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The following procedures (“Procedures”) supplement the UMCP Policy on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) of Faculty (as approved by the Chancellor, March 26, 1993, and revised in University of Maryland 2015 Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures Manual). In case of conflict, the UMD Procedures represent the governing document.

Definitions of the Committees participating in the Smith School’s APT process are:

APT: School’s Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committees. There are two APT committees:
   a. Junior APT- or JAPT: all tenured faculty in the School (for promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty member seeking to become an Associate Professor with tenure).
   b. Senior APT- or SAPT: all tenured full professors in the School (for promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty member seeking to become a Full Professor or a Professor of Practice).

Notes: The Dean is not eligible for membership on any APT committee in the School. Although there are two APT committees, in the discussion below, the committee will be called the APT and the appropriate APT committee will apply.

There are two advisory subcommittees to the APT committee.

ARC: Area Review Committee. There are two ARC committees:
   a. JARC: all tenured faculty in the area of a candidate seeking to become an Associate Professor (for promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty seeking to become an Associate Professor with tenure).
   b. SARC: all full professors in the area of a faculty member seeking to become a Full Professor (for promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty seeking to become a Full Professor).

Note: Although there are two ARC committees in an area, in the discussion below, the committee will be called the ARC and the appropriate ARC committee will apply.

The ARC activities shall include: a) preparation of a descriptive report on the candidate’s record; b) external referee selection; c) information gathering, cohort comparison and analysis, review, analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s research, teaching and service accomplishments and advisory vote; and d) preparation of a written report on its analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments to inform subsequent parts of the candidate’s assessment, namely his/her CRC, the School APT and the Dean’s evaluation.

CRC: The Candidate Review Committee (at the level of the School) is charged with conducting an intensive review of the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. The CRC holds an advisory vote, and reports this information back to the APT Committee in an oral report. Afterwards, the CRC reports a description of both the oral report and the discussion of the APT Committee and its vote back to the College Dean. A Candidate Review Committee shall consist of two members of the candidate's area and two members from outside the candidate's area, all of whom are
eligible to serve on the School APT Committee.

1. It is the policy of the Robert H. Smith School of Business that the Tenured Faculty of the School shall formally review the candidates for promotion and tenure during the year in which the candidate is to be considered for promotion and/or promotion and tenure at the University of Maryland at College Park. Consistent with the current University of Maryland Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual, the criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions fall into three general categories: a) performance in teaching, advising and mentoring of students; b) performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity; and c) performance of professional service to the University, the profession, or the community.

The impact of a candidate’s published research shall receive strong consideration in assessing his/her research performance. Impact shall be reflected through some combination of: a) citations; b) indices of research productivity; c) the evaluations of external referees or reviewers who are widely recognized authorities in the candidate’s field (see #6), as well as other appropriate indicators. When assessing impact in the case of junior candidates whose research portfolio is generally recently published and thus, may not have had sufficient amount of time to elicit a representative number of citations, emphasis shall be placed on the evaluation of the external reviewers/referees.

2. The promotion and tenure process may be initiated either by the candidate or the chairperson of the area to which the candidate belongs. In the special case where the area chairperson is an associate professor and a candidate from the area is applying for full professor, the Dean will appoint an acting area chairperson, with the candidate’s consent. The acting chairperson will be a full professor from the same area, or closely related area, who will perform all of the area chairperson’s APT-related duties enumerated herein for that particular candidate. The area of the candidate will set up the appropriate ARC committee – either JARC or SARC. If there are not enough individuals with sufficient rank in an area to form a committee of not less than three individuals, then the Dean of the School, or his/her designee (usually the Associate Dean of Faculty), shall appoint a sufficient number of individuals from other faculty areas to create an ARC of not less than three. A strong effort shall be made to select individuals with knowledge of the candidate’s field.

3. The ARC will meet to elect a chairperson (who shall not be the area chairperson) to lead its activities which shall include: a) preparation of a descriptive report on the candidate’s record (see #6); b) external reviewer selection (see #7); c) information gathering, cohort comparison and analysis, review, analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s research, teaching and service accomplishments and advisory vote (see #7); and d) preparation of a written evaluative report (see #8) on its analysis and evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments to inform subsequent parts of the candidate’s assessment, namely his/her CRC, the School APT and the Dean’s evaluation. Activities a) through c) may be performed concurrently, with the analysis subsequently synthesized in the evaluative report indicated in activity d). The candidate’s review of the descriptive report will be compliant with University guidelines.
4. Acting for the APT, the ARC shall generate a cohort comparison group for the candidate based on its knowledge about the candidate’s scholarship and research, and shall also decide the appropriate criteria for the peer group comparison. This information may include number of “A”-level publications, citation count, the H-index, or other information deemed appropriate. The ARC shall take great care to insure the accuracy of the information collected for comparison and also shall provide a written statement, explaining how the cohort group and the comparison criteria were chosen that will be shared with the candidate’s CRC, the School APT, the Dean, and the University APT. The ARC’s information gathering activities, including its peer comparison, shall in no way constrain those that the candidate’s CRC chooses to undertake in its subsequent, due diligence.

