

The College of Information Studies Procedures for Review, Appointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty

APPROVED BY COLLEGE APT
MAY 3, 2019

This document specifies procedures for the review, appointment, and promotion of Professional Track faculty members who have a paid appointment in the College of Information Studies, University of Maryland, College Park (the “iSchool”). The procedures contained in this document are based on the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty (II-1.00(A)) and the University of Maryland Policy on Professional Track Faculty (II-1.00(G)). This document also references the College of Information Studies' Criteria for Review, Appointment, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty. These and any referenced College policies and procedures shall be publicly available online. New Professional Track faculty hires should be provided a copy of or a link to this document prior to appointment.

1. Policy

Professional Track faculty titles and ranks are grouped in four broad categories: Research Faculty, Instructional Faculty, Specialist Faculty, and Term-Limited Faculty (See Appendix A for a complete list of position titles used by the iSchool).

Professional Track appointments may be part-time, i.e., less than 50% full-time equivalent within the iSchool, or full-time, i.e. at least 50% within the iSchool. Appointment of a part-time Professional Track faculty member to full-time is treated as a new appointment and is subject to the review procedures outlined in this document, unless the individual has previously held a full-time appointment with that rank and title. If an individual has previously held a full-time Professional Track position within the UMD iSchool, they may be appointed with the same rank and title as a part-time appointment or reappointed full-time to the same rank and title with no additional review.

The iSchool considers all Principal level titles generally to be parallel to Professor, albeit without tenure. Of particular note, the PTK Criteria specify teaching requirements for Principal Lecturer that parallel requirements for TTK Professor (e.g. "national or international reputation"), which sets a more rigorous set of expectations on Principals than the University does (in II-1.00(A)). Likewise, the service criteria for Principal Faculty Specialist parallel requirements for a TTK Professor and are more rigorous than the University's.

Except for the term-limited faculty position titles, there is no mandated minimum, maximum, or expected term length or time to promotion for Professional Track Faculty appointments. Professional Track Faculty appointments are renewable except where specifically limited by the University. As noted above, renewal of an appointment with the same title and rank is an administrative action that is outside the scope of these procedures.

The iSchool will use the 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 Professional Track policies and professional resources. In accordance with University policy (II-1.00[A]), Professional Track faculty shall be given progressively longer contracts when possible.

Voting

In considering and voting for Professional Track Faculty promotion cases, all rank appropriate Professional Track Faculty will be eligible to participate in and vote on appointment and promotion cases, regardless of their title and designation within the Professional Track. Faculty members full-time in the iSchool who are currently at the rank of Senior Lecturer, Senior Faculty Specialist, and Associate Research Faculty positions will be eligible to vote on promotion cases for Senior Lecturer, Senior Faculty Specialist, and Associate Research Faculty positions. Faculty members full-time in the iSchool who currently hold the rank of Principal Lecturer, Principal Faculty Specialist, or Research Professor (or other titles equivalent to "full" rank) will be eligible to vote on promotion cases for Senior Lecturer, Senior Faculty Specialist, Associate Research, Principal Lecturer, Principal Faculty Specialist, or Research Professor Faculty positions.

For all votes, a quorum of eligible individuals must be present or participating with at least a voice connection that can hear and be heard by all participants, and the vote shall be considered positive if a simple majority of those present vote in favor.

The results of all votes shall be reported to the APT committee and to the Dean. As unit head, the Dean is the hiring official, and the APT committee shall be informed of the Dean's decision.

The Dean may participate in all appointment and promotion cases with voice but no vote.

2. Appointment Reviews

When making initial appointments, the specific faculty title should correspond to the appointee's primary responsibilities, as indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank should be appropriate given the specific criteria for such rank, as described in the iSchool Review, Appointment, and Promotion Criteria for Professional Track Faculty.

