

Guidelines for Professional Track Faculty

Professional track faculty include Instructional Faculty as well as non-tenure-track research faculty and faculty specialists.

a. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Instructional Faculty

Instructional Faculty at the University of Maryland have four ranks: Junior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer. These ranks do not carry tenure. The appointment and promotion criteria for these ranks are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Minimum Credentials for Each Instructional Faculty Rank.

Titles	Junior Lecturer	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
Academic Degree	The normal minimum requirement is a Master's degree or ABD. Exceptions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.	The normal minimum requirement is a Master's degree; PhD (or equivalent) preferred.	The normal minimum requirement is a Master's degree; PhD (or equivalent) strongly preferred.	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).

<p>Professional Experience</p>	<p>Created for graduate students finishing their programs beyond their Graduate Assistantship.</p> <p>At a minimum, appointees should have at least two semesters experience as a Teaching Assistant or equivalent.</p>	<p>The title Lecturer is used to designate appointments of persons serving primarily in a teaching capacity.</p> <p>Appointees will have a proven record of effective teaching within the discipline and at least one-year of instruction (or its equivalent) or at least five years experience practicing within the discipline.</p>	<p>In addition to having the qualifications of a Lecturer, the appointee shall have an exemplary teaching record over the course of at least five years of full-time instruction or its equivalent as a Lecturer (or similar appointment at another institution) and shall exhibit promise in developing additional skills in the areas of research, service, mentoring, or program development.</p>	<p>In addition to the qualifications required of the Senior Lecturer, the appointee shall have an exemplary teaching record over the course of at least five years full-time service or its equivalent as a Senior Lecturer (or similar appointment at another institution) and/or the equivalent of five years full-time professional experience as well as demonstrated excellence in the areas of research, service, mentoring, or program development.</p>
<p>Contract Terms</p>	<p>Appointments to this rank are typically one-year and are renewable for a maximum of six years.</p>	<p>Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable.</p>	<p>Appointments to this rank are typically one to five years and are renewable.</p>	<p>Appointments are typically made as five-year contracts. Appointments for additional five-year terms can be renewed as early as the third year of any given five-year contract.</p>

i. *Search Procedures*

Competitive, posted searches will be conducted for full-time Instructional Faculty teaching positions and are strongly encouraged for 50% FTE or greater. All searches will follow campus procedures & policies and regular departmental practices.

ii. *Written Contracts:*

Contracts shall follow campus procedures for issuing these contracts. 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. As with other BSOS departments, CCJS will use the University's online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources.

iii. *Support for Instructional Faculty:*

In accordance with campus policy and in the best interest of students, all Instructional Faculty members should be provided with the necessary and appropriate department or unit support for the execution of their duties. These resources should conform to departmental practices for faculty with respect to assistance with course preparation, provision of teaching supplies, and staff support. Care should be taken to ensure that students can have access to both full-time and part-time faculty members through mailboxes, appropriate spaces for meetings, email, etc. and where appropriate and feasible, professional development of full-time and part-time PTK should be encouraged and supported.

iv. *Instructional Faculty Role in Departmental Governance:*

All Instructional Faculty are considered members of the Department. Accordingly, they may attend regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee (i.e., faculty meetings). They are not members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, however, and therefore cannot vote on matters of curriculum or the appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenure-track faculty. Instructional faculty will have a representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Instructional Faculty.

v. *Mentoring and Additional Training for Instructional Faculty:*

The Department shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. At the time of hiring, or within the first semester, the Department will provide each new faculty members with a copy of the Department's criteria for performance evaluation and review for promotion. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.

vi. *Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Instructional Faculty:*

Ongoing evaluations and reviews for promotion will account for and assess all departmental duties as described in the appointment letter. The specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's efforts, as indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the Unit's specific criteria for such rank. Evaluation and promotion review will be conducted at both departmental and college levels based on all of the duties (and percentages of time allotted for each) articulated in the current faculty contract.

vii. *Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Part-Time and Adjunct Instructional Faculty:*

Instructional Faculty appointed at less than 100% FTE will be reviewed and promoted on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. For example, in a department where eight courses per academic year represent a full workload for 100% FTE, Instructional Faculty teaching two courses per year are eligible for promotion at $\frac{1}{4}$ the pace of full-time counterparts.