5. The ARC also will select at least six reviewers (external to the University) for the candidate’s research. The candidate will name at least three of these reviewers, but no more than half. Issues related requesting evaluation letters from collaborators will be addressed through University policy. The area chairperson shall solicit evaluation letters with a letter of uniform format that is the same for all Areas of the Smith School. These reviewers shall be widely recognized authorities in the candidate's field. The total number of external reviewers shall be no less than six or more than eight. Reviewers should possess recognized expertise in the candidate's area. The Dean's designee (usually the Associate Dean of Faculty) shall review and consult with the ARC about the composition of candidate’s referee group before the area chair invites the referees to evaluate the candidate. The Area Chairperson shall send the following to reviewers as the basis for their evaluation: the candidate’s Vita, personal statement, and research materials as selected by the candidate.

6. Members of the ARC shall review the candidate’s Vita, personal statement, research materials, letters from the referees and peer comparison. Acting for the APT, the ARC shall prepare a descriptive report on the candidate, identifying in a factual way, all the candidate’s activities and achievements in teaching, advisement, research, scholarship and service. This descriptive report shall be shown to the candidate. The candidate has the right to disagree with the descriptive report and to append a personal statement to the report indicating any such disagreements and the reasons for them. The descriptive report, including any appendices, becomes part of the candidate's file.

7. The ARC shall finalize its evaluation by meeting to discuss the case and to provide an advisory vote conducted by secret ballot. Prior to the scheduled meeting where the advisory vote will be taken, any ARC member may submit anonymous comments or questions, positive or negative, about the candidate’s qualifications for tenure to the Area Chair (not the Chair of the ARC). These comments will be shared with the ARC and discussed at the meeting prior to the advisory vote. The outcome of the vote, together with the discussion at the ARC meeting will be used to explain the reasons for its advisory vote.

8. After the ARC has completed its deliberations and taken an advisory vote, it shall prepare a written evaluative report including: a) its analysis of the
candidate’s research, teaching and service record; and b) its advisory vote and explanation of that vote. Because the ARC members are generally those faculty most familiar with the candidate’s area of research as well as his/her teaching and service accomplishments, their written evaluative report will inform the Candidate’s CRC, and the School APT’s evaluations, as well as the Dean’s letter evaluating the candidate’s case.

In the area of research, this analysis and evaluation shall be particularly detailed and thorough, taking into consideration the individual’s programs of research, the scholarly and applied contributions made by a representative set of the candidates’ research articles, books and papers, representative comments from the referees’ letters, the results of the peer comparison, and an analysis of the candidate’s accomplishments and impact as well as predicted future scholarly contributions and impact. Similar analyses shall be conducted in the areas of teaching and service (See Exhibit 1 of this document for an outline of this report). Dissenting ARC members may write their own statements that will be attached to the ARC’s report.

9. After reviewing the candidate's file, including the ARC Report, the area chairperson (or the acting area chairperson as referred to in #2 above) shall write a separate letter to the Dean giving his or her recommendations with respect to promotion of the candidate. This letter will include the reasons for the recommendation or lack thereof and shall become part of the candidate’s promotion and tenure file.

10. The area chairperson will insure that the candidate assembles all information required by the campus P&T transmittal form. Then the Area Chairperson shall assemble the candidate’s file containing: (a) candidate’s Vita, and personal statement, (b) external reviewers’ letters, (c) copies of papers, articles, books, etc., (d) teaching evaluations, (e) area chairperson’s letter, (f) the peer comparison, (g) the descriptive report; and h) the ARC’s evaluative report. The Dean’s Office will distribute Items (a-h), as well as any other materials listed by current University of Maryland Appointment Promotion, and Tenure Procedures Manual as mandatory for a candidate’s dossier at this point in the evaluation process, to the College APT Committee at least two weeks prior to the College APT meeting.

11. Cases for promotion and, possibly, tenure shall go forward to the APT regardless of the ARC’s advisory vote and the recommendation of the area chairperson.

12. The Dean, or his/her designee (normally the Associate Dean of Faculty), nominates a chair for the JAPT and a chair for the SAPT. The chair of the JAPT will generally be different than that of the SAPT. The chairs of the JAPT and SAPT are approved or disapproved through electronic ballot (majority vote) of the membership of the APT.

15. A Candidate Review Committee (CRC) will be selected for each candidate by the Area Chair, after consultation with the Dean’s designee (usually the Associate Dean of faculty), and the candidate. A CRC shall consist of two members from the candidate’s area and two members from outside the candidate’s area. These individuals shall be chosen because of their ability and their willingness to conscientiously carry out the duties of the CRC as
described below. The CRC Committee will elect a chairperson.