2.1. Initial Appointment of Junior Professional Track Faculty

Requests for initial appointment to Lecturer, Faculty Specialist, and Assistant Research Faculty positions can be considered by the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (the APT committee) at any time. The minimally required materials are specified by the University in the Transmittal Form for Professional Track Faculty Promotion / New Appointments. Review materials provided for an initial appointment should include:

- Position description specifying title, rank, and expected duties
- Candidate's resume or CV, signed and dated
- At least two, and no more than three reference letters speaking to the candidate's qualifications for their primary duties. For new Professional Track hires, reference letters collected as part of the hiring process may be used for review of an initial appointment. (References are optional for part-time; required for full-time appointments).
- Statement from the candidate describing their approach and qualifications for the primary duties
- Materials or measures that demonstrate candidate's qualifications for the expected duties (Optional, included at the candidate's discretion)

- Interview feedback - Candidates for full-time Professional Track Faculty positions will participate in a campus interview during which they will meet with position-appropriate faculty, staff, and students, including, but not limited to, faculty in similar positions. For research and instructional faculty positions this visit will normally include a public presentation. Feedback from campus interviews will be collected by the APT Chair or a designee. Candidates for part-time Professional Track positions may be considered for appointment based on a phone or videoconference interview with at least one person instead of an on-campus visit, in which case the interviewer may provide feedback to APT verbally or in writing.

All written materials shall be made available to all eligible members of the College APT committee at least one week prior to the vote.

For faculty who will teach graduate courses, a second vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty for appointment to the Graduate Faculty of the University is also required.

Junior Lecturers are not eligible for promotion to Lecturer. However, they may, upon meeting the qualifications and completing an initial appointment review, be appointed as a Lecturer.

2.2. Initial Appointment of Senior Professional Track Faculty

Requests for initial appointment to Senior and Principal Lecturer; Senior and Principal Faculty Specialist; and Associate and Full Research Faculty can be considered at any time. The materials, committee, review procedures, and voting requirements for initial appointment Senior Professional Track Faculty positions are the same as those for promotion to Senior Professional Track Faculty ranks.

2.3. Appointment of Part Time or Term-Limited Professional Track Faculty

Appointments as Junior Lecturer, Lecturer, Faculty Specialist, and Assistant Research Faculty position that are less than 50% FTE within the iSchool (i.e., part-time), or as a term-limited Faculty Assistant, Post-Doctoral Scholar, or a Post-Doctoral Associate, are considered by the Appointments Subcommittee, a subcommittee elected by the APT consisting of at six members: a tenured faculty member as chair, two other tenured or tenure-track faculty members, and one member each from the Lecturer series, a Research Faculty series, and the Faculty Specialist series.

The materials provided for review of a part time or term-limited appointment will include: a position description, resume or CV, statement from the candidate speaking to their approach and qualifications, and feedback from interviews conducted by at least two faculty members or a faculty member and a staff member.

Votes of the appointment subcommittee may be conducted face-to-face or via e-mail. For a face-to-face vote, a quorum shall consist of more than 50% of the members who would be eligible to vote. For an email vote to be valid, the vote must be preceded by a discussion period of at least two days, and all members who are eligible to vote on the case must vote without abstention (except in the case of a conflict of interest). The vote shall be considered positive if a simple majority of eligible unconflicted committee members vote in favor. The tenured and tenure-track members of this subcommittee may also vote on appointment of part-time or term limited candidates to the graduate faculty.

The results of votes by the appointment subcommittee shall be reported to the APT committee and to the Dean. As unit head, the Dean is the hiring official, and the APT committee shall be informed of the Dean's decision.

2.4. Expedited Review of Initial Appointment of Full-Time Junior Professional Track Faculty

The Dean or his designee may designate initial full-time appointments to junior Professional Track faculty positions that must be urgently considered between the last regularly scheduled APT meeting of a semester and the first regularly scheduled meeting of the following semester for expedited review. This process shall only be used to meet urgent instructional needs. In such cases the expedited review will be performed by the appointments subcommittee (the same subcommittee that normally reviews part-time and term limited appointments), which may meet in person or by email. In either case, a unanimous vote of the eligible voters is required. Appointments made using the expedited review process are limited to two consecutive Fall or Spring semesters; summer teaching appointments for full-time faculty may not be made using expedited review. If the expedited review process is used, a full appointment review by APT (as described above, including a campus interview) must be conducted during the faculty member's first semester.

