

The College of Information Studies: Maryland's iSchool

Procedures for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, Professors of the Practice, College Park Professors, University of Maryland Professors

1. Scope

This document specifies procedures for the following reviews for tenure-track and tenured faculty members who have, or are candidates for, an iSchool appointment, including:

- 1) Review for initial appointment as Assistant Professor,
- 2) Pre-tenure contract renewal review for an Assistant Professor,
- 3) Review for appointment as, or promotion to, Associate Professor with tenure, appointment as Associate Professor without tenure, or the award of tenure to an untenured Associate Professor,
- 4) Regular progress reviews for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professional Track faculty members who were hired with a contractual provision for automatic appointment to Assistant Professor upon earning a doctorate,
- 5) Periodic and Comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty,
- 6) Review for appointment as, or promotion to, Professor,

This document also specifies procedures for the following reviews for untenured faculty:

- 7) Review for appointment as Professor of the Practice
- 8) Review for appointment as College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor
- 9) Review for appointment as Emeritus Professor or Emerita Professor

For faculty appointed in the iSchool on a paid partial appointment who have their tenure home in another unit, the iSchool's report for promotion will be prepared as described in this document, but it will be advisory to the tenure home unit, and timelines will be adjusted to meet the schedule requirements of that unit's process. For promotion and tenure reviews that require letters from external reviewers, the letters obtained by the faculty member's tenure home will be used.

Procedures for review, appointment and promotion of all other faculty members can be found in the College of Information Studies Procedures for Review, Appointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty.

Criteria for all reviews covered by this document can be found in the iSchool Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, a separate document.

2. Policies

The University of Maryland APT Manual and Guidelines is the controlling document for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure cases.

The iSchool Plan of Organization is the controlling document for the iSchool Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT). The iSchool APT committee is responsible for the annual faculty progress reviews, faculty appointments, faculty promotions, and for the award of tenure to

faculty. Two unusual characteristics of the iSchool APT committee should be borne in mind when reading this document. First, the APT committee elects other committees as described below; although these are in essence subcommittees of the APT committee, they are referred to as committees. Second, only iSchool faculty members at or above the rank to which an appointment, promotion, or the award of tenure is being considered are members of the APT committee for the discussion and vote on that case. In other words, the membership of the iSchool APT committee adjusts automatically (as described in the Plan of Organization) to be appropriate for the matter at hand. The same provision extends to the election by the APT committee of record preparation committees and review committees – in such elections, faculty present for the discussion and that vote on the committee’s membership are limited to those who will be eligible to vote on the results of the committee’s work.

All eligible faculty members, as specified in the Plan of Organization, are expected

- to participate in meetings of the APT committee,
- to vote without abstention on matters before the committee, and
- to stand for election to committees elected by the APT committee, unless they are on sabbatical or other authorized leave, assigned to a full-time university position outside the College, subject to a conflict of interest, or unavoidably absent at the scheduled time of the APT committee meeting.

Faculty members who are on leave or assigned outside the College

- remain members of the APT during the period of their leave, and
- they may participate in APT meetings at their option.

In-person participation in APT meetings

- is required of all other members when possible,
- but remote participation in APT meetings and remote voting is authorized when necessary;
 - faculty needing to participate remotely must provide adequate notice to the chair of the APT committee to permit arrangements for remote participation and remote voting. The chair shall make suitable arrangements for remote participation in such a way that all participants can hear each other, and in such a way that the confidentiality and integrity of APT voting can be assured.

Neither advance nor proxy voting are authorized.

- Members who expect to be unavoidably absent (e.g., because of teaching obligations) and are not on leave or on assignment outside the College must inform the chair of the APT committee so that the reasons for absences can be correctly reported.

All reviews shall be conducted with reference to Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (a separate document).

Conflicts of interest that arise from close personal relationships (e.g., marriage), unusually close financial relationships (e.g., business partners), thesis and dissertation advisor/advisee relationships, or a supervisory relationship in another unit of the University are recognized by the university in a diverse set of policies (e.g., those relating to faculty appointments and those relating to faculty participation in outside employment). Ordinary professional and personal interactions (e.g., co-authoring, personal friendship, or professional disagreements) do not normally create a conflict of interest for the purposes of faculty review, appointment, promotion, or tenure. Faculty members who believe that they may have

a conflict of interest on a specific matter should consult with the chair of the APT committee (or, in the case of the chair, with the Dean) before the APT committee meets to consider the matter.