Further clarification on UM Adjunct Faculty Policy and eligibility for Adjunct II status can be found [Here](#).

viii. *Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation:*

All Instructional Faculty will have formal reviews of their performance. Formal evaluations will be completed at: the midpoint of initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Junior Lecturers; the midpoint of initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Lecturers; the midpoint of initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Senior Lecturers; and, the midpoint of initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Principal Lecturers. This timeline is for full-time Instructional Faculty; formal evaluations of part-time Instructional Faculty will occur on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. These reviews will assess whether the faculty member is successfully meeting obligations and provide

a commentary on progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the next rank. The review will be completed by members of the Departmental Teaching Committee (of which the Director of Undergraduate Studies is a member). Formal evaluations shall be kept on record in a promotion file and shall be consulted when decisions are made about rank, salary, and contract renewal. All faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it in accordance with [campus policy](#).

ix. *Procedures for Promotion:*

1. There is an expectation that individuals will fulfill at least the length of their initial contract terms before seeking promotion. However, individuals can request an expedited review for promotion to the next higher rank. Waivers of the usual timelines will be considered on a case-by-case basis for individuals who demonstrate performance at that higher level within a shorter timeframe.
2. Individuals seeking promotion will write a formal request letter to her/his Department Chair outlining the relevant points supporting a promotion. The letter should address the criteria listed in Table 1 and in other sections of this document.
3. The candidate 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. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
 - ii. A teaching portfolio following campus faculty guidelines
 - iii. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)
4. The Department Chair will form a committee of at least three members, assigning a committee chair, and faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. At least one member will be a tenure-track faculty member and at least one committee member will be a professional track faculty. If there are no professional track faculty in the Department at or above the rank sought by the candidate, the Departmental chair will ask the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to recruit someone from another department.
5. The committee chair will submit the following package to the Department Chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee summary report, which includes a recommendation regarding promotion.
6. Upon completion of the first-level review by the committee, the CCJS

Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision inform the candidate in writing whether the recommendations made by the review committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative. If either the Department Chair or the review committee supports promotion, the materials will be forwarded to the Dean. If neither the Department Chair nor the review committee supports promotion, the case will not be forwarded to the Dean and the Chair will explain the reasons for the negative decision in his letter to the candidate. For review or promotion from Junior Lecturer to Lecturer or from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, the review process will end at the level of the Dean.

The promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer has a somewhat different procedure. If the Chair and/or committee supports promotion, the case will progress to the second level of review. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity with the approved bylaws of the College. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's standards for promotion have been met. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a written justification to the Provost, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost will transmit his or her recommendation and a written justification to the President.

At the College and University levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever recommendations are negative. For a positive decision, candidates will be informed of the decision at the conclusion of the review process. Once granted, a promotion cannot be rescinded.

7. In the case of a negative outcome at any level, the candidate for promotion can reinitiate this process in future years. In other words, a negative decision for promotion does not preclude renewal of the existing appointment.

Candidates have the right to appeal a negative decision. The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was

negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

For faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, the candidate can appeal to the Department. Within two weeks of receiving the appeal, the Department Chair must form an Appeals Committee consisting of three 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. The candidate can appeal that decision to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The 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 Principal Lecturer, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting that the case be submitted to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the Provost because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the

appeal and that these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

8. With the exception of Junior Lecturers, individuals may choose to stay at a given rank indefinitely (i.e., are not required to seek promotion within any specific timeframe).
9. Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment and one or more secondary appointments. When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for promotion, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows
 - i. If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary unit, then the secondary unit’s advice to the primary unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the Chair or director of the secondary unit.
 - ii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized school, then the director’s recommendation will be informed by advice from a review committee in that unit. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the Unit’s Plan of Organization.
 - iii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized school, then there shall be a review committee established and a formal recommendation provided in a manner consistent with that unit’s policies.