3. Promotion Reviews

Each position type has primary duties and may have secondary duties (other areas of significant activity). Candidates should provide materials that demonstrate their qualifications and accomplishments related to their primary and secondary duties, as specified in the Criteria for Review, Appointment, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty. The minimally required materials are specified by the University in the Transmittal Form for Professional Track Faculty Promotion / New Appointments. These materials can include, but are not limited to:

Teaching

Example Materials: Teaching materials (syllabi, assignments, etc.), Sample student work
Evaluative Materials: Course Evaluations, Peer review of teaching, Student outcomes (awards, placement, etc.)
References: Student or alumni references, Program directors, and others familiar with the candidate's teaching and education related work

Service

Example materials: Descriptions of programmatic innovations
Evaluative materials: Programmatic measures and outcome metrics, evidence of institutional adoption of innovations
References: Supervisor and/or others familiar with the outcomes of the candidate's service and administrative leadership activities

Research

Example materials: Peer-reviewed publications and presentations
Evaluative materials: Citation counts, venue impact measures, Keynotes and other invited presentations, awards and honors
References: Research leaders familiar with the candidates work

Process steps:

1. Faculty Member submits a request to be considered for promotion to the Dean or designee by September 15.
2. Faculty member shall work with the Dean or designee to select a Record Preparation Committee (RPC) and an RPC Chair by October 15.
3. College APT committee shall elect the RPC by November 15.
4. Candidate shall submit required materials to the RPC Chair by November 15.
5. RPC Chair will request space on the iSchool designated file repository from the iSchool Technology Officer by November 15 to house the faculty member's required materials.

The repository space will only be made available to the APT members who will be eligible to vote on the case at the time of the final vote on the case.

The RPC Chair will place all of the materials on the repository at the same time at least one full week before the APT meeting scheduled for the final vote case.

6. For promotion to Senior Lecturer or Senior Faculty Specialist positions the RPC should collect at least one and may collect up to three reference letters from individuals either employed by the University or external who are qualified to speak to the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments. For promotion to Principal Lecturer, Principal Faculty Specialist, or Associate or Full Research Faculty Positions the RPC must get three letters from well qualified individuals outside the University. When letters are requested, an effort must be made to solicit at least one letter from a reference suggested by the candidate. The RPC Chair will solicit letters from reviewers selected by the RPC by December 15, with a deadline receipt of February 1.

7. RPC will meet to vote that the required materials are complete and ready to go forward to the APT for the Faculty Member's promotion at least two weeks before the March APT meeting.

The time and location of all RPC meetings should be announced in advance to all faculty members who will (at the expected time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case. Any member of the APT who will (at the expected time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case may silently attend. The RPC may, at its option, invite non-members to speak, but they will have no vote.

An RPC will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus on any matter (e.g., the content of any document), voting shall be by secret ballot, and the vote results shall be reported to the APT.

8. The RPC chair will compose a document summarizing the candidate's promotion case at least one week before the March APT meeting.

The document will consist of:

- Relevant accomplishments that the candidate has made directly relating to the promotion case

- Measures and metrics of quality or impact providing evidence of the outcome of the promotion case
- RPC's recommendation that the case is ready to go forward to the APT

9. A full promotion packet shall be available to the APT committee at least one week before the APT meeting.

The RPC Chair shall include all of the submitted materials, including the summary document from the RPC on the repository.

A confirmation shall be sent to the APT members when the packet is available for review.

10. The candidate's promotion will be voted on during the March APT meeting.

11. Following the APT vote, the RPC will prepare an evaluative letter and recommendation for the Dean.

The letter will summarize the APT vote, recommendation, and the salient factors of the candidate's performance contributing to that recommendation.

The promotion materials and the evaluative letter will be submitted to the Dean.