Except as noted below (in the case of the Progress Review Committee), it is the responsibility of the iSchool APT committee chair to inform the APT committee of the existence (but not necessarily the nature) of a conflict of interest that makes a specific faculty member ineligible to participate in a specific matter. If a known conflict of interest makes the APT chair ineligible to participate in a specific matter, the Dean will inform the APT committee of that fact and the APT committee will elect an acting chair for that matter.

3. Appointment and Promotion

3.1. Initial Appointment to a Paid Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty Position

Every member of the APT committee, regardless of their rank or position type, participates in the campus interview, discussion, and decision for candidates for initial paid appointment in the iSchool (whether joint with another unit or not) as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor. When a search committee has been formed, the search committee will initially brief the APT committee, but search committee members who are not members of the APT committee (e.g., student members) must depart prior to discussion among members of the APT committee.

The APT committee will conduct at least two votes for each candidate. The first vote is by all members of the APT committee. The second vote, conducted only after the results of the first vote have been reported, is limited to tenure-track or tenured faculty members. For candidates for Associate Professor without tenure, an additional vote limited to Associate Professors and Professors is required. For candidates for Associate Professor with tenure, an additional vote limited to tenured faculty members is required. For candidates for Professor, an additional vote limited to Professors is required. Additional votes beyond the second express an initial assessment of the qualifications of the candidate for a senior or tenured senior appointment; in the event a conditional offer of employment is made and accepted as Associate Professor or Professor, an additional review (described below) will be required.

3.2. Appointment as or Promotion to Associate Professor, or Award of Tenure to an Untenured Associate Professor

Timing: Offers of employment as Associate Professor, with or without tenure, are conditional on the award of that rank by the President. Review for initial appointment as Associate Professor will therefore normally need to occur expeditiously after a conditional offer has been made and accepted. Review for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure normally occurs during the Fall semester of the sixth full year after appointment as an Assistant Professor, although there are provisions for earlier or later reviews in specific cases. Review for the award of tenure to an untenured Associate Professor will occur at the time specified in their contract. When the review will be in the Fall semester, preparation of the case normally begins in May and the faculty vote is normally scheduled to occur in early November.

Materials: Faculty members are required to submit a personal statement, a c.v. in the University's required format, a representative selection of publications, a teaching portfolio, University teaching evaluation summaries for any courses taught in academic units other than the iSchool since the previous

promotion (or, in the case of initial appointments, for the last five years), citation statistics for published work, and (in a sealed envelope or as email attachment) eight or more recommended external reviewers. The final list of recommended external reviewers and drafts of all other materials should normally be submitted by May 1; final materials other than citation statistics and the teaching portfolio should normally be submitted on August 1; the final teaching portfolio and citation statistics should normally be submitted on October 1. It is important that the draft materials submitted on May 1 be in nearly final form, lacking only comments and updates, because schedules will preclude extensive review and comment on subsequent versions. Additionally, iSchool staff will prepare the required teaching evaluation summaries (both the per-section teaching evaluation summaries that include student comments for review by the committee and the statistical summary required by the University APT).

Record Preparation Committee: The APT Committee will elect one Record Preparation Committee (RPC) for each promotion or tenure case.¹ The RPC will consist of an elected chair and two other elected members, all of who must be elected from faculty who will be (at the time of the vote) eligible to vote on the case. The candidate for promotion or tenure shall be given the opportunity to suggest to the APT a faculty member to chair their RPC. The Dean serves ex officio on the RPC with voice but no vote. To facilitate timely requests for letters from external reviewers, the RPC for a promotion or tenure case that will be voted on in the Fall semester should be elected no later than March 20. The time and location of each meeting of the RPC should be announced in advance to all faculty members who will (at the time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case. A faculty member who serves in a mentoring role in a jointly appointed faculty member's other unit(s) may participate with voice, but no vote. Any member of the APT who will (at the time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case may silently attend. The review committee may, at its option, invite nonmembers to speak, but they will have no vote. The 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 selection of external reviewers, the choice of materials to send to external reviewers, or the content of any document), voting shall be by secret ballot, and the vote results shall be reported to the APT.