Table 2: Guidelines for Preparing the Promotion Review Report for Instructional Faculty

Titles	Junior Lecturer	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
--------	-----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------

<p>Course Materials (e.g. syllabi, learning outcomes, assignments, student work, etc.)</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that includes the following:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that includes the following:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> <p>Sample of student work with your feedback</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that demonstrates a history of:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> <p>Sample of student work with your feedback</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide a teaching portfolio that represents a true commitment to the scholarship of the teaching. Evidence may be provided through:</p> <p>A clear, well-written sample syllabus with appropriate learning outcomes</p> <p>Examples of pedagogically supported student assignments or activities</p> <p>Sample of student work with your feedback</p>
<p>Assessments (e.g. peer review, course evaluation summary, learning outcomes assessment, etc.)</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> <p>A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> <p>A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)</p> <p>Peer reviewed instruction and evaluation of teaching</p>	<p>At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following:</p> <p>A record of positive teaching evaluations</p> <p>A record of learning-oriented assessments (if teaching general education courses)</p> <p>Peer reviewed instruction and evaluation of teaching</p>

Instructional Advancements & Innovations	If applicable	If applicable	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: Examples of course/assignment/exam redesigns and/or modifications Proposals for newly created courses or formats	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: Examples of course/assignment/exam redesigns and/or modifications Proposals for newly created courses or formats
Other Evidence of Instructional Accomplishments (e.g. teaching philosophy, awards, training, research/scholarship in teaching/learning, etc.)	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Evidence of having completed a teacher training workshop or seminar	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Any evidence of teaching awards or scholarship	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Any evidence of teaching awards or scholarship Evidence of mentorship, service, or leadership	At a minimum, a faculty member must provide the following: A clear, concise teaching philosophy (not a list of positive teaching evaluations) Any evidence of teaching awards or scholarship Evidence of mentorship, service, or leadership
Summary	Record of teaching experience or Teaching Assistantship and a willingness to improve skills through training and mentorship.	Record of effective teaching and at least one-year of full-time instruction (or equivalent) or a combined five years of practical experience.	Record of significant contribution to the Unit's undergraduate instructional mission by excellence in instruction and/or student mentorship and service.	Outstanding and continuous record of contribution to the Unit's undergraduate instructional mission by excellence in instruction, student mentorship, and/or campus leadership and service.

x. *Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturer to Principle Lecturer (Full Time Only)*

Although neither mandated nor guaranteed, a salary increase from the BSOS Dean for promotions from full-time Lecturer to full-time Senior Lecturer or from full-time Senior Lecturer to full-time Principal Lecturer, can be negotiated by the Chair if it is matched by the Department. The amount can be augmented above the match if consistent across all candidates of the same rank in a given year within a department. The College will determine the minimum salary increases for promotion annually. Note that raises associated with promotion are independent of merit increases.

1. *Guidelines for Merit Increase.*

When merit funds are available, PTK Instructional Faculty will be assigned to one of three merit categories by the Department Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies according to their teaching evaluations (and performance in any other duties described in their contract): “exceeding expectations,” “meeting expectations,” or “performing below expectations.” The time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the of the last merit increase. The Departmental Chair will allocate available merit based on these rankings. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and increase in a formal letter from the Chair.

2. *Guidelines for Termination*

All campus instructional contracts include standard language for termination prior to end of appointment for both the University and the employee. Reasons for the University to terminate a contract prior to the end of appointment can be for reasons of performance or unit financial circumstances.

3. *Eligibility for College Award*

Instructional faculty can be nominated for the Excellence in Teaching Award, Excellence in Teaching and Mentorship Award, Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion Award and/or the Excellence in Service Award.

b. Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Research Faculty

Research Faculty at the University of Maryland have several ranks, which are listed below along with their criteria for appointment and promotion. These ranks do not carry tenure.

Table 3. Minimum Credentials for Each Research Faculty Rank.

