
PROMOTION AND TENURE

6.1	PROMOTION AND TENURE -- UNIVERSITY SYSTEM POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK AND TENURE.....	3
6.2	UMBC CRITERIA FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION	5
	6.2.1 Assistant Professor.....	5
	6.2.2 Associate Professor.....	5
	6.2.3 Professor	7
6.3	UMBC PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES	7
	6.3.1 Criteria and Procedures for Contract Renewal for an Assistant Professor in a Tenure-track Line	7
	6.3.2 Dossiers and Outside Opinions.....	8
	6.3.3 Department Promotion & Tenure Committee (DP&TC).....	10
	6.3.4 Department Chair.....	11
	6.3.5 Administrative Reviews.....	12
	6.3.6 Conflict of Interest.....	12
	6.3.7 University Faculty Review Committee (UFRC).....	13
	6.3.8 Candidate's Rights.....	14
6.4	EVALUATION OF TEACHING	15
	6.4.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	15
	6.4.2 Additional Qualitative Measures for Evaluation of Teaching	17
	6.4.3 Departmental Review Process	17
6.5	REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY	17
	6.5.1 UMBC Policy on Departmental Annual Review of Tenured Faculty.....	17
	6.5.2 UMBC Policy for Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty	18
6.6	UMBC LIBRARY FACULTY RANK, PROMOTION, AND PERMANENT STATUS REVIEW PROCEDURES	22
	6.6.1 Introduction.....	22
	6.6.2 Library Faculty Ranks	23
	6.6.3 Evaluation Criteria for Rank, Permanent Status, and Promotion.....	25
	6.6.4 Procedures for Assignment of Rank upon Initial Appointment	26
	6.6.5 The Professional Review Committee.....	27
	6.6.6 Procedures and Calendar for Promotional and Permanent Status Review	28
	6.6.7 Promotional and Permanent Status Review Timetable.....	31
	6.6.8 Appendices	33
6.7	UMBC EARLY (NON-SCHEDULED) TENURE REVIEW POLICY	39
6.8	UMBC GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF SENIOR LECTURER.....	39
	6.8.1 Background.....	39
	6.8.2 Eligibility	39
	6.8.3 Criteria	40
	6.8.4 Procedures.....	40

6.9	UMBC GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PRINCIPAL LECTURER.....	40
	6.9.1 Eligibility	41
	6.9.2 Criteria	41
6.10	DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	42
	6.10.1 Preamble	42
	6.10.2 Research.....	42
	6.10.3 Teaching	42
	6.10.4 Student Participation In Teaching Reviews.....	42
	6.10.5 Service	42
	6.10.6 Mentoring of the Candidate	43
6.11	PROMOTION AND TENURE RECONSIDERATION POLICY	43
	6.11.1 Purpose	43
	6.11.2 Faculty Review Committee Membership	43
	6.11.3 Grounds for Reconsideration	43
	6.11.4 Burden of Proof	44
	6.11.5 Guidelines and Procedures for Requests for Reconsideration	44
	6.11.6 Request for Extension of Time	45
	6.11.7 Conflict of Interest	45
	6.11.8 Responsibilities and Powers of the Faculty Review Committee	45
	6.11.9 Faculty Review Committee Findings and Recommendations	46
	6.11.10 President’s Decision Regarding the Request for Reconsideration.....	46
	6.11.11 Implementation of President’s Reconsideration Decision	46
	6.11.12 Professional Conduct and Confidentiality	46
	6.11.13 Legal Representation	47
	6.11.14 Reconsideration File	47
	INDEX.....	48

6 PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Faculty who asked in 1989 to remain under the then-current Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Policy of the University of Maryland are covered by that policy, not the University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure that follows. The former policy and the signed notification forms stating the wish to remain under the ART Policy are on file in the Office of the Provost.)