Process: The normal process is:

- The RPC will normally first meet in April to provide feedback on the draft materials, to select the external reviewers, and to make tentative selections of the representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. The chair will then obtain advance commitments from a sufficient number of external reviewers (normally three from the candidate's list and three others chosen by the RPC).
- The RPC will then normally confer again by email or teleconference in July to review the final materials and to make the final selection of representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. Review packages will normally be sent in mid-August, with a requested response date of October 1.
- The chair will draft the Summary Statement of Professional Accomplishments and will submit that statement to the faculty member being reviewed by mid-September in order to provide to provide at least two weeks for comments and, if the faculty member desires, filing a written response.
- The review committee will then normally meet in October to review the letters from external reviewers and the teaching portfolio and to discuss the contents of the evaluative report. The chair will then draft an evaluative report, and the committee will then meet again no later than mid-October to review and approve that report.

¹ The University APT manual refers to the Record Preparation Committee as the "Advisory Subcommittee."

- The entire tenure package will then be forwarded to the APT committee, which will meet to discuss and vote on the tenure case, normally in the first week of November.
- The report will then be revised by the chair of the RPC to report the outcome of the vote and to make whatever other changes the APT may direct.
- The report will then be sent to the Dean, who will prepare an independent report.
- Subsequent handling of the case will then proceed as specified in the University's APT manual.

3.3. Appointment as or Promotion to Professor

Timing: Consideration for promotion to Professor occurs in response to a request from the faculty member. Faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion to Professor are expected to inform the Dean by mid-December of the year prior to the academic year in which they wish to be considered. The review process then proceeds on the same timeline as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Materials: Same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Process: Same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

3.4. Initial Appointment as Professor of the Practice

The title Professor of the Practice can be awarded to applicants who have achieved national or international prominence through practice and leadership. Appointments may be for as long as five years, are renewable, and do not include nor contribute to tenure.

Timing: New appointments may be considered at any time. Renewals should normally be considered in the Fall semester of the final year of the appointment.

Materials: For initial appointment, the required materials are the same as for appointment as Professor. For renewal, only a current C.V. is required.

Process: For initial appointment, the process for appointment to a Paid Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty position will be followed. For a renewal appointment, the individual will inform the Dean that they wish to be considered for an additional term no fewer than 180 days prior to the end of the existing appointment. Required materials for a renewal appointment must be submitted to the Dean's Office at least 15 days prior to the scheduled APT review. For initial appointments, the full APT provides a courtesy vote. For renewal, Full Professors and those who hold the same title are eligible to vote.

3.5. Initial Appointment as College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor

The titles College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor can be awarded to a faculty member who would qualify for appointment as Professor, but for the fact that they are employed elsewhere. Appointment as College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor is normally for a period of three years and is and is renewable. Neither title includes tenure.

Timing: New appointments may be considered at any time. Appointment terms will end on June 30 of the third June following the appointment. Renewals should normally be considered during the Fall semester of the final year of the appointment.

Materials: For initial appointment as a College Park Professor by an individual who is a Professor at the University of Maryland Baltimore, a c.v. in the University's required format and a statement from the applicant describing how their background and experience will contribute to the mission of the College and the University are required. The statement must identify specific iSchool faculty members who can speak knowledgeably about their background, expertise, and potential contributions to the College and/or the University. For initial appointment as a College Park Professor who is not a Professor at the University of Maryland Baltimore, or as a University of Maryland Professor, the required materials as the same as those for initial appointment as a Professor. For renewal, only a current C.V. is required.

Process: To appoint a University of Maryland Baltimore Professor as a University of Maryland Professor, no RPC is formed. The APT decision is informed by the submitted materials, and the chair will prepare the report of the APT committee discussion and vote. For all other appointments to the positions of University of Maryland or College Park Professors, the process is the same as for appointment as Professor. For initial appointments, the full APT provides a courtesy vote. For renewal, Full Professors and those who hold the same title are eligible to vote. Required materials for a renewal appointment must be submitted to the Dean's Office at least 15 days prior to the scheduled APT review.

3.6. Granting of the title Emerita or Emeritus

Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors, Professors of the Practice, (full) Research Professors, (full) Research Scientists, (full) Research Scholars, Principal Lecturers, and Principal Faculty Specialists who retire from the university with at least ten years of service may apply for Emeritus/Emerita status.