12. The Dean will prepare an independent recommendation for the Office of the Provost.

For positions at the Senior, Associate, Principal or Full level, the Dean will prepare an independent recommendation and will forward the case to the Office of the Provost for review and approval.

The Dean's letter shall be available upon request to the members of the APT who were eligible to vote; and the candidate shall be informed of whether the Dean's recommendation was positive or negative. The candidate shall be notified of the final promotion decision in writing.

Outcomes:

- In cases of positive decisions regarding applications for promotion, the promotion shall be accompanied by an increase in compensation, subject to budget constraints and directives from University System of Maryland. Minimum increases in compensation shall be set annually by the Dean. Promotions may not be rescinded, and future appointments shall be to the faculty rank granted through the promotion process.
- In the event of a negative decision, the faculty member can appeal based on alleged violations of procedural due process that would have had a material effect on the decision. All appeals shall be handled according to the procedures established by the Provost's Office of Faculty Affairs and shall be initiated within the period defined in those procedures. For Professional Track faculty appointments that do not have maximum terms, as established in Policy II-1.00(A), a negative decision regarding an application for promotion does not automatically preclude renewal of the existing Professional Track appointment.

4. Other Reviews

4.1. PTK Review Committee

The PTK Review Committee performs two functions:

- 1) It conducts annual progress reviews for junior Professional Track Faculty (PTK) who are not in term-limited appointments, i.e. Lecturers, Assistant Research Faculty, and Faculty Specialists. For PTK faculty who have not yet attained the highest position title in their series, it conducts a review every other year. These reviews focus on faculty development, intended to help faculty improve performance and achieve their next career milestone. The progress review process results in letters to the faculty members who have been reviewed.
- 2) The Committee also conducts the annual merit pay review for all PTK faculty. Merit pay reviews evaluate accomplishments during the previous year (the review year). The merit pay review results in a report to the Dean on merit pay.

Both kinds of reviews are based on the Review, Appointment, and Promotion Criteria for Professional Track Faculty.

MERIT PAY FUND: Merit pay dollars are transmitted to the Dean by the University's Provost as a percent of total salary budget. At least 80% of the merit pool shall be allocated by the Dean in a manner consistent with the ratings as determined under the provisions of this plan. These monies will be distributed as a dollar amount. The remaining 20% of the merit pay pool may be used by the Dean at his or her sole discretion to resolve special salary problems, though final allocation will not occur until all appeals on merit pay ratings or pay allocations are resolved.

The Dean shall periodically evaluate the salary structure of the College and consult with the University's Provost to address any salary inequities that have developed in the College.

The PTK Review Committee will normally meet during the second half of the Spring semester. The APT committee will elect the PTK Review Committee, usually during the Fall semester. The PTK Review Committee will consist of four members, including one full Professor, one Principal or Senior Lecturer, one Associate or full Research Faculty member, and one Senior or Principal Faculty Specialist. In the event that no eligible member exists in a Professional Track faculty series, the APT shall elect a second (and, if necessary, third) Professional Track faculty member from some other series. Only one Professional Track member shall be in the highest rank in their series (Principal Lecturer, full Research Faculty, or Principal Faculty Specialist), and that member shall serve as chair. To foster continuity, one member of the committee should be elected from among the members of the committee from the prior year. To foster broad engagement and a diversity of perspectives, all other members of the committee should be new each year so that as many different faculty members as possible will have the opportunity to review each junior faculty member before their promotion case is presented. No member of the committee should serve for more than two consecutive years. Faculty members who have been notified that they will be promoted to Senior rank or Associate Professor with tenure before the due date of the materials may be elected as members.

Each year the Dean shall review the make-up of the PTK Review Committee over the previous five years to ensure that a reasonable representation of faculty diversity has been achieved. If it has not, the Dean shall recommend appropriate action to the APT to rectify the situation.

If not already a member, the faculty mentor assigned to the faculty member having a progress review will normally also participate with voice but no vote. The Dean also serves ex officio on this committee with voice but no vote.