6.1 PROMOTION AND TENURE -- UNIVERSITY SYSTEM POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK AND TENURE

(Sections II.A and II.B excerpted from [Board of Regents Policies and Procedures II-1.00](#) - University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty; Approved by the Board of Regents April 5, 1989; Amended November 12, 1993; Amended October 6, 1995; Amended April 4, 1997; Amended July 11, 1997; Amended July 10, 1998; Amended December 4, 1998; Amended April 7, 2000; Amended October 27, 2000; Amended December 8, 2000; Technical Amendment September 2002; Amended February 21, 2003; Amended October 22, 2004; Amended June 22, 2005; Amended June 20, 2008; Amended April 12, 2016; Amended May 10, 2016)

II. FACULTY RANKS, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND PERMANENT STATUS

A. General Principles

1. The only faculty ranks which may involve a tenure commitment are: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Distinguished University Professor, Senior Staff Scientist, Associate Staff Scientist, Assistant Staff Scientist, Principal Agent, Senior Agent, Agent, (i.e., II.C. 1a-1d, 2a-2c, 3d-3f) and such other ranks as the Board of Regents may approve. Appointments to all other ranks, including any qualified rank in which an additional adjective is introduced (such as “Clinical Professor” or “Medical School Professor”), are for a definite term and do not involve a tenure commitment (i.e., II.C. 2d-2h, 3a-3c, 4a-4g, 5a-5d, 6a-6g).

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this policy, faculty in certain ranks may be granted permanent status. The only faculty ranks which may involve a permanent-status commitment are Library II, Librarian III, and Librarian IV and such other ranks as the Board of Regents may approve. Permanent status may not be granted to an individual holding the rank of Librarian I.

Permanent status is defined as continuing employment such that a decision to remove an employee must be made by the President of the campus and must be justified by cause as defined by USM and campus policy. Permanent status is an employment status different from tenure.

Each institution shall develop criteria and procedures for the review process leading to the granting of promotion and/or permanent status to occur no later than the sixth year of continuous full-time employment. An appointee who has been notified that permanent status has been denied shall be granted an additional and terminal one-year appointment in that rank, but

barring exceptional circumstances, shall receive no further consideration for permanent status. Permanent status can be awarded only by an affirmative decision based upon a formal review. Individuals who have been granted permanent status under BOR VII-2.15 – POLICY ON LIBRARIANS, which is superseded by this policy, shall retain this status. Appointments of faculty librarians with permanent status may be terminated at any time for cause. Cause shall include moral turpitude, professional or scholarly misconduct, incompetence, and/or willful neglect of duty. In addition to being terminated for cause, faculty engaged exclusively or primarily in library services may be terminated because of the discontinuation of the department, program, school, or unit in which the appointment was made or because of the lack of appropriations or other funds with which to support the appointment. Procedures for termination of faculty librarians with permanent status are those that apply to tenured and tenure-track faculty, as described in I.C.6 through I.C.11.

Appointments of faculty librarians who do not have permanent status may be terminated for cause under policies and procedures that apply to non-tenure track faculty.

Subject to the approval of the President or designee, the campus libraries of USM constituent institutions shall develop guidelines, procedures, and appropriate criteria for evaluating librarians' performance. These guidelines, procedures, and criteria should be monitored system-wide to ensure equity with respect to standards.

Every institution shall have written procedures governing the processes on granting promotion and permanent status. Following review for form and legal sufficiency by the Office of the Attorney General, these procedures must be submitted to the Chancellor for review and approval.

A person appointed to the position of Director shall serve in that capacity at the pleasure of the President or his or her designee, regardless of whether the appointee has at the time of the appointment, or obtains during the appointment, permanent status as a librarian.

2. In addition to the ranks listed in II.C (below), there may also be such other faculty ranks as institutions shall define and include in their respective appointment, rank, and tenure policies, subject to the approval of the Board of Regents.
3. Institutions should specify in writing to faculty at the time of appointment the length of appointment and the applicable terms and conditions of the appointment with regard to tenure.

B. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

1. The criteria for tenure and promotion in the University of Maryland System are: (1) teaching effectiveness, including student advising; (2) research, scholarship, and, in appropriate areas, creative activities or other activities that result in the generation in application of intellectual property through technology transfer; and (3) relevant

service to the community, profession, and institution. The relative weight of these criteria will be determined by the mission of the institution.

2. The activities considered to be within the criteria for promotion and tenure shall be flexible and expansive. The assessment of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and service during the promotion and tenure process shall give appropriate recognition, consistent with the institution's mission, to faculty accomplishments that are collaborative, interdisciplinary, and interinstitutional and to faculty innovations in areas such as undergraduate education, minority-achievement programs, K-16 curriculum development, and technology-enhanced learning.
3. Every institution shall have written procedures governing the promotion and tenure process. Following review for form and legal sufficiency by the Office of the Attorney General, these procedures must be submitted to the Chancellor for review and approval. These procedures shall include, at a minimum, the following:

Criteria: A statement of criteria upon which reviews will be based, and guidelines for appointment or promotion to each academic rank, with recognition that institutional mission is the primary factor that defines these criteria.