Titles	Faculty Assistant	Post-Doctoral Associate	Assistant Research Professor	Associate Research Professor	Research Professor
Academic Degree	The normal minimum requirement is a baccalaureate degree.	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).	The normal minimum requirement is a PhD (or equivalent).
Professional Experience	The appointee shall be capable of assisting faculty in any dimension of academic activity and shall have the ability and training adequate to the carrying out of the particular techniques required, the assembling of data, and the use and care of any specialized techniques.	The appointee shall have been trained in research procedures, shall be capable of carrying out individual research or collaborating in group research at the advanced level, and shall have had the experience and specialized training necessary for success in such research projects as may be undertaken.	This rank is generally parallel to Assistant Professor. Appointees shall have demonstrated superior research ability and potential for contributing to the educational mission through teaching or service. Appointees should be qualified and competent to direct the work of others (such as technicians, graduate students, other research personnel).	This rank is generally parallel to Associate Professor. In addition to the qualifications required of the Assistant Research Professor, appointees shall have extensive successful experience in scholarly or creative endeavors, the ability to propose, develop and manage major research projects, and proven contributions to the educational mission through teaching or service.	This rank is generally parallel to Professor. In addition to the qualifications required of the Associate Research Professor, appointees shall have demonstrated a degree of proficiency sufficient to establish an excellent reputation among regional and national colleagues. Appointees should have a record of outstanding scholarly production in research, publications, professional achievements or other distinguished and creative activity, and exhibit

					excellence in contributing to the educational mission through teaching or service.
Contract Terms	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable for up to three years. After three years in rank, appointees who have performed satisfactorily should be eligible for appointment to an appropriate faculty position or encouraged to apply for a staff position.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable, provided the maximum consecutive service in this rank does not exceed six years. After six years in rank, appointees who have performed satisfactorily should be eligible for appointment to an appropriate faculty position.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to five years and are renewable.	Appointments to this rank are typically five years and are renewable.

i. Search Procedures

Competitive, posted searches will be conducted and all searches will follow [campus procedures & policies](#) and regular departmental practices.

ii. Written Contracts

Contracts shall follow campus procedures for issuing these contracts. 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 teaching in

addition to research, then the contract letter stipulates the range of expectations in addition to research, and the % FTE dedicated to each of the domains will be included in the contract. As with other BSOS departments, CCJS will use the University's online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources.

iii. Support for Research Faculty

In accordance with [campus policy](#), all research faculty members should be provided with the necessary and appropriate department or unit support for the execution of their duties. These resources should conform to departmental practices for faculty with respect to provision of supplies and staff support. Faculty members will have access to mailboxes, appropriate spaces for meetings, email, etc. and where appropriate and feasible, professional development will be encouraged and supported.

ii. Research Faculty Role in Departmental Governance

All research faculty are considered members of the Department. Accordingly, they may attend regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee (i.e., faculty meetings). They are not members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, however, and therefore cannot vote on matters of curriculum or the appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenure-track faculty. Research faculty will have a representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of research faculty.

iii. Mentoring and Additional Training for Research Faculty

The Department shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. At the time of hiring, or within the first semester, the Department will provide each new faculty member with a copy of the Department's criteria for performance evaluation and review for promotion. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.

iv. Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Research Faculty:

Ongoing evaluations and reviews for promotion will account for and assess all departmental duties as described in the appointment letter. The specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's efforts, as

indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the Unit's specific criteria for such rank. Evaluation and promotion review will be conducted at both departmental and college levels based on all of the duties (and percentages of time allotted for each) articulated in the current faculty contract.

v. *Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation:*

All research faculty will have formal reviews of their performance. Formal evaluations will be completed: at the midpoint of the initial term and the midpoint of any renewed term for Faculty Assistants; at the midpoint of initial term and the midpoint of any renewed term for Post-Doctoral Associates; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Assistant Research Professors; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Associate Research Professors; and, the midpoint of initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Research Professors. Formal evaluations of part-time research faculty at the rank of Assistant Research Professor and higher will occur on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. These reviews will assess whether the faculty member is successfully meeting obligations and provide a commentary on progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the next rank. The review will be completed by a committee chaired by the Research Faculty's direct supervisor. Ideally, this committee will include at least one PTK faculty member. Formal evaluations shall be kept on record in a promotion file and shall be consulted when decisions are made about rank, salary, and contract renewal. All faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it in accordance with [campus policy](#).

