should invariably address the following areas.

(i) **Scholarship.** In its assessment of the candidate's published work, the report should be modeled on the best peer reviews in appropriate professional journals. It should address the contribution made by the work to general historical knowledge, its importance and innovativeness in the candidate's field, and the solidity of fact and interpretation. Evidence that the candidate has achieved a national reputation in his or her field should be presented where appropriate. Such evidence will typically take the form of outside evaluations, the essence of which should always be incorporated. The report must seriously engage these issues and make clear the nature of all findings that result from this process.

(ii) **Teaching & Contribution to Academic Programs in the University of Maryland.** The report should incorporate the results of class evaluations and of all surveys conducted at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The gist of any letters received from the student body should be incorporated. This section should include a frank discussion of the impressions formed by subcommittee members during visits to the candidate's classroom. Attention should be given to any special or innovative contribution made by the candidate to academic programs within the Department and/or the University. Programmatic demands in individual fields vary considerably: in some smaller fields advising, teaching and administrative obligations are disproportionately heavy. In appropriate cases the report should recognize that fact. Reflecting the prominence given to graduate education on this campus, the report should pay particular attention to the candidate's contribution to and effectiveness in the graduate program.

(iii) **University and Community Service.** The report should cite and evaluate the candidate's contribution to departmental and University governance and his or her service to the wider community.

(iv) **Professional Service.** The report should cite any special activity in or service to the historical profession and evaluate the impact of that service on his or her standing within the profession.

Consideration of these four areas of activity will constitute the basis for the departmental APT Committee's recommendation. The conclusion of the report should make a clear case for the departmental APT Committee's recommendation for or against promotion or tenure, indicating whether or not the Committee's decision is unanimous. In all cases this recommendation should include some estimate of the candidate's promise for the future. Dissenting opinions, if offered in writing by eligible voting members of the departmental APT Committee, should be appended to the report, and forwarded to the next level of review provided they are supplied within one week after the meeting. Neither the APT Committee report nor the dissenting opinions are made available to the candidate. Any written dissenting opinions that become part of the APT dossier shall also be made available to the APT Committee.

2. Emeritus

The Emeritus Advisory subcommittee will prepare a single draft report which will describe and evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching and advisement, research, and service. The report must either recommend or disapprove the awarding of emeritus status. The departmental APT Committee will then consider this draft, and vote to accept (possibly with revisions) or reject it. Faculty holding the (non-emeritus) rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered are eligible to vote. If the vote favors award of emeritus status, the final report will then be sent to the next level as prescribed by University policy.

PROCEDURES ON CONFIDENTIALITY IN DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY APT SEARCHES Adopted by the Department Assembly 12 May 2008

1. ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION

Electronic communication is never completely secure. In order to reduce the risk of confidential material leaking from those authorized to see it, the sending of collective emails to the APT is discouraged. For those who want to discuss the search or candidates through electronic means a Drop Box will be created. This Drop Box will be a secure email folder available only to members of the Department APT. At the conclusion of the search, the Drop Box would be archived and closed.

2. EMAIL

Email communication with the Search Committee is permitted up to two days before the drafting of the Report.

3. APPLICANT FILES

Applicant files must remain in the Department office; APT members may peruse them there but cannot remove or copy them. Search Committee members may be permitted to take files out of the central office, but must sign them out. Copying of confidential material in the files is not permitted. Confidential material in applicant files consists of letters of recommendation (which are given under the assurance of confidentiality), the personal letter of application, and any other material of a personal nature regarding the candidate.

4. JOINT SEARCHES

In the event of joint searches, members of the History Department APT may not communicate confidential information with any member of the other Department unless they themselves are members of the other Department's APT.

5. SEARCH COMMITTEE REPORTS

All Reports of the Search Committee will be in hard copy, i.e. paper form only. They will not be distributed through email. They will be placed in sealed envelopes, stamped confidential, and placed in the mail boxes of APT members. At the end of the APT meeting, they will be collected and destroyed.