16. The CRC shall be formed in sufficient time to carry out its assigned duties, namely to: a) conduct an intensive review of the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure; b) conduct a secret advisory vote; c) make an oral report to the APT summarizing its information gathering and evaluation of the candidate’s case for promotion and/or tenure, and its advisory vote; d) investigate and report back its findings on questions and concerns raised about the candidate by members of the School’s APT; and e) prepare a letter summarizing its analysis, findings, and advisory vote, as well as summarizing the APT’s discussion of the candidate and reporting the APT vote.

17. The CRC shall conduct an intensive review of all materials in the candidate’s file as described in #11. If the CRC believes more information is needed beyond that contained in the existing candidate file, it may decide to collect such. In order to assist the CRC in thoroughly analyzing and assessing the candidate’s record, the Dean’s Office will establish and oversee a process enabling faculty who are members’ of Smith’s APT Committee, to confidentially provide comments and questions to the CRC about the Candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. Such comments and questions will be accepted by the designated representative of the Dean’s Office (excluding the Dean, Senior Associate Dean, Associate Deans or Assistant Dean’s) up until one week before the Smith APT Meeting. The CRC then will carefully consider these questions and concerns, and conduct additional due diligence as needed. It shall then respond to as many of the questions and concerns as appropriate and reasonably possible during its oral report on the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and tenure, given during the Smith APT meeting or during the question and answer sessions that follows its oral report. The CRC must meet formally at least once after its intensive review of the candidate but before its presentation of the oral report in the School APT meeting.

18. Based on an individual member’s review of candidate’s file and the CRC’s oral report and the APT discussion, the APT will vote on the candidate by secret ballot. In order to obtain a positive or favorable recommendation from the APT, two-thirds of those faculty members of the APT who vote must vote in favor of the candidate. Abstention votes will not be included in the calculation of the two-thirds majority but will be reported. Following the APT vote, the members of the CRC who attended the APT meeting will jointly write a letter to the Dean, to be completed within fifteen days of the meeting of the APT. This letter will comprehensively describe the discussion of the candidate at the APT Meeting, report the vote, and highlight the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses. However, the CRC shall not be obligated to include any negative information about the candidate that was not expressed at the APT meeting. The Dean’s designee (typically the Associate Dean for Faculty) shall communicate the results of the APT vote to the candidate.

19. The candidate’s file, containing the CRC summary letter, and the items described in #11 above, will be sent to the Dean. The Dean will write an evaluation letter. In the letter, the Dean will report the results of the advisory ARC vote, the advisory CRC vote, and the vote of the APT. The
Dean’s letter will be added to the candidate’s file, which will be forwarded to the next level within 30 days of the APT Meeting, unless both the APT and the Dean vote against promotion. In the latter case, the file shall go forward to the Provost only to insure that proper procedures were followed. At this level of the School’s Promotion and Tenure process, the APT’s decisions and the Dean’s decision shall be reported to the candidate only if either or both are negative. This notification shall be provided by the Dean in a manner consistent with University’s policy for candidate notification of APT decisions (see University of Maryland 2015 Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures Manual).

20. The same procedures as above shall apply to external candidates.
Exhibit 1

Exemplar Outline of ARC Evaluative Report Overall Length (5-6 pages, single space, with double spacing between headings and paragraphs)

I. Title: ARC Evaluative Report for Professor _________
   A. Summary Paragraph-- mentioning research record highlights, reputation in field, predicted future productivity, summary conclusions from peer comparison, summary of teaching and service accomplishments, summary evaluation of all reviewers, summary recommendation of ARC mentioning vote as advisory.

II. Research and Scholarship
   A. Overview paragraph mentioning structure for section including area of discipline in which candidate works, strong competencies, discussion of candidate’s specific research programs and planned future work, overall statement of how the candidate has contributed to the field.
   B. Research Program/Stream 1, Title
      a. Areas of focus and mediums through which candidate has focused—e.g. empirical articles, theoretical articles, books
      b. Specific review of 2-4 articles and the unique contribution that candidate has made to the area. External reviewer quotes on this research program/stream
      c. Summary of contributions and conclusions
   C. Research Program/Stream 2., etc.
   D. Placement of Publications—Ranking of outlets of articles and books, brief discussion
   E. Peer Comparison Presentation, Conclusions
   F. Summary Collective Assessment across Research and Scholarship, quoted comments of external reviewers. Summary statement on influence and impact

III. Teaching and Mentoring
   a. Sizes, types, levels of courses taught
   b. Description of work with doctoral students and placements if appropriate
   c. Anonymous comments of students taken from evaluations
   d. Summary paragraph of course evaluation data

IV. Summary of Service at University, School, Area, and profession.

V. Conclusions—Long paragraph comparing candidate achievements to P&T Criteria sent by Smith School to Campus APT Committee and to that of other elite Universities and Schools as shown in peer analysis. Review of the candidate’s research areas and achievements, any special competencies that enhance contributions, excellence level of current research record and predictions for future, achievements, and committee recommendation for promotion/and tenure.