No faculty member may participate in a review for which they have a conflict of interest, as determined by the Chair; conflicts of interest for the chair will be determined by the Dean. In the event a member of the committee has a conflict of interest, the Chair (or in the case of the Chair, the Dean) shall appoint replacements as needed to reach a minimum of two voting members for each review.

The PTK Review Committee will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement, a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus, voting shall be by secret ballot.

Materials: All full-time faculty members must provide a c.v. in the format specified by the University's APT guidelines and complete an online form summarizing their accomplishments during the prior calendar year and their plans for the current calendar year. Faculty members scheduled for a progress review must additionally submit a personal statement describing their teaching, research and service activities, as appropriate to their position. These materials will normally be due to the Dean's office on the second Friday in March.

At least one week before the committee meets, the Dean's office shall provide to each member of the PTK Review Committee the following input:

- A complete list of faculty members who are due for review by the PTK Review Committee, including for each faculty member: what kind(s) of review the faculty member is scheduled for (merit only, or merit and progress), the percentage of effort as determined by the faculty workload policy, and any known conflicts of interest,
- Any adjustments to the faculty member's workload that apply specifically to that faculty member (typically specified in the appointment letter).
- The materials provided by the faculty member, and
- A teaching evaluation summary for each course taught by that faculty member in the prior calendar year, peer teaching evaluations, or other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Progress Review Schedule. Progress reviews are conducted:

- Each year for each junior Professional Track faculty member.
- Every second year for each senior professional track faculty member who has not yet reached the highest rank in their series.
- There are several exceptions to these general requirements:
 - No progress review is conducted for faculty who are in their first semester at the time of the review,
 - No progress review is conducted for faculty in the year in which they submit an application for promotion, and
 - No progress review is conducted for faculty who have been selected for promotion but not yet promoted.
 - No progress review is conducted for Professional Track faculty members hired with a contractual provision for automatic appointment to Assistant Professor upon earning a doctorate.

Progress reviews are conducted for all full-time faculty with paid iSchool appointments, regardless of what fraction of their appointment is paid by the iSchool.

Progress Review Process. Professors, Principal Lecturers, full Research Faculty, and Principal Faculty Specialists who are members of the committee participate (have voice and vote) in all reviews; other members participate only in progress reviews for junior Professional Track faculty. The faculty mentor will normally serve as recording secretary to draft progress review letters. The letter should address the research, teaching, and service relevant to their primary and secondary duties, together with introductory and concluding comments. The draft letters will be edited for consistency by the Chair of the PTK Review committee, and the edited draft letters will then be made available for comment by all members of the APT committee who are above the corresponding rank of the faculty member being reviewed (except those with a conflict of interest) and the Dean for a period of at least one week. If comments are received, the Chair will share the comments with members of the review committee along with any changes made by the chair to the draft letter in response to those comments, and the members of the review committee will be asked to approve (or further revise) the report. Upon approval, the letter will be forwarded to faculty member, the Dean, and all faculty above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, and the Dean will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the report.

Merit Pay Review Process. The PTK Review Committee shall provide merit pay recommendations to the Dean based its evaluations of faculty members for: (i) teaching, advising and mentoring; (ii) research, scholarship and creative activity; and (iii) service to the profession, university and the College. The Committee will determine faculty members' degree of merit for each category, assigning a score on a 5-point scale for that category (where, 1=substantially below expectations, 2= below expectations, 3=met expectations, 4=above expectations, 5=substantially above expectations), taking into account any adjustments to the current workload policy that apply to specific faculty members. Subsequently the scores will be combined into an overall score by multiplying each score by the percentage of effort (specified in the appointment letter) for that score for that faculty member to determine the overall level of merit.

Determining annual merit increases shall be based on a three-year moving average of merit ratings received over the most recent three years of evaluation (or less for professional track faculty members who have not been evaluated for three years). When merit funds are not available, the PTK Review Committee shall as, a matter of record, provide ratings that will be used in subsequent years when merit funding is made available. If no merit pay is awarded for three or more consecutive years, the moving average will be extended on a one-time basis in the first year when merit pay is again awarded to include all consecutive years in which merit pay was not awarded. Once merit pay is awarded the system reverts to the three-year moving average for subsequent years.