6. APT CHAMBER

Private conversation and communication between individual members of the APT is encouraged in personnel matters. The appropriate venue for discussion of Search Committee Reports and recommendations is the APT chamber. Everything said in that chamber is to be regarded as confidential and should not be made public knowledge.

PROCEDURES FOR FORWARDING DECISIONS TO THE NEXT LEVEL OF REVIEW

The tenure, promotion, or emeritus case shall go forward to the next level of review if more than half of the eligible (and voting) faculty vote cast is favorable or if the recommendation of the Chair is favorable. The report should not give a breakdown of the votes by rank, but state only (i) vote of eligible faculty and (ii) vote of all others. If both the eligible faculty and the Chair's recommendations are negative, the case shall be reviewed by the Dean to ensure that the candidate received the substantive and procedural due process rights defined in the University Guidelines. If the Dean believes that the candidate has not received due process, he/she shall direct the Department to reconsider. The candidate may withdraw from his or her review at any time prior to the President's decision.

The chair of the APT subcommittee works with the Department Chair to prepare the revised version of the evaluative report, reflecting the discussion in the APT Committee meeting.

The Chair of the Department shall make a separate written recommendation regarding promotion and/or appointment to the next level. It shall be transmitted to the Dean and shall be made available to all eligible members of the APT Committee (but not to the candidate).

Upon completion of the Department's promotion and tenure review, the Chair shall within two weeks of the date of the decision; or, in the case of an emeritus decision, he/she shall within ten calendar days of the vote: (1.) inform the candidate whether the recommendation of the APT Committee and the Chair were positive or negative (including specific information on the vote and 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. The Chair of the APT subcommittee shall review this letter to ensure that it accurately summarizes the considerations regarded as relevant by the APT Committee. If the Department Chair and the APT subcommittee chair are unable to agree on appropriate language and contents of the summary letter, each shall write a summary letter to the candidate. In the event of a denial of tenure, promotion, or recommendation for emeritus status, such communications should be sent to the candidate by certified mail.

THE APPEALS PROCESS

For further information on the Guidelines and Procedures for Appeals, consult the current UMCP Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty.

PROCEDURES FOR THE THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF UNTENURED, TENURE TRACK FACULTY Adopted 21 September 2009

Purposes

The Third-Year Review process is an important moment in the career of an untenured faculty member. Yet neither the University nor the Department provide very specific guidelines as to how this Review is to be conducted, and how the Report it produces should be framed. It is merely stipulated in the Departmental Guidelines for APT and Tenure that Third-Year Reviews must follow the same procedures as the tenure review with two exceptions: first, letters from outside reviewers are not sought, and, second, the Report will not be shared outside of the Department. The Third-Year Review process would benefit from clarification of its purposes and procedures, although it is to be expected that there will be variations of emphasis and attention in the Reports that are produced.

The Third-Year Report is produced by a sub-committee of the APT. It should address two issues. First, a recommendation should be made as to whether a second three year contract should be issued to the candidate. Second, an evaluation will be presented as to the candidate's progress towards the mandatory sixth-year tenure review. These two issues are related, although they are not inextricably linked. A candidate who is clearly failing in every sector of his or her performance is not likely to be renewed. On the other hand, a candidate who is performing well in teaching and service, but whose scholarship is developing more slowly is likely to be confronted with a specific injunction as to what needs to change to present a strong tenure portfolio.

Procedure

The Report will register the faculty's assessment of how the candidate is progressing towards tenure and it

will contain specific suggestions as to what, if anything, the candidate needs to do to enhance her or his prospects for presenting a strong tenure portfolio. Ideally, candidates should present evidence of substantial movement towards the completion of a research project that will result in the publication of a sufficient body of high quality scholarship to justify an eventual tenure review. In the teaching area, the candidate should demonstrate a proficiency in communicating material to students which expands knowledge and stimulates critical thinking. In addition, but at a distinctly lower order of priority, there would typically be evidence of fulfillment of service obligations.