Timing: For retirements at the end of an academic year, candidates are asked to request consideration by the second Friday in March to permit an APT vote at an April APT Committee meeting.

Materials: An updated c.v. is required prior to consideration by the APT committee. There are also additional requirements, listed in the University APT manual, that are required before the University will process the request.

Process: Voting members are tenured faculty who are at or above the current rank of the retiring faculty member, Professional Track faculty who are in the same series (research faculty, lecturer, or faculty specialist) as a Professional Track faculty member being considered for emerita or emeritus status; and, when voting on emerita or emeritus status for Professors of the Practice or Professional Track faculty, Professors of the Practice. Members being considered for emeritus or emerita status may not vote on their own case. Other members of the APT may participate in the discussion with voice, but no vote. The chair will prepare a report of the APT discussion and vote.

4. Other Reviews

4.1. Annual Review Committee

The Annual Review Committee conducts the annual merit pay review for all faculty members with paid iSchool appointments, and contract renewal reviews for Assistant Professors at the end of their contract period (usually the end of the Spring semester in their third full academic year). The Annual Review Committee also conducts progress reviews for Assistant Professors and early-career Associate Professors. Merit pay and contract renewal reviews evaluate accomplishments, whereas progress reviews are developmental reviews intended to help faculty members achieve their next career milestone.

The Annual Review Committee will normally meet during the second half of the Spring semester. The APT committee will elect the Annual Review Committee, usually during the Fall semester. The Annual Review Committee will consist of two Professors and two tenured Associate Professors. 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 tenure 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 Associate Professor with tenure before the due date of the materials may be elected as members.

Each year, the Dean shall review the makeup of the Annual Review Committee over the previous five years to assure that a reasonable representation of faculty diversity has been achieved. If it has not, the Dean shall take appropriate action to rectify the situation.

The committee shall elect a chair from among its members at its first meeting. 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.

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.

The Annual Review Committee will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement on the content of a letter or report to be forwarded to the faculty or on how faculty comments should be incorporated in the final letter or report, a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus, voting shall be by secret ballot.

Materials: All tenured and tenure-track faculty members must provide a c.v. in the format specified by the University's APT guidelines and complete an online summary of 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 research statement and a teaching statement. 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 Annual Review Committee the following input:

- A complete list of faculty members who are eligible for review by the Annual Review Committee, including for each faculty member: what kind(s) of review the faculty member is

scheduled for, the percentage of effort as determined by the faculty workload policy, and any known conflicts of interest,

- The materials provided by the faculty member, and
- A teaching evaluation summary for each course taught by that faculty member and peer teaching evaluations since the most recent review.

Progress Review Schedule. Progress reviews are conducted:

- Each year for each Assistant Professor, for each Associate Professor without tenure, and for each Professional Track faculty member hired with a contractual provision for automatic appointment to Assistant Professor upon earning a doctorate.
- In the second, fourth and sixth years after the award of tenure for Associate Professor with tenure. Progress reviews for Associate professors with tenure satisfy the university's requirement for comprehensive reviews of tenured Associate Professors, and results from such reviews are therefore forwarded to the Provost.
- There are three 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 or tenure, and
 - No progress review is conducted for faculty who have been selected for promotion but not yet promoted.

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

Progress Review Process. Professors who are members of the committee participate in all reviews; Associate Professors participate only in reviews of Assistant Professors. The faculty mentor will normally prepare an initial draft of the progress review letter, which should normally be about two pages before the meeting, and will update that draft afterwards. The letter should address research, teaching, and service, together with introductory and concluding comments. The draft letters will be edited for consistency by the Chair, and the edited draft letters will then be made available for comment by all tenured members of the APT committee above the 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.

Contract Renewal Review Process. The same process will be followed as for a progress review, through preparation of the report by the Annual Review Committee, although the draft report may be somewhat longer than a typical progress review letter. The review committee shall then vote by secret ballot on whether the content of the draft contract renewal report is ready for presentation before forwarding the draft report to the APT committee, and the results of that vote shall be reported to the APT Committee. The case will then be discussed at a meeting of the APT Committee, and a vote on contract renewal by secret ballot will be conducted by the APT Committee. The report will then be revised by the chair of the Annual Review Committee to include the results of the APT Committee vote and to make any other changes that the APT may direct. After approval of the final form of the report by each unconflicted tenured member of the APT committee (which can be obtained by email), the report will

then be forwarded to the Dean, who will make the final decision on contract renewal. The Dean will meet with the faculty member whose contract has been renewed to discuss their progress.