Procedures: A description of tenure and/or promotion review procedures, including participants, documentation, degree of confidentiality, schedule of the annual cycle for reviews, and authority for final approval.

Appeals: A statement of the right of faculty to appeal promotion and tenure decisions, the grounds for such appeals, and a description of appeal procedures.

6.2 UMBC CRITERIA FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Faculty appointment and promotion shall be based solely on the merit of the candidates and should reflect UMBC's mission as a doctoral, research university. The following minimum criteria will govern appointment or promotion to each of the professional ranks.

“For all research, scholarship, creative and/or professional activities, regardless of the medium of publication or execution, the work must call upon the faculty member's academic and/or professional expertise, and will be evaluated based on the academic department or program's criteria for excellence, including: Peer review, impact, and significance to their field(s) of specialization.”

6.2.1 Assistant Professor

The appointee shall ordinarily hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field(s) of specialization. The appointee should show promise for superior teaching, research or scholarship, and service. In addition, the appointee's record should show evidence of potential for offering graduate instruction and directing graduate research.

6.2.2 Associate Professor

In addition to having the qualifications of an Assistant Professor, the appointee shall ordinarily have demonstrated successful teaching; a national reputation for research productivity, measured by peers in their field(s) of specialization by scholarship (for example), articles in refereed journals, chapters in edited volumes, books or monographs published by major university presses, art exhibitions, public installations, creative performances, and/or community engaged scholarship project outcomes); proven ability to offer graduate instruction and to direct graduate research; and evidence of relevant service to the University, the profession, and the community. Appointees must have demonstrated their ability to conduct independent scholarly activities not directly associated with prior work carried out to complete the doctorate or other terminal degree. Further, the appointee must maintain a record of teaching effectiveness, as successful scholarship alone will not be sufficient to warrant appointment or promotion at this rank.

6.2.3 Professor

In addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, the appointee shall ordinarily have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. A national, or where appropriate, international reputation for scholarly activities, measured by peers in the candidate's field(s) and demonstrated by scholarship (for example, articles in refereed journals, chapters in edited volumes, books or monographs published by major university presses, art exhibitions, public installations, creative performances, and/or community engaged scholarship project outcomes), and the active pursuit of external research support, as appropriate to their field(s), is expected of candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank. There must be a record of continued relevant service to the University, the profession, and the community.

6.3 UMBC PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

(Approved by the UMBC Faculty Senate, November 11, 1986, and as subsequently amended on March 17, 1988, November 14, 1989, September 22, 1992, March 9, 1993, April 11, 1995, November 14, 1995, May 14, 1996, October 8, 1996, December 4, 1999 and May 9, 2017. The procedures are consistent with the [University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty](#); Approved by the Board of Regents April 5, 1989; Amended November 12, 1993; Amended October 6, 1995; Amended April 4, 1997; Amended July 11, 1997; Amended July 10, 1998; Amended December 4, 1998; Amended April 7, 2000; Amended October 27, 2000; Amended December 8, 2000; Technical Amendment September 2002; Amended February 21, 2003; Amended May 10, 2005; Amended December 13, 2005; Amended March 14, 2006; Amended February 20, 2007; Amended April 10, 2007; Amended October 14, 2008; Amended December 9, 2008; Amended April 12, 2010; Amended May 10, 2011. Section headings and paragraph style adapted to the format of this *Handbook*.)

The procedures included in this document apply to contract renewal, promotion of faculty to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor, and to the granting of tenure. Each Department shall have written departmental guidelines for contract renewal and promotion of faculty to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. The written guidelines should also be on file with the Office of the Dean and readily available to all Departmental faculty.

6.3.1 Criteria and Procedures for Contract Renewal for an Assistant Professor in a Tenure-track Line

All Departments and Programs shall review for contract renewal all non-tenured Assistant Professors in their third year of service at the University. Upon request, permission from the Dean's Office to conduct such review in the faculty member's second year may be granted. In cases where a faculty member being reviewed in his/her third year is denied a second three-year contract, the University shall extend the initial contract to provide for a fourth year as a terminal year.

Any Department or Program that prefers to review non-tenured faculty in their second year, must make that preference known, with a stated rationale, to the Dean's Office. If approved, the amended review schedule will remain in effect for five years and cannot be changed. Departments and Programs shall have the opportunity to change their review schedule every fifth year beginning with the Spring of 1995.

