

## **1. DEPARTMENT PROFESSIONAL TRACK FACULTY POLICY**

---

1. *Professional Track Faculty Representation.* Persons in this category are those who currently teach in the department. They are encouraged to participate in faculty meetings, but they will not vote on matters of importance only to tenured and tenure track faculty (for example, tenure & promotion, merit committee matters for tenured and tenure track faculty, and tenure track hiring). Persons in this category can also be elected/appointed to committees, with the exception of those committees that are of concern only to tenure and tenure track faculty. Persons in this category will have voting representation on committees which are tasked with the creation/adoption/revision of Professional Track Faculty policy. Persons in this category will have voting representation on committees tasked with addressing the appointment, reappointment and promotion of professional track faculty. Note: This category *does not* include adjunct and affiliate faculty, or persons who teach in other departments and teach a course cross-listed with Anthropology.

### 2. Searches for Professional Track Faculty

2.1a Professional Track Faculty titles can be found here- <https://faculty.umd.edu/appointment/new-titles.html>. Minimum credentials for each instructional faculty rank are included in Table 1 of the 'BSOS Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Instructional Faculty'.

2.1.b Competitive, posted searches should be conducted for full-time instructional faculty teaching positions and are strongly encouraged for 50% FTE or greater. Searches may be waived on a case-by-case basis when filling short-term vacancies. All searches will follow campus procedures & policies and regular departmental practices.

2.1.c Contracts shall follow campus procedures, including the online contract management system for issuing these contracts in order to ensure that the most up-to-date contract guidelines are being followed and so that the University can better track appointments and promotions of Professional Track Faculty. Contracts will stipulate the terms of employment, the salary, assignments and expectations, notification date about renewal or non-renewal, resources, and performance/ evaluation criteria and timeline. When a professional track faculty member's duties include administration, service, and/or research in addition to teaching, then the contract letter stipulates the range of expectations in addition to teaching, and the % FTE dedicated to each of the domains will be included in the contract. The specific title will correspond to the majority of the appointee's effort as indicated by the assignments and expectations. Whenever possible professional track faculty should be offered progressively longer contracts in order to provide stability to the faculty member and the department.

## 2.2 Procedures for Review, Reappointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty

- 2.2.a New hires will receive a copy of the BSOS evaluation and promotion policy. At the time of appointment or reappointment, each professional track faculty shall be provided with a letter of offer that includes a confirmation of the time of the scheduled review and any exceptional or unusual arrangements relating to criteria for appointment. Professional track faculty shall receive a formal review for contract renewal in the fall semester corresponding to their eleventh semester of continuous full-time service, except for cases described in paragraph IV.F.7 of the University of Maryland System Policy. When an appointment is made at some time other than at the beginning of the academic year (July or August, as appropriate), the time of the scheduled review shall be confirmed at the time the appointment is made. The usual condition is to defer the decision by one full year if the appointment is effective after September 30. This special condition should be acknowledged at the time of employment and made part of the contract of employment.
- 2.2.b Appointment, Reappointment, and/or promotion will be based primarily on the candidate's record of accomplishment, as appropriate, in each of the three areas of teaching and advisement, research, and service, and the anticipated level of future achievements as indicated by accomplishments to date. Due to the fact that professional track faculty are hired to fill specific goals, i.e. the instructional or the research professor series, which are the two series that Anthropology anticipates are relevant for our Department, as opposed to the tenure-track faculty who are expected to achieve in all three areas of teaching, research and service, in this case the above term 'appropriate' refers to the activities as defined in the candidate's contract. The teaching, research, or service parameters will be measured using the same definitions used for tenure track and tenured faculty but with the overall scope defined by the expectations defined in the contract. Considerations relating to the present or future programmatic value of the candidate's particular field of expertise, or other larger institutional objectives, may legitimately be considered in the context of a reappointment decision. The faculty and the Department Chair are responsible for advising professional track faculty on any and all programmatic considerations relevant to the reappointment decision, conveying any such information to the candidate at the earliest opportunity during annual assessments of progress towards seventh year reappointment.
- 2.2.c Faculty review committees are an essential part of the review and recommendation process for all full-time faculty. Review committees and administrators shall impose the highest standards of quality and ensure that all candidates receive full and impartial treatment.
- 2.2.d In accordance with the university APT policy, when the President or designee has completed his or her review of the case and informed the candidate of the decision, the list of the members of department, college, and campus committees shall be made available upon request.
- 2.2.e First-Level Review
- 2.2.e.1 For Promotion only: A candidate wishing to be considered for promotion (there is no official minimum or maximum time in rank that will lead to evaluation for promotion) will provide the department chair with the following no later than October 1st of the academic year in which the review will take