Merit Pay Review Process. The Annual 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 iSchool. 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 for that score for that faculty member to determine the overall level of merit.

To satisfy the university's requirement for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty, the Annual Review Committee shall determine whether each tenured faculty member is or is not materially deficient in meeting expectations, and they shall include that determination in their written report. The merit pay committee will normally reach this judgment by determining whether the faculty member has been reported as being below expectations in the same area (teaching, research, or service) in both the current and the previous merit pay review, but the committee may also independently consider any factors specified in the iSchool's Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty in reaching their judgment.

Committee members shall not participate in determining the degree of merit or the identification of material deficiencies for themselves, nor for other faculty for whom they have a conflict of interest.

A three-year moving average of merit ratings received over the most recent three years of evaluation (or less for faculty members who have not been evaluated for three years) will constitute the basis for determining merit increases in the current year. In years when merit funds are not made available, the Annual Review Committee will conduct merit review as a matter of record to provide ratings that will be used in subsequent years when 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.

The Dean allocates merit pay; the Merit Pay Committee advises the Dean. At least 80% of the merit pool shall be allocated by the Dean in a manner consistent with the ratings decided on by the Dean, as specified in this plan. Those monies will be distributed as a dollar amount. The remaining 20% of the merit pool may be used by the Dean, at his or her sole discretion, for solving special salary problems.

Following the establishment of the final ratings, the Annual 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 tenured and tenure-track faculty member using the criteria identified above. The final merit ratings shall 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).

In years in which merit pay is available, the Dean shall prepare a confidential report to the Merit Pay 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. For faculty paid by more than one unit, amounts from other units need not be reported to the Committee. If funds are retained by the Dean for solving special salary problems, these amounts need not be reported to the committee individually, but the total dollar amount shall be reported.

After all salary adjustments for tenured and tenure-track faculty have been reviewed by the College financial officer, the Dean shall provide to each tenured and tenure-track faculty member a letter stating their new salary, the dollar amount of the salary adjustment, and the rationale for the merit and/or salary adjustments (including at least the Merit Pay Committee's rating in each area, the aggregated rating assigned by the Merit Pay Committee for the current year and for each year included in the moving average, and the final merit rating assigned by the Dean). For faculty paid by more than one unit, the letter should (if mutually agreeable) be provided by the faculty member's tenure home and should separately identify increases, if any, from each unit. The letter shall include a statement informing the faculty member of their right to meet with the Dean (and, where applicable, the head of any other unit from which the faculty member is paid) and to appeal his or her decision on their merit-based increase.

The Merit Pay Committee and the Dean may deviate from this plan only in the presence of extenuating circumstances. If there is a deviation, the Dean and Merit Pay Committee will present the deviation and rationale to the tenured and tenure-track faculty through written communication.

A faculty member may choose to appeal his or her merit pay allocation by sending a letter to the Dean within ten days of receiving his or her letter of notification of merit pay allocation. The letter must specify the faculty member's basis for appealing. An Appeals Committee consisting of the Dean, the Merit Pay Committee, and one additional tenured faculty member appointed by the Dean, will review the faculty member's request within 30 days. Two outcomes from the appeals process are possible: (1) no change in merit pay; or (2) the faculty member's merit pay may be increased, with the increase awarded in the next year in which merit pay is available. A decision will be rendered by a simple majority in a secret ballot of the Appeals Committee, and the decision of the Appeals Committee is final. The Dean will inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