For contract renewal, the candidate must demonstrate, from the time of employment to the time of review for contract renewal, progress in working toward meeting the expectations for promotion to associate professor. Supporting documents submitted for contract renewal will be the same as for promotion and tenure, with the exception of external letters.

6.3.2 Dossiers and Outside Opinions

By the end of the Spring 2007 semester, each department will have a written policy specifying their Promotion and Tenure procedures. Such a policy will include [but not necessarily be limited to] how teaching is assessed in the department and the role that students play. Copies of the department policy will be made available to all faculty within the department, to the Dean of the College and the Provost. The Department Chair, at the beginning of the Fall semester, shall request from each candidate appropriate supporting material for promotion and/or tenure and shall receive such other material as the candidate deems germane. In addition to materials illustrative of the candidate's scholarship and teaching, the dossier must contain a current curriculum vita; a self-assessment by the candidate of accomplishments and expectations in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that avoids unnecessary duplication of the curriculum vitae. The self-assessment of teaching should be a reflective statement that includes the candidate's teaching philosophy and goals as well as a self-evaluation of his/her teaching efforts and accomplishments. The dossier should also include a copy of the report of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee during the department review, if any, for contract renewal. The candidate shall attach to his [or her] vita a signed and dated cover sheet certifying that its content is thorough and accurate. Manuscripts described as "accepted for publication" shall be accompanied by a copy of the letter of acceptance. Publications that have been peer reviewed (e.g., those in refereed journals) should be distinguished from those which have not. Copies of all Student Course Evaluations (SCE's) administered in at least three years of teaching preceding the year of the review shall be included in the dossier. Direct Instructor Feedback Forms (DIFF's), which were designed to provide feedback to instructors and are not intended for use by promotion and tenure committees, are not to be included in the dossier. The Department Chair shall be responsible for collecting a complete dossier from the candidate, making it available to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (DP&TC), and transmitting it to the appropriate Dean. All dossiers submitted by faculty members should be accompanied by a statement from the department chair indicating what the typical teaching load is and how the department assesses teaching. New information regarding the outcome of work in progress and represented in the initial dossier may be included at any time the Promotion and Tenure review is occurring prior to being submitted to the UFRC. Such information shall be submitted to the appropriate Dean of the College who will be responsible for seeing that such information is sent to any relevant parties.

Opinions from authorities outside the University shall be solicited. These external referees should be nationally or internationally recognized scholars in the candidate's field(s). Although people who are currently or have recently collaborated with the candidate can serve as external referees, attempts should be made, if possible, to minimize the number of collaborators included. The following procedures should be observed: (a) the candidate shall submit a list of names of potential

reviewers, in no case fewer than four and no more than six unless the nature of the material to be reviewed requires an unusually wide disciplinary representation; (b) the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee (DP&TC) shall formulate its own list of outside reviewers, which may overlap with the candidate's list but may not be identical to it; (c) the candidate may comment on or object to any names that appear on the DP&TC's list which were not included on the candidate's list, and reasons for objection must be stated in writing; the DP&TC is not bound to accept the candidate's objection. The candidate's file should contain a signed statement that the candidate has seen and approved of or objected to the names on the list, and in the latter case, the reasons for the objection should be included; (d) the Committee shall choose outside reviewers, making certain that at least two reviewers come from each list without overlap. The identity of the chosen referees shall be protected to the full extent permitted by law. Except in unusual circumstances, at least two of the referees must have present or past academic appointments. The number of referees should be consistent with effective reviewing of the subject matter and of the disciplinary contribution of the candidate, but in no case should the number be less than five or greater than seven. Judicious selection of outside reviewers, suitably targeted to differing aspects of a candidate's contribution and supplementary to expertise available among the candidate's colleagues, strengthens a case and makes consideration at higher level of review simpler and more authoritative; mere multiplication of general endorsements does not. The DP&TC shall identify which referees were selected from the candidate's list of recommended referees and which were selected independent of the candidate's recommendations. At least two referees should come from each list without overlap. The list of the chosen referees shall be accompanied by brief biographical sketches of each, describing their credentials and accomplishments and the association, if any, to the candidate. Referees shall be provided with the candidate's curriculum vita and other appropriate materials. The candidate shall be informed that his/her self-assessment will be forwarded to each referee if the candidate chooses. In order to maximize the ability to recruit appropriate external referees, each department shall determine a date when it will start recruiting external referees, with permissible dates for contact starting the middle of April. The department chair shall inform the dean of the date decided upon by the department. If external referees are contacted in the spring, they will be informed that their evaluation must be based upon the final dossier submitted on behalf of the candidate in the fall.