vi. *Procedures for Promotion:*

1. Faculty assistants and Post-Doctoral Associates are not eligible for promotion. After a certain amount of time demonstrating satisfactory performance (see Table 3), they may be eligible for appointment to a different rank or position. Assistant Research Professors may be promoted to Associate Research Professor and Associate Research Professors may be promoted to Research Professor. Therefore, the following procedures refer to these ranks.
2. There is an expectation that individuals will fulfill at least the length of their initial contract terms before seeking promotion. However, individuals can request an expedited review for promotion to the next higher rank. Waivers of the usual timelines will be considered on a case-by-case basis for individuals who demonstrate performance at that higher level within a shorter timeframe.
3. Individuals seeking promotion will write a formal request letter to

her/his Department Chair outlining the relevant points supporting a promotion. The letter should address the criteria listed in Table 3 and other sections of this document.

4. The candidate 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. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
 - ii. A personal statement, following campus faculty guidelines, that discusses the demonstrated record of achievement in research and/or professional activity
 - iii. Examples of research (e.g., articles, technical reports, books)
 - iv. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)
5. The Department Chair will form a committee of at least three members, assigning a committee chair, and faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. At least one member will be a tenure-track faculty member and at least one committee member will be a professional track faculty. If there are no professional track faculty in the Department at or above the rank sought by the candidate, the Departmental chair will ask the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to recruit someone from another department.
6. The committee chair will submit the following package to the Department Chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee summary report.
7. Upon completion of the first-level review by the committee, the CCJS Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision inform the candidate in writing whether the recommendations made by the review committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative. If either the Department Chair or the review committee supports promotion, the materials will be forwarded to the Dean. If the neither the Department Chair nor the review committee supports promotion, the case will not be forwarded to the Dean and the chair will explain the reasons for the negative decision in his letter to the candidate. For review or promotion from Assistant to Associate Research Professor, the review process will end at the level of the Dean.

The promotion from Associate Research Professor to Research Professor has a somewhat different procedure. If the chair and/or committee supports promotion, the case will progress to the second level of review. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity with the approved bylaws

of the College. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's standards for promotion have been met. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a written justification to the Provost, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review. The Provost will transmit his or her recommendation and a written justification to the President.

At the College and university levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever recommendations are negative. For a positive decision, candidates will be informed of the decision at the conclusion of the review process. Once granted, a promotion cannot be rescinded.

8. In the case of a negative outcome at any level, the candidate for promotion can reinstate this process in future years. In other words, a negative decision for promotion does not preclude renewal of the existing appointment.

Candidates have the right to appeal a negative decision. The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

For faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Research

Professor, the candidate can appeal to the Department. Within two weeks of receiving the appeal, the Department Chair must form an Appeals Committee consisting of three 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. The candidate can appeal that decision to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The 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 Research Professor, the candidate may appeal the decision by requesting that the case be submitted to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the Provost because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

9. With the exception of Faculty Assistant and Post-Doctoral Associate, individuals may choose to stay at a given rank indefinitely (i.e., are not required to seek promotion within any specific timeframe).
10. Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment and one or more secondary appointments. When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for promotion, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows:
 - i. If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the

secondary unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the Chair or director of the secondary unit.

