

## Pre-Submitted Amendments to the APT Guidelines Recommendations (proposed amendments are indicated in green)

### **Amendment #1: Submitted by Michael Boyle**

*Guidelines Page 9 – Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities*

~~Work that has been submitted~~ Pieces in preparation that are not completed and but not yet accepted for publication should not appear on a CV.<sup>4</sup>

~~1. The one exception is working papers, customary in certain fields such as economics and mathematics. These should be listed under “Monographs, Reports and Extension Publications.”~~

### **Amendment #2: Submitted by Michael Boyle**

*Guidelines Page 9 & 10 – Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities*

All authors should be listed in the order they appear on the publication. In exceptional cases, e.g., when the work is a product of a large group (more than 10 authors), not all authors need be listed. As an example, ~~you~~ **the candidate** may list the first three, the last three, and ~~yourself~~ **the candidate him or herself** (including ~~your~~ **placement** in the total author list). That is, if a candidate named "Candidate" is the 97th author, the citation may be listed as: *Smith, Jones, Curley...Candidate (97th)...Moe, Larry, Shemp* (total of 189 authors). Candidates ~~should~~ **may** designate the identity of the author with intellectual leadership on jointly authored papers (if this designation can be appropriately ascertained) by using \* or placing that name in bold, and identifying which co-authors they mentored as undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, faculty research assistants, and junior faculty. **In some units, the designation with \* and bold may be inappropriate for the culture of the area; a unit with the approval of its college may choose a policy of abstaining from these designations. Candidates should clearly characterize their contribution(s) to a collaborative activity, as practiced in the Department.**

### **Amendment #3: Submitted by Andrew Harris**

*Guidelines Page 20 – External Evaluators*

***...In some circumstances, a greater proportion of letters from collaborators\* may be needed in order to provide a complete, equitable, and thorough evaluation of the contributions of the candidate. Such letters may be allowed if justification is provided by the Unit undertaking the evaluation (e.g., in cases of very large collaborations where coauthors number in the tens to hundreds).***

---

**Amendment #4: Submitted by Kumea Shorter-Gooden**

*APT Policy Page 2 – Purpose of this Policy*

The University of Maryland is dedicated to the discovery and the transmission of knowledge, to the achievement of excellence in **all its** academic disciplines, **and to the growth and development of our society. To achieve this, the University is committed to developing and sustaining an excellent and diverse faculty. A fair, unbiased, and impartial appointment, tenure, and promotion process is essential to this goal.** Each faculty member has a personal responsibility for contributing to the achievement of excellence in his or her own academic discipline and for exercising the best judgment in advancing the department, the college, and the University. Those faculty members holding the rank of Professor have the greatest responsibility for establishing and maintaining the highest standards of academic performance within the University. This Policy on the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty exists to set the standards for appointment and promotion to the various faculty ranks and to recognize and to encourage the achievement of excellence on the part of the faculty members through the awarding of tenure and through promotion within the faculty ranks. ~~Through this process the University builds and enhances its educational programs and services and it advances the state of knowledge, which supports the growth and development of our society.~~

**Amendment #5: Submitted by Kumea Shorter-Gooden**

*APT Policy Page 11 – II. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion*

The criteria for appointment, tenure and promotion shall reflect the educational mission of the University of Maryland at College Park to provide an undergraduate education ranked among the best in the nation; to provide a nationally and internationally renowned program of graduate education and research, making significant contributions to the arts, humanities, the professions, and the sciences; **to provide every student with an education that incorporates the values of diversity and inclusion;** and to provide public service to the state and the nation embodying the best tradition of outstanding land-grant colleges and universities.

**Amendment #6: Submitted by Kumea Shorter-Gooden**

*APT Policy Page 11 – II. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion*

Each college, school, and department shall develop brief, general, written Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. **The criteria should be reviewed periodically by the unit, as deemed necessary, but no less frequently than once every five (5) years. This review should include consideration of the unit's progress toward increasing the diversity of its tenured faculty.** The criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions fall into three general categories: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of students; (2) performance in

research, scholarship, and creative activity; (3) performance of professional service to the university, the profession, or the community.

**Amendment #7: Submitted by Kumea Shorter-Gooden**

*APT Policy Page 27 – C. Third-level Review*

1. A third- or campus-level review committee shall be established in the following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members holding the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges (colleges listed here) and one from among the four small colleges (colleges listed here). Since this committee shall make its recommendation on the basis of whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion have been met, members of this committee shall have a track record of outstanding academic judgment along with sufficient intellectual breadth and depth to be capable of comparing and judging candidates from varied disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. **The Provost should endeavor to ensure that the committee is diverse.** No small college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once in every three years. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from....