Though it will usually be expedient to contact potential referees initially by phone, each referee shall be sent a letter, briefly describing UMBC, the department, its programs, and requesting the referee to provide an assessment of the candidate's overall scholarly accomplishments and potential by comparing the candidate with someone of similar rank from a university comparable to UMBC. The respective Deans will jointly draft a model letter to be sent to outside reviewers annually. Those portions of the letter to be drafted by the Dean and to appear in every letter sent to outside reviewers include a description of UMBC and the University's mission, a description of the promotion and tenure procedures and questions to be addressed by the external reviewers, a statement that each reviewer is to include in his/her letter a description of his/her personal and/or professional relationship with the candidate, a statement that UMBC will maintain both the confidentiality of their letter and their identity to the full extent permitted by law, and a reminder that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed when communication is by fax. The Deans will update their sections of the letter as necessary. The DP&TC will draft those sections that include a statement of appreciation and a description of the process, a description of the department, typical workload requirements in the department, and the departmental mission. The model letters will be included in the DP&TC packets sent to Department Chairs and DP&TC chairpersons. The candidate shall be shown the body of the letter soliciting reviews. A copy of the individual letter sent to each referee shall be attached to the referee's evaluation and shall become part of the candidate's dossier. In cases where the same letter is sent to several referees, only one such letter needs to be included.

The letters expressing opinions of external referees will be requested and received by the Chair of the DP&TC. These letters will become part of the candidate's file and will be available at each level of review. Under no circumstances shall the candidate see the letters nor shall the contents of the letters be made public.

6.3.3 Department Promotion & Tenure Committee (DP&TC)

After the dossiers of candidates in a department have been assembled, the Department Chair shall call a meeting of the DP&TC. Consideration by all eligible department colleagues available to participate is an essential part of the process. However, it is the responsibility of each eligible faculty member to determine that service on the DP&TC does not create a conflict of interest. (See [Section 6.3.6](#), Conflict of Interest, below).

6.3.3.1 Composition

The DP&TC shall consist of the Department Chair (with voice and vote) and full-time tenured faculty members who are senior in rank to the candidate. In cases where the department consists of many faculty members eligible for service on the DP&TC, if it so desires, the DP&TC may select an ad hoc subcommittee to present a summary of the candidate's dossier to the full DP&TC. The entire DP&TC, however, shall make the final recommendation.

In cases where the department has fewer than five faculty members eligible for the DP&TC, the Department chair, in consultation with the faculty and the candidate, shall solicit the names of faculty outside the department who are willing to serve on the DP&TC. The number of nominees on this list shall be two greater than the number needed to create a five member DP&TC. The nominees shall have expertise in the candidate's field(s) and may be either from related departments at UMBC or from outside UMBC. The appropriate Dean shall select the outside members of the committee from among these nominees.

The Department Chair shall convene the DP&TC which shall elect its permanent Chair. The Chair of the department shall not be eligible to be the permanent Chair of the DP&TC.

6.3.3.2 Student Input

In September, the Department Chair, in consultation with majors or other appropriate students, the DP&TC, and candidate, shall appoint two student members. The process for selecting students should be consistent with the Departmental guidelines. If the department has a graduate program, one of the students appointed shall be a graduate student. A department may make an exception to include only undergraduate or graduate students on the committee (e.g., based on the courses taught by the faculty member), but the justification of the exception should be included in the dossier. Students for whom the faculty member is currently serving as a mentor are not eligible to serve on the committee.

Each department must develop a written policy specifying the student's role on the DP&TC (teaching component). Examples of issues the policy should address include: how volunteers will be recruited; what information will be made available to students; what information, if any, students will collect; whether students will prepare their own report (oral or written); to whom the student reports, if solicited, will be made available.

6.3.3.3 Votes

The DP&TC shall base its judgment on the selection of materials in the candidate's dossier, the evaluations from the outside referees and the assessment of teaching accomplishments by the student members. The student members shall vote with the DP&TC on teaching only. In addition, separate votes shall be taken by the DP&TC on the candidate's accomplishments in scholarship and service. All vote tallies need to be indicated in the DP&TC's report as well as a vote tally on the overall Committee recommendation. All votes shall be by secret ballot. A set of Committee signatures must be appended to each recommendation. The Department rules shall clearly state if absentee votes are acceptable, and if so, the regulations for casting them. If the Department allows absentee ballots, the ballots should remain sequestered until all votes are in before being tallied. Student members shall only participate in discussion of and voting on the teaching portion of DP&TC deliberations. The chair of the DP&TC shall retain the ballots until the case is completed.