- ii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-departmentalized school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from a review committee in that unit. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the Unit's Plan of Organization.
- iii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized school, then there shall be a review committee established and a formal recommendation provided in a manner consistent with that unit's policies.

vii. *Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions from Assistant Research Professor to Associate Research Professor and Associate Research Professor to Research Professor (Full Time Only)*

Although neither mandated nor guaranteed, a salary increase from the BSOS Dean for promotions from full-time Assistant Research Professor to full-time Associate Research Professor or from full-time Associate Research Professor to full-time Research Professor, can be negotiated by the Chair if it is matched by the Department. The amount can be augmented above the match if consistent across all candidates of the same rank in a given year within a department. The College will determine the minimum salary increases for promotion annually. Note that raises associated with promotion are independent of merit increases.

viii. *Guidelines for Merit Increase.*

When merit funds are available, PTK research faculty will be assigned to one of three merit categories by the Department Chair and their direct supervisor according to a review of their CV: "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," or "performing below expectations." The time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the of the last merit increase. Available merit will be allocated based on these rankings and the available funding. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and increase in a formal letter from the Chair.

ix. *Guidelines for Termination*

All campus instructional contracts include standard language for termination prior to end of appointment for both the University and the employee. Reasons for the University to terminate a contract prior to the end of appointment can be for reasons of performance or unit financial circumstances.

x. *Eligibility for College Awards*

Research faculty can be nominated for the Excellence in Research Award, Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion Award and/or the Excellence in Service Award.

c. ***Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Faculty Specialist Ranks***

Faculty Specialists at the University of Maryland have several ranks, which are listed below along with their criteria for appointment and promotion. These ranks do not carry tenure.

Table 4. Minimum Credentials for Each Faculty Specialist Rank

Titles	Faculty Specialist	Senior Faculty Specialist	Principal Faculty Specialist
Academic Degree	The normal minimum requirement is a BS/BA.	The normal minimum requirement is an MA/MS or a BA/BS plus three years' experience.	The normal minimum requirement is an MA/MS plus three years' experience or a BA/BS plus five years' experience.
Professional Experience	The appointee shall be capable of data collection and processing, assisting with data analysis, contributing to presentations, and assisting with project management activities.	The appointee shall have demonstrated an ability to fulfill the duties of faculty specialist, as well as contribute to grants and/or research reports and/or articles, supervise students or junior faculty specialists and demonstrate a potential for leadership.	The appointee shall have demonstrated an ability to fulfill the duties of senior faculty specialist, as well as write grant proposals, serve as lead on projects, presentations and papers, mentor students and faculty specialists, manage project budgets, coordinate multiple projects and demonstrate leadership.
Contract Terms	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable. Whenever possible, faculty will be given progressively longer contracts.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to three years and are renewable. Whenever possible, faculty will be given progressively longer contracts.	Appointments to this rank are typically one to five years and are renewable. Whenever possible, faculty will be given progressively longer contracts.

i. *Search Procedures*

Competitive, posted searches will be conducted and all searches will follow [campus procedures & policies](#) and regular departmental practices.

ii. *Written Contracts*

Contracts shall follow campus procedures for issuing these contracts. 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 teaching in addition to research, then the contract letter stipulates the range of expectations in addition to research, and the % FTE dedicated to each of the domains will be included in the contract. As with other BSOS departments, CCJS will use the University's online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources. All new hires will receive a copy of the CCJS Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion for Professional Track Faculty Specialist Ranks, along with the College's evaluation and promotion policy.

iii. *Support for Faculty Specialists*

In accordance with [campus policy](#), all professional track faculty members should be provided with the necessary and appropriate department or unit support for the execution of their duties. These resources should conform to departmental practices for faculty with respect to provision of supplies and staff support. Faculty members will have access to mailboxes, appropriate spaces for meetings, email, etc. and where appropriate and feasible, professional development will be encouraged and supported.

iv. *Faculty Specialist Role in Departmental Governance*

All Faculty Specialists are considered members of the Department. Accordingly, they may attend regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee (i.e., faculty meetings). They are not members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, however, and therefore cannot vote on matters of curriculum or the appointment, tenure, or promotion of tenure-track faculty. Faculty Specialists will have a representative (with voting power) on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, revising or otherwise addressing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Faculty Specialist.

v. *Mentoring and Additional Training for Faculty Specialist*

The Department shall provide for the mentoring of PTK faculty by appropriate senior faculty, either tenured/tenure-track or PTK faculty. At the time of hiring, or within the first semester, the Department will provide each new faculty member with a copy of the Department's criteria for

performance evaluation and review for promotion. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision.