place:

- i. A formal request letter to her/his department chair outlining the relevant points supporting a promotion.
- ii. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
- iii. A teaching portfolio following campus faculty guidelines
- iv. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)

2.2.e.2 The review committee of the department shall consist of all eligible members of the faculty. Eligible members of the faculty are all full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members, excluding the Department Chair. For the purposes of a committee reviewing a request for promotion one voting committee member must be a Professional Track Faculty member of equal or higher rank. If fewer than three eligible members of the faculty are available, faculty from allied disciplines shall be invited to serve as voting members of the faculty committee so that there are at least three voting members. The review committee may establish an advisory subcommittee, but the vote of the entire eligible faculty shall be considered the recommendation of the faculty. The Department Chair will submit a recommendation separately; the recommendation of the Department Chair shall be considered together with all other relevant materials at higher levels of review. The department review committee shall appoint an eligible member of the faculty, who may be the chair of the review committee, to be the spokesperson for the committee.

2.2.e.3 Full-time Professional Track Faculty are provided annually with an informal assessment by the Department Chair following consultations with the faculty of their progress toward seventh year reappointment. Any change in the nature of the department's programmatic needs or in other larger institutional objectives which may have a bearing on the candidate's prospects for continued employment will be brought to the attention of the candidate at the earliest possible time. In addition, the Department Chair shall make the best possible effort to advise candidates of prevailing standards of quality and of the most effective ways to demonstrate that they meet the standards. The advice and assessments provided the candidates will avoid simplistic quantitative guidelines and will not suggest or imply that decisions will be based on the quantity of effort, independent of its intellectual quality.

2.2.e.4 The department review committee shall prepare a committee summary report on each candidate. This report shall describe in a factual way all of the candidate's activities and achievements in teaching and advisement, in research, and in service. The report shall be shown to the candidate before the formal review and faculty vote begins. The candidate shall have the right to review the report and to append an optional Personal Statement which shall indicate any disagreement with the committee's version of the facts and such other information that the candidate chooses to present. The existence of disagreement as to facts shall also be acknowledged in the report. The report and the appended Personal Statement, if any, shall be seen by all persons involved in the review process at every level.

2.2.e.5 The committee chair of a committee reviewing for promotion will submit the following package to the department chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote which will take place by Feb 15<sup>th</sup> at the latest: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee

summary report. Committees reviewing for reappointment only need to submit the summary report and the optional personal statement if supplied. The committee summary report will state the committee's vote and recommendation and explain the basis for the faculty's recommendation insofar as that basis has been made known in the discussions taking place among the members of the committee. This package will be provided to the Department Chair for his or her information and for forwarding to higher levels of review. Faculty participating in the unit's deliberations who wish to express a dissenting view are free to do so, and any such written statement shall be provided to the Department Chair and included in the materials sent forward to the next level of review. These letters shall be made available to all eligible members of the department faculty.