The Third-Year Review Report should identify the strengths and the weaknesses in all the relevant areas of the candidate's performance. Perceived problems in the candidate's teaching performance must be identified. If there are inadequacies in the scholarship, they, too, must be clearly spelled out. It may not be possible in the Report to identify an exact program of action to remedy deficiencies in the teaching or scholarly record. A program of action may be suggested in order to address the problems identified. Ongoing mentoring around such a program should be provided by the Chair, the prior mentor (who ceases to be an official mentor after the successful completion of the Third-Year Review) and other member of the Department, including the members of the Committee who are willing and able to help.

The sub-committee of the APT should inform candidates well in advance what is expected of them in terms of the review, and what material they should provide to the committee. Normally, they can be expected to provide copies of their published and unpublished scholarship to both the committee and to the whole APT. This can be done either electronically or in hard copy. Candidates should write a short personal statement of three or four pages which will locate their published and unpublished scholarship within a wider body of historiography, describes the progress made in their scholarship, and explains where they expect to be by the time they reach their tenure year.

The APT sub-committee should receive syllabi and course outlines from the candidate and they should have access to all the teaching evaluations. A different member of the sub-committee should observe each of the classes offered by the candidate.

Committees should meet with the candidate to hear the candidate talk about his or her work and plans for the coming three or more years. The content of the meeting should range across the three spheres of scholarship, teaching and service. The Committee should hear the candidate speak of his or her plans and contribution to each sphere of activity; most attention should be given to teaching and scholarship. This meeting should occur after the committee has attended the candidate's classes and after they have read the candidate's scholarship

This meeting with the sub-committee should be primarily an information gathering meeting. It is appropriate for the committee to ask questions of the candidate and to engage in discussion about any aspect of the candidate's professional performance. It is also an opportunity for the candidate to ask the committee questions about his or her progress, or any other question on which the candidate needs advice concerning their professional profile. The candidate must understand, however, that such discussion does not imply a position or commitment from the committee or any of its members concerning their judgment of the candidate's suitability for renewal or for tenure.

Aftermath

As with all APT proceedings, confidentiality as to the content and nature of the discussion is important to the preservation of fairness and collegial harmony. It is important also because of the damage that can be done to untenured faculty if they receive distorted versions of the discussion of their particular case. The sub-committee of the APT will present the Report for consideration by the full APT. The APT may accept, reject or amend the Committee's draft. Once the APT has adopted the Report it will be shown to the candidate by the Chair who will lead the candidate through the main findings and recommendations of the Report. Subsequent to this meeting, the candidate's mentor, the members of the sub-committee and other members of the APT should be available to consult with the candidate and provide guidance as to what needs to be done to present a strong tenure portfolio.

POLICY ON PERIODIC REVIEW OF FACULTY TEACHING

Adopted on 4 December 2017

The department endorses the periodic peer review of tenure-track and tenured faculty teaching, and it acknowledges that its documentation plays a crucial role in the evaluation process for promotion and tenure through the ranks, especially with regard to the assembly of a Teaching Portfolio by the candidate to accompany the file when the chair passes it on to the College and eventually University APT committees. The Teaching Portfolio is not included in the APT subcommittee report for the Department APT. Assistant and associate professors are evaluated every two to three years. The department endorses the periodic peer review of tenure-track and tenured faculty teaching. Assistant and associate professors are evaluated every two to three years (research leaves, sabbaticals, and other time away from campus may cause biannual reviews to be postponed for a year). Professors' teaching will be evaluated once every five years and will be considered, as with associates, in the fifth-year post-tenure review.