vi. *Performance Evaluation and Review for Promotion of Full-time Faculty Specialist*

Ongoing evaluations and reviews for promotion will account for and assess all departmental duties as described in the appointment letter. The specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's efforts, as indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the Unit's specific criteria for such rank as well as the duties specified in the individual's contract. Evaluation and promotion review will be conducted at both departmental and college levels based on all of the duties (and percentages of time allotted for each) articulated in the current faculty contract.

vii. *Procedures for Ongoing Evaluation*

All faculty specialists will have formal reviews of their performance. Formal evaluations will be completed: at the midpoint of the initial term and the midpoint of any renewed term for Faculty Specialists; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every three years thereafter for Senior Faculty Specialists; at the midpoint of the initial term and at least every five years thereafter for Principal Faculty Specialists. Formal evaluations of part-time will occur on a modified timeline proportional to their % FTE. These reviews will assess whether the faculty member is successfully meeting obligations and provide a commentary on progress towards meeting the criteria for promotion to the next rank. The review will be completed by a committee chaired by the Faculty Specialist's direct supervisor. Ideally, this committee will include at least one PTK faculty member. Formal evaluations shall be kept on record in a promotion file and shall be consulted when decisions are made about rank, salary, and contract renewal. All faculty members shall have the opportunity to review each evaluation and sign off on it in accordance with [campus policy](#)

viii. *Procedures for Promotion*

1. Individuals seeking promotion will write a formal request letter to her/his Department Chair outlining the relevant points supporting a promotion. The letter should address the criteria listed in Table 4 and other sections of this document.
2. The candidate 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. An up-to-date and signed CV (in the campus standard format for CVs) (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>)
 - ii. A personal statement, following campus faculty guidelines, that discusses the demonstrated record of achievement in research and/or professional activity
 - iii. Examples of work/research products
 - iv. Names of at least two professional references (internal or external)
3. The Department Chair will form a committee of at least three members, assigning a committee chair, and faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. At least one member will be a tenure-track faculty member and at least one committee member will be a professional track faculty. If there are no professional track faculty in the Department at or above the rank sought by the candidate, the Departmental chair will ask the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to recruit someone from another department. A single committee can evaluate multiple applicants if necessary.
4. The committee chair will submit the following package to the Department Chair no later than two weeks after the committee vote: a) materials submitted by the candidate, b) report from references, and c) committee summary report.
5. Upon completion of the first-level review by the committee, the CCJS Chair will within two weeks of the date of the decision inform the candidate in writing whether the recommendations made by the review committee and the Unit administrator were positive or negative. If either the Department Chair or the review committee supports promotion, the materials will be forwarded to the Dean. If the neither the Department Chair nor the review committee supports promotion, the case will not be forwarded to the Dean and the chair will explain the reasons for the negative decision in his letter to the candidate. For review or promotion from Faculty Specialist to Senior Faculty Specialist, the review process will end at the level of the Dean.

The promotion from Senior Faculty Specialist to Principal Faculty Specialist has a somewhat different procedure. If the chair and/or committee supports promotion, the case will progress to the second level of review. Second-level review of recommendations for promotion from departments will be conducted within BSOS. The BSOS review committees will be established in conformity with the approved bylaws of the College. Both the recommendation of the BSOS committee and the recommendation of the Dean will go forward to be considered, together with all other relevant materials, at higher levels of review. The third- or campus-level review committee will make its recommendations on the basis of whether or not the University's standards for promotion have been met. The committee will transmit its recommendation and a

written justification to the Provost, along with all materials provided from the lower levels of review.

At the College and University levels of review, summaries will be provided to the candidate whenever recommendations are negative. For a positive decision, candidates will be informed of the decision at the conclusion of the review process. All transmittals of decisions to the candidate should be in writing. Once granted, a promotion cannot be rescinded.

6. In the case of a negative outcome at any level, the candidate for promotion can reinitiate this process in future years. In other words, a negative decision for promotion does not preclude renewal of the existing appointment.