- 2.2.e.6 The recommendation of the Department Chair shall also be in writing. The Department Chair's recommendation shall be transmitted to the second-level review, and a copy shall be made available for review by any member of the faculty participating in the reviewed deliberations. The Department Chair shall also prepare a letter to be provided to the candidate, stating the nature of the recommendation and summarizing the basis for that recommendation. The faculty member serving as chair of the department's review committee shall review both letters written by the Department Chair to ensure that the letter provided to the candidate accurately summarizes the recommendation and justification forwarded to the next level of review.
- 2.2.e.7 In accordance with the university APT policy, the case shall go forward to the next level of review if the faculty vote is fifty percent favorable, or if the Department Chair's recommendation is favorable. Promotion requests for the middle rank in either PTK title series (associate research scientist/scholar or senior lecturer) are reviewed at the college level and decided by the Dean. Promotion requests for the highest rank in either PTK title series (research scientist/scholar or principal lecturer) are reviewed at the campus level and decided by the Provost. If both the faculty and Department Chair's recommendations are negative, the case does not go forward for further review and the department's action is considered final. The decision shall be communicated to the candidate in writing.
- 2.2.e.8 In the case of a negative outcome, the candidate may submit a written appeal to the department chair within two weeks of being notified of the decision. The appeal must be based on the grounds that (a) the procedure described above was not followed correctly or that (b) the criteria used for evaluation were inadequate or improper. Appeals cannot be made on any other basis. Within two weeks of receiving the appeal, the department chair must form an appeals committee consisting of five faculty members at or above the rank of the promotion who had not served on the initial review committee. The committee then has four weeks to consider the written appeal, meet with the candidate and any other relevant individuals, and send a written decision to the chair and the candidate. If the appeal is successful, then a new promotion review will be conducted, correcting the deficiencies of the prior one. If the outside letters were not the subject of the appeal, then they will serve as the outside letters for the new review. If the appeal is denied, the candidate is not promoted and the chair of the review committee sends the candidate a letter explaining the grounds on which the appeal was denied. A candidate seeking promotion to the middle ranks of either PTK title series can appeal that

decision to the Associate Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The Associate Dean, either alone or with the advice of an ad hoc committee that s/he forms for this purpose, can reverse the departmental appeals committee's decision on the grounds that (a) procedures were not properly followed or (b) the evaluation criteria were inadequate or improper. This decision is final and not subject to further appeal. For candidates seeking promotion to the highest ranks in either PTK title series, the final decision on an appeal will be handled at the level of the Provost.

- 2.2.e.9 BSOS will determine minimum salary increases for promotions annually.
- 2.2.e.10 In the event a professional track faculty member holds multiple appointments in different departments in the same title series the professional track member should apply for promotion in the unit in which he or she has the greatest %FTE employment.
- 2.2.e.11 Merit Pay for Professional Track Faculty will be determined by the Merit Pay Committee. The Merit Pay Committee will use the expectations as defined by the contract (i.e. for an Instructional series versus a Research Professor series) to determine eligibility.
- 2.2.f Recognition
  - 2.2.f.1 A negative decision on promotion does not preclude renewal of an existing professional track appointment.
  - 2.2.f.2 Promotions cannot be rescinded – future appointments will be to the rank granted through the promotion process.
  - 2.2.f.3 Professional track faculty are eligible for nomination to these BSOS awards: the Outstanding Development Award, the Excellence in Teaching Award, the Excellence in Mentorship Award, the Excellence in Service Award, the Excellence in Research Award, and the Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion Award. <http://bsos.umd.edu/faculty-staff/college-awards>
- 2.3 Mentorship of Professional Track Faculty
  - 2.3.a Mentorship of professional track faculty will be voluntary, and on request from the professional track faculty member. The professional track faculty can choose their own mentor. The professional track faculty member can ask the Department Chair to appoint a tenured or professional track faculty member as mentor if they wish. Mentorship will entail meeting at least once a semester. The mentee will be expected to schedule these meetings. These purpose of these meetings will be to discuss the mentees professional development. Should the mentee request formal feedback a written description of their progress from the perspective of the mentor can be requested once an academic year.