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

4.2. Comprehensive Reviews for tenured Associate Professor and Professors

Timing: The University of Maryland College Park policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance requires that a comprehensive review be conducted for each tenured faculty member no less frequently than every five years. For new Associate Professors with tenure, comprehensive reviews are conducted by the Review Committee using the procedures specified above. For Professors and Associate Professors after their sixth year in that rank, the procedures in this section apply and comprehensive reviews are normally conducted every five years. However, in the event that two successive merit pay reviews determine that a tenured faculty member who is reviewed under the procedures of this section is materially deficient in meeting expectations without an intervening comprehensive post-tenure review, that faculty member will be scheduled for a comprehensive post-tenure review in the subsequent academic year, regardless of whether five years have elapsed since their most recent

comprehensive post-tenure review. Comprehensive reviews for Associate Professors and Professors whose tenure home is in the iSchool should be initiated by October of the fifth academic year after their most recent Appointment, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review (including comprehensive reviews conducted by other units during special administrative assignments outside the iSchool). If a faculty member was on any combination of sabbatical leave, leave of absence, or University administrative assignment for one or more academic years, the post-tenure review will be delayed for the same number of years. If the faculty member is on a one-semester sabbatical leave or leave of absence in the semester in which the review would normally occur, the review will be performed during the following academic year. Comprehensive reviews for Professors whose tenure home is in another unit will be conducted according to the policies of that unit.

Process: The APT committee shall elect a separate Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Committee (CPTRC) for each comprehensive review. The CPTRC shall consist of three elected members, all of whom shall be Professors at the University of Maryland. For faculty with a tenure home in the iSchool who hold a paid joint appointment in one or more other units, one member should be from one such unit. When possible, at least two members of the CPTRC are required to hold paid iSchool appointments. When fewer than two unconflicted iSchool Professors are available for election, the APT Committee may appoint one qualified member from outside the iSchool.

The time and place of meetings of the CPTRC shall be announced in advance to Professors who hold paid iSchool appointments. Meetings of the CPTRC may be silently observed by any unconflicted Professor who holds a paid appointment in the iSchool. The iSchool Dean, and the senior administrator of any unit in which the faculty member holds a paid appointment, may participate with voice, but no vote.

The faculty member being reviewed shall submit a written report and a c.v. in the form required by the APT manual by October 15. The written report shall focus on (1) research, scholarly and creative activities, (2) teaching, advising, and other educational activities, and (3) service activities to the University, state, nation, professional community, or other organizations. There is no required format for the faculty member's written report. The iSchool staff will provide the CPTRC with university teaching evaluation summaries (which include student comments) for all courses taught at the University of Maryland by the faculty member being reviewed, and the confidential reports to the Dean of the merit pay committees, for each academic year since the most recent prior review. No letters from external reviewers are required.

The CPTRC shall normally meet in early November to consider the submitted materials and to discuss the case. The chair of the CPTRC shall then draft the appraisal report for each member of the committee to review and edit. The appraisal report shall include a categorical ranking of Outstanding, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. In the event that agreement cannot be reached, one or more members may submit separate appraisal reports. The CPTRC shall provide their final report to the faculty member by November 15. The faculty member may, at their option, prepare a written response to the review committee; any such response must be submitted by December 1.

The Dean and the faculty member shall meet, normally in early December, to discuss the review. When the members of the CPTRC are unanimous in assigning a categorical ranking of Outstanding, the Dean should publicly recognize the faculty member's accomplishments, and if resources permit the Dean should consider additionally recognizing the faculty member's accomplishments in a materially significant way (e.g., through the allocation of travel funds to support public outreach or exploratory research). When the members of the CPTRC are unanimous in assigning a categorical ranking of

Unsatisfactory, and in such other cases as the Dean may determine are necessary, the Dean and the faculty member shall discuss and agree on a firm written development plan for enhancing meritorious work and for enhancing less satisfactory performance. The development plan that is required in such cases must include a timetable and a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals.

The Dean shall prepare a brief written report stating the Dean's final evaluation of the faculty member and shall provide that report to the faculty member and forward that report together with all materials submitted by the candidate initially and (optionally) in response to the report, prepared by the staff, or prepared by the committee, to the Provost by February 1. In the event that the faculty member disagrees with the final evaluation, a written appeal may be filed with the Provost by February 15. In such cases, the Provost will review the appeal and the materials forwarded by the Dean, the Provost will then meet separately with the faculty member, and the Provost will then issue a decision, normally by April 15. The Dean will then forward the materials, including the Provost's decision in the event of an appeal, to the Office of Faculty Affairs, normally by May 1. The Dean will also file a copy of all materials in the faculty member's personnel file. The Provost's office will also maintain copies of all reports generated during the process. The same appeals process may be used by Associate Professors with tenure following a comprehensive review with which they disagree. In such cases, the Associate Professor must file their appeal within two weeks of being notified that their review materials have been forwarded to the Provost.