Candidates have the right to appeal a negative decision. The grounds for appeal of a negative promotion decision will be limited to (1) violation of procedural due process, and/or (2) violation of substantive due process. A decision may not be appealed on the ground that a different review committee, Department Chair, Dean or Provost exercising sound academic judgment might, or would, have come to a different conclusion. An Appeals Committee will not substitute its academic judgment for the judgment of those in the review process.

Violation of procedural due process means that the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the formal review for promotion by those in the review process to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in relevant promotion and tenure review procedures of a department, school, college, campus or system. Procedural violations occurring prior to the review process are not a basis for an appeal.

Violation of substantive due process means that: (1) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration; e.g. upon the candidate's gender, race, age, nationality, handicap, sexual orientation, or on the candidate's exercise of protected first amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (2) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, i.e., it was based on erroneous information or misinterpretation of information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting materials.

For faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Faculty Specialist, the candidate can appeal a negative promotion decision to the Department. Within two weeks of receiving the appeal, the Department Chair must form an Appeals Committee consisting of three 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. The candidate can appeal that decision to the Dean of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The 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 Principal Faculty Specialist, the candidate may appeal a negative decision by requesting that the case be submitted to the Campus Appeals Committee for consideration. The request will be in writing and be made within 60 days of notification of the negative decision. If the request is granted, all papers to be filed in support of the appeal must be submitted to the Appeals Committee not later than 120 days after notification unless otherwise extended by the Provost because of circumstances reasonably beyond control of the candidate. In writing these appeals letters, the appellant should be aware that these letters serve as the evidentiary basis for investigations of the validity of the appeal and that these letters will be shared by the Campus Appeals Committee with the parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Committee for a determination of the issues.

7. Individuals may choose to stay at a given rank indefinitely (i.e., are not required to seek promotion within any specific timeframe).
8. Faculty members with joint appointments hold both a primary appointment and one or more secondary appointments. When a joint appointment candidate is reviewed for promotion, the primary appointment unit is responsible for making the recommendation after first obtaining advisory input from the (one or more) secondary units, as appropriate. The advisory input from secondary unit(s) will be as follows:
 - i. If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in the secondary unit, then the secondary unit's advice to the primary unit shall consist solely of a written recommendation by the Chair or director of the secondary unit.
 - ii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is neither an academic department nor a non-

departmentalized school, then the director's recommendation will be informed by advice from a review committee in that unit. That advice shall be in a format consistent with the Unit's Plan of Organization.

- iii. If the candidate holds a permanent appointment in a secondary unit that is either an academic department or a non-departmentalized school, then there shall be a review committee established and a formal recommendation provided in a manner consistent with that unit's policies.

xi. *Guidelines for Raises Associated with Promotions (Full Time Only)*

Although neither mandated nor guaranteed, a salary increase from the BSOS Dean for promotions from full-time Faculty Specialist to full-time Senior Faculty Specialist or from full-time Senior Faculty Specialist to full-time Principal Faculty Specialist, can be negotiated by the Chair if it is matched by the Department. The amount can be augmented above the match if consistent across all candidates of the same rank in a given year within a department. The College will determine the minimum salary increases for promotion annually. Note that raises associated with promotion are independent of merit increases.

1. *Guidelines for Merit Increases*

When merit funds are available, PTK Faculty Specialist will be assigned to one of three merit categories by the Department Chair and their direct supervisor according to a review of their CV: "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," or "performing below expectations." The time frame of consideration for these evaluations will be since the of the last merit increase. Available merit will be allocated based on these rankings and the available funding. Faculty will be informed of their ranking and increase in a formal letter from the Chair.

2. *Guidelines for Termination*

All campus contracts include standard language for termination prior to end of appointment for both the University and the employee. Reasons for the University to terminate a contract prior to the end of appointment can be for reasons of performance or unit financial circumstances.

3. *Eligibility for College Awards*

Faculty Specialist can be nominated for the Outstanding Development/Administration Awards, Excellence in Service Award, and Excellence in Research Award.