**Amendment #8: Submitted by Kumea Shorter-Gooden**

*Guidelines Page 10 & 11 – The Curriculum Vitae - Teaching, Mentoring and Advising*

**Teaching, Mentoring and Advising**

1. Courses taught in the last five years. Indicate enrollment and unusual formats.
2. Course or Curriculum Development, **including the creation of courses that focus on underrepresented populations, the integration of diverse cultural perspectives into existing courses, and the use of varied pedagogical strategies to meet the learning styles of a diverse student body.**
3. Textbooks, Manuals, Notes, Software Web Pages and Other Contributions to Teaching.
4. Teaching Awards and Other Special Recognition.
5. Advising (Other than research direction): Indicate number of students per year
  1. Undergraduate
  2. Graduate
  3. Other advising and mentoring activities (advising student groups, **advising underrepresented students**, special assignments, recruiting, faculty **membership** mentorship, **recruiting/advising/mentoring activities that enhance diversity and inclusion**, etc.)
6. Advising: Research direction. This refers to students whose projects the candidate has directed or chaired. The name of the student and academic year(s) involved should be included, as well as placement of the student(s), if project is completed.
7. Contribution to learning outcomes assessment.

8. Extension, Entrepreneurship and Public Engagement Activities. Major programs established, workshops, presentations, media activities, awards, honors, etc.

**Amendment #9: Submitted by Kumea Shorter-Gooden**

*Guidelines Page 12 – Teaching Portfolio*

In addition to **materials for the tenure and/or promotion dossier**, ~~you~~ **the candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio, according to Department guidelines, which could include the following types of items: course syllabi; a statement of teaching philosophy; a statement about how the candidate addresses diversity and inclusion in teaching; reflective assessments; learning outcomes assessment materials; and mentoring accomplishments, such as placement of advisees in academic and professional positions. Examples of teaching portfolio elements are included in the Appendix.**

**Amendment #10: Submitted by Randy Ontiveros**

*Guidelines Page 20 – External Evaluators*

The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal must be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted and ~~any prejudicial discussion regarding declines or non-answers is discouraged~~ **shall not be construed as positive or negative comment on the candidate's qualification for tenure.** In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review).

**Amendment #11: Submitted by Randy Ontiveros**

*Guidelines Page 21 - External Evaluators*

- All letters received in response to solicitation must be included in their entirety if the letters arrive in time for consideration by the Department APT Review Committee.
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation.
- Each letter should clearly indicate whether the evaluator was **nominated selected** by the candidate, or by the committee.
- Dossier preparation and evaluation is facilitated if letters from external evaluators are sent as searchable electronic attachments.
- **At each stage of the review process, APT voters should be reminded that declines or non-answers to email solicitations shall not be construed as substantive comment on the candidate's tenure case. This guideline is especially important in cases involving research in new or**

**interdisciplinary fields, or fields involving the study of underrepresented groups, as there are often a fewer number of full professors available to write.**

**Amendment #12: Submitted by Jordan Goodman**

*Guidelines Page 20 - External Evaluators*

The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a ~~formal~~ request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal **to availability requests and official requests** must be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted, and any prejudicial discussion regarding ~~declines or~~ non-answers is discouraged. **Evaluative information (negative or positive) provided with any written communication may be considered. However, information provided by evaluators who decline without access to the candidate's materials provided by the Department should be given lesser weight than written responses provided by official evaluators who have accepted the invitation and been provided access to the candidate's official materials for promotion and/or tenure.** In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review)....

**Amendment #13: Submitted by Steve Hurtt**

Research, Scholarship, Creative **and/or Professional** Activity.

**Amendment #14: Submitted by Ryan Belcher**

*APT Policy Page 21 – A. First Level Review 1.*

A. First level Review

1. Eligible Voters: At the first level unit of review, the review committee shall consist of all members of the faculty of that unit who are eligible to vote **and one undergraduate student or one graduate student.** To be eligible to vote within the first level unit, the faculty member must hold a tenured appointment in the university and must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion. **To be eligible to vote within the first level unit, the undergraduate or graduate student must be in good academic, financial, and judicial standing with the University and must study within the College or similar institution of the candidate.** Tenured faculty voting on promotions cases at the first level of review may only do so in a single academic department or non departmentalized school, and may only vote in units in which they have a regular appointment and where this is permitted by the unit's plan of organization. In those cases where a faculty member has the opportunity to vote in more than one department or non departmentalized school, the faculty

member votes in that department/school in which the faculty member holds tenure.

**Amendment #15: Submitted by Ryan Belcher**

*APT Policy Page 27 – C. Third-level Review 1.*

C. Third level Review

1. A third-or campus-level review committee shall be established in the following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members holding the rank of Professor, one from each of the eight large colleges (Agriculture and Natural Resources; Arts and Humanities; Behavioral and Social Sciences; Business; Engineering; School of Public Health) and one from among the four small colleges (Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Information Studies; Journalism; Public Policy). **The Provost shall also appoint one undergraduate student or one graduate student. The student(s) must be in good academic, financial, and judicial standing with the University.** Since this committee shall make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion have been met, members of this committee shall have a track record of outstanding academic judgment along with sufficient intellectual breadth and depth to be capable of comparing and judging candidates from varied disciplinary, cross disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. No small college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once in every three terms. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, from the Senate Executive Committee, and from the faculty at large. **For the undergraduate student and the graduate student members, the Provost will rely on recommendations from the Student Government Association, the Provost Student Advisory Council, Department Chairs, Deans, and the Senate Executive Committee.** No one serving in a full time administrative position may serve as a voting member of the committee. The Provost shall be a non voting ex officio member.