Each year those who are due for review will be assigned to another tenured faculty member who will conduct the evaluation. Faculty members may also suggest that a certain professor be assigned to review them. The associate chair will send out the request to those faculty members who are eligible to review (professors and associate professors in residence in a given year) along with the instructions for review. These questions are adapted from those posted at the Office of Faculty Affairs website and those directions provided by the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC). These guidelines are appended to this policy. Faculty members should respond to their reviews and keep a copy of both the review and their response for inclusion in an eventual teaching portfolio for use in the APT process. A final version of the review and the faculty member's response should be forwarded to the associate chair so that s/he can maintain records that will be incorporated into departmental Post Tenure review files. The associate chair will be responsible for contacting delinquent reviewers and seeing that the files are complete.

Reviews may be conducted either through a pre-announced classroom visit, or by reviewing recordings of classes made through Panopto or some other recording medium. If recordings are used in the evaluation process, the faculty member being reviewed should provide several different recordings that showcase different teaching methods. Reviews should also take into account syllabi and other teaching materials as well as other course development efforts.

Please consult the Peer Evaluation Guidelines that are provided by the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center (TLTC) and the Office of Faculty Affairs:
<https://faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/evaluation.pdf>

Please see below for a TLTC best practices summary, including an observation rubric.

Best practices:

(adopted from <https://umd.app.box.com/v/tlhc-peer-obs-guide>)

Central to the University's mission, we as faculty of a learning community should work collaboratively, as scholars, to share and support effective pedagogy and advance student learning. No matter how experienced or skilled we are at something, we can always benefit from the constructive and supportive feedback of our peers. We benefit the most when feedback is regular, timely, and from a diverse range of perspectives, so in some cases that may be a senior faculty member¹ in our own discipline and in others someone from another field with a particular area of expertise.

The goal of a peer teaching evaluation should be to provide both the instructor and the observer with an opportunity to have a reflective conversation about how we can advance student learning outcomes and make our teaching more effective, engaging, efficient, and equitable. Observations are "formative" in that they are not intended to score the sum of our ability, but rather to provide guidance on ways we can enhance our craft as scholarly teachers.

¹ For tenure-track faculty, the APT process requires that a tenured faculty member conduct an observation. However, the policy does not preclude faculty of any rank from serving as observers. All faculty are encouraged to arrange peer observation at least once a year and invite colleagues with a range of perspectives and expertise. See faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/evaluation.pdf for more guidance.

Recommended Observation Process

- 1) **Pre-Class Meeting** – The goal is to have a structured conversation about the course goals, your strategies for achieving them, and any challenges or questions that you would like to get more feedback on. See Appendix 1 for some possible discussion prompts.
- 2) **Classroom Observation** – At least one complete class meeting should be observed in the least-obtrusive manner possible for the course design and format. If a course has multiple components (e.g., full class meetings and smaller lab section) it may be beneficial to observe one of each meeting. See Appendix 2 for one approach to organizing observation notes.
- 3) **Post-Observation Meeting** – After the class meeting(s), both the observer and the instructor can have a structured conversation to reflect on each other's comments and discuss possible strategies for enhancing effectiveness, student engagement, course efficiency, and student outcome equity. See Appendix 3 for some discussion prompts.
- 4) **Synthesis & Documentation** - To document the observation procedure, both the observer and the instructor can prepare a summary reflection on the three meetings. Notes and feedback forms do not necessarily need to be included.

Revision of Guidelines

The Guidelines were amended to conform with the authoritative University document, the UMCP Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty (March 26, 1993). These departmental guidelines will be reviewed five years after adoption.

Distribution to New Faculty

All newly appointed faculty should be given a copy of these Guidelines.

Appendix 1

Pre-Class Meeting Conversation Prompts

Materials that might be helpful to have in front of you

- Course syllabi, assignments, assessments, ELMS page, etc.
- Student evaluations from previous semesters
- Feedback from any previous peer observations

By no means should this list constrain your conversation, but here are some prompts to help get you started:

Course Syllabus

- Does it articulate specific learning outcomes that you have for students in your course?
- Does it include items recommended on faculty.umd.edu/teach/syllabus
- Does it link to campus policies: <http://www.ugst.umd.edu/courserelatedpolicies.html>
- Does it have a detailed schedule that helps students understand the structure of the course and plan for major scheduled grading events (see go.umd.edu/msge)?