Following the establishment of final ratings, the PTK Review Committee will meet with the Dean and discuss the ratings. The Dean shall, in a timely manner, conduct his or her own evaluation of each professional track faculty member using the criteria identified above. The final merit ratings will be determined by the Dean. The assignment of merit pay (other than funds used by the Dean for solving special salary problems) shall take into account the final merit ratings, with appropriate allowances to ensure fairness in the case of faculty who receive merit pay from more than one unit (e.g., such that merit pay is proportionate to the percentage of salary received from the iSchool).

The Dean shall prepare a confidential report to the PTK Review Committee indicating his/her final decisions. The report shall include for each faculty member their final merit rating and the amount of merit-based increases in the current year as a dollar amount. Amounts paid by other units need not be

reported to the PTK Review Committee. The Dean shall also report to the PTK Review Committee the total dollar amount used to resolve special salary problems.

After all salary adjustments for Professional Track faculty have been reviewed by the College's financial officer, the Dean shall provide to each Professional Track faculty member a letter stating their new salary and the dollar amount of the salary adjustment. The Dean shall also include the PTK Review Committee's rating in each area for the current year and for each year of the moving average, and the Dean's final merit rating. For faculty paid by more than one unit, those salary increases will also be noted in the Dean's letter. Faculty will also be informed of their right to meet with the Dean (and the head of any other unit from which the faculty member is paid) and to appeal the decision on their merit rating or pay allocation.

The Dean and the PTK Review Committee may deviate from this plan only due to extenuating circumstances. If there is a deviation, the Dean and PTK Review Committee will present the deviation and rationale to the APT Committee through a written communication.

A faculty member choosing to appeal his or her merit rating or pay allocation shall inform the Dean, in writing, within ten calendar days of receiving his or her letter of notification of merit rating and pay allocation. The communication must specify the faculty member's basis for appealing. An Appeals Committee consisting of the Dean, the PTK Review Committee, and one additional professional-track faculty member appointed by the Dean shall review the appeal within 30 calendar days. The Appeals Committee shall determine if there is any adjustment made in the merit rating or pay allocation. If there is a pay adjustment, the increase shall be entered into the University's payroll system no later than June 30 for implementation by July 1. Decisions by the Appeals Committee shall be rendered by a simple majority in a secret ballot. Decisions by the Appeals Committee are final. The Dean will inform the affected faculty member in writing of the decision.

PTK Review Committee members may not participate in determining merit pay ratings for themselves nor for Professional-Track faculty for whom they have a conflict of interest. Questions regarding perceived conflicts of interest shall be referred to the Dean for decision. All decisions of the PTK Review Committee require at least two nonconflicted members. In the event that two members of the PTK Review Committee are determined by the Dean to have a conflict of interest on any decision, the Dean shall call for an election of a new Committee.

Appendix A: Professional Track Faculty Position Titles

Titles, descriptions of and minimum qualifications for Professional Track Faculty Specialist positions are listed in the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty (II-1.00(A)). Only the position titles listed here are used in the iSchool.

Term-limited faculty positions:

- Junior Lecturer
- Faculty Assistant
- Post-Doctoral Scholar
- Post-Doctoral Associate

Research faculty positions:

- Assistant Research Faculty

- Assistant Research Professor
- Assistant Research Scholar
- Assistant Research Scientist
- Assistant Research Engineer
- Associate Research Faculty
 - Associate Research Professor
 - Associate Research Scholar
 - Associate Research Scientist
 - Associate Research Engineer
- Full Research Faculty
 - Research Professor
 - Research Scholar
 - Research Scientist
 - Research Engineer

Instructional faculty positions:

- Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- Principal Lecturer

Specialist faculty positions:

- Faculty Specialist
- Senior Faculty Specialist
- Principal Faculty Specialist