Assessment

- How do you assess student learning and performance? What, in your mind, constitutes solid evidence that they have achieved your goals for the course?
- To what extent are your expectations and assessment criteria communicated to students in advance of their efforts?
- What steps do you take to ensure that assessments are objective, fair, and appropriately calibrated to the expectations of the course?
- How do you assess whether the course was effective at the end of the semester?

Student Work

- What, if anything, are you expecting that students have done before coming to the upcoming class meeting?
- What, if any, strategies do you use to ensure that they have done the pre-class work?

Class Meetings

- What are your learning goals for students in the upcoming class meeting? How do you plan to help students achieve those goals?
- What strategies do you use to ensure that students are actively engaged during class meetings?
- What do you do to establish a positive, supportive, and inclusive classroom climate?

Feedback

- What feedback have you received in the past, whether from students or peers, and how have you addressed it? It may be helpful to review student evaluation reports together.
- Is there anything in particular that you would like to get some specific feedback on from your classroom observation?
- Do you have any concerns about how the presence of observers might affect the class meeting? What would make the observation as unobtrusive as possible?

Appendix 2

Class Meeting Observation Worksheet

By no means should this list constrain your feedback, but here are some things that might be included in your narrative.

Yes	Mostly	Somewhat	No
-----	--------	----------	----

Provide comments for each:

CLASS MEETING LOGISTICS				
The class meeting started and ended on time.				
The instructor appeared well-prepared for the class meeting.				
Objectives for the class meeting were articulated to students.				
In the context of the meeting's objectives, class time was used effectively.				
THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE				
All students appeared to be actively engaged in the class meeting.				
Student questions and input were encouraged and addressed in a respectful manner.				
The classroom felt like a positive, supportive, and inclusive environment.				
Tools, technologies, and/or materials used were effectively designed and helpful to learning.				
GOALS FROM PRE-CLASS MEETING Things that you hoped to observe or want to include.				

Post-Class Meeting Conversation Prompts & Written Narratives

By no means should this list constrain your conversation or written narratives, but here are some prompts to help get you started:

Instructor

- In the context of your stated objectives for that class meeting, how did you feel it went?
- Do you feel that the meeting was typical for that particular class? Why or why not?
- What specific aspects of the class meeting did you feel were particularly effective?
- What specific aspects of the class meeting could have been even more effective?

Observer(s)

- In the context of your stated objectives for that class meeting, how did you feel it went?
- What specific aspects of the class meeting did you feel were particularly effective?
 - What specifically did you observe that leads you to think so?
 - How might your own teaching benefit from having observed this?
- What specific aspects of the class meeting could have been even more effective?
 - What specifically did you observe that leads you to think so?
 - What strategies might the instructor consider in the future?
 - Which TLTC, College, or Departmental resources could be most helpful?
- What are your overall recommendations for how the instructor can advance student learning outcomes this semester? In future semesters?

If either of you are unfamiliar with the resources, events, and activities that the Teaching & Learning Transformation Center provides, it might be helpful to visit tltc.umd.edu together and spend a few minutes exploring the site.

Written Narratives

Each observer can prepare a written narrative to document the conversations, observation, and recommendations while it is still fresh in their mind. Try to be specific, constructive, and detailed in your summary so that it is useful to the instructor as guidance. You might consider summarizing:

- Observed strengths and evidence of improvement over time.
- Opportunities to be more effective, engaging, efficient, or equitable.
- Resources and activities that would be most beneficial for professional development.

After receiving the observer's narrative, the instructor can prepare a narrative reflecting on the observation experience, the feedback received, and plans for future development. The more specific you are about what you might try going forward, how it might improve learning, and how you plan to assess your effectiveness, the more easily you will be able to document how your teaching has advanced over time in a teaching portfolio.