6.3.3.4 DP&TC Report

The DP&TC majority report shall be written by a member or members of the DP&TC, other than the Department Chair. This report shall be a narrative statement commenting on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in each area and justifying the overall recommendation. The report shall include a narrative statement indicating whether the DP&TC agreed or disagreed with positive and negative conclusions of the external reviewers and why. The votes and signatures should be affixed in the appropriate places. The signatures on the report indicate that the person signing agrees that the content of the report is an accurate rendering of the DP&TC assessment. The report should reflect the opinion of the DP&TC, including opinions of the majority and of the minority. However, it is important to indicate qualifications to the negative opinion (e.g., the negative opinion reflected only one or two people's opinions). If the report is a fair rendering of the DP&TC's opinion, there should be no need for a minority report. In the few cases where some members of the DP&TC feel a need to write a minority report, this report should be signed.

All faculty members eligible to vote should be listed on the report. Faculty should sign either the majority report or the minority report (if there is one). If a faculty member does not sign either report, the reason for his or her failure to sign (e.g. on sabbatical) should be listed.

The cover sheet (routing form) requires the voting tally and signatures of all members of the DP&TC. Accompanying each report will be a sheet listing the external referees, their titles, and academic affiliations, and whether each referee was selected from the candidate's or from the DP&TC list.

6.3.4 Department Chair

6.3.4.1 Report of Department Chair

As a faculty member in the department of the candidate, the Department Chair shall participate with voice and vote as a member of the DP&TC. After the DP&TC has completed its report, the Department Chair shall, in his or her role as administrator of the department, write a separate report which will be available to the members of the DP&TC and which will not repeat the deliberations of the DP&TC, but will provide a broader perspective on the candidate's contributions to the department and to the University from the chair's administrative perspective. In the event of a conflict of interest, upon recommendation of the Dean, a Department chair may be excused by the

Provost from serving on the DP&TC and from writing a separate recommendation on a candidate. (See [Section 6.3.6](#), Conflict of Interest, below.)

The Department Chair shall submit the DP&TC's report (or reports) and the Department Chair's report to the appropriate Dean and to the candidate by December 15. In the event that the Department Chair's appointment prevents that person from participating in the DP&T committee, then the Dean shall assume the administrative responsibility of the Chair and there will be no Department Chair's report. The report should carry an explicit assurance that procedures as laid down in University regulations and in departmental guidelines have been followed.

6.3.5 Administrative Reviews

The Dean, in August of each year, shall provide to Department Chairpersons, Program Directors and other appropriate supervisors written instructions concerning procedures to be followed in the promotion and tenure process. In addition, the Dean shall devote sufficient time during the August Chair's meeting to explain, clarify and instruct with regard to promotion and tenure procedures and schedule.

The respective Dean for a candidate shall review the reports of the DP&TC and the Department Chair as the formal recommendations of the department. If the Dean believes it to be useful, he/she shall consult with the DP&TC and the Department Chair concerning the candidate.

The Dean shall make a formal recommendation which need not duplicate the detail of the DP&TC or Department Chair reports, unless the Dean considers such information necessary. The report of the Dean normally shall be submitted to the Provost and the candidate by March 15 of that academic year. In the event of a conflict of interest, the Dean may be excused by the Provost from making a recommendation on a candidate. (See [Section 6.3.6](#), Conflict of Interest, below.)

The Provost shall, after consulting with the University Faculty Review Committee (an advisory committee of seven professors selected by the Faculty Senate), make a recommendation which normally will be transmitted to the President and the candidate by May 15. In the event of a conflict of interest, the Provost may be excused by the President from making a recommendation on a candidate. (See [Section 6.3.6](#), Conflict of Interest, below.)

Ultimate approval of all recommendations for granting of tenure and for promotion to associate professor or professor rests with the President of the University. The President shall notify the candidate and the candidate's respective Dean and Department Chair of his/her decision by June 1. The President may grant an additional year without change of academic status if the final administrative decision on the candidate cannot be reached by the end of the academic year. Further, under extraordinary circumstances, reconsideration of a negative recommendation may be possible.

6.3.6 Conflict of Interest

As outlined in the preceding sections, service in the review process is mandated unless there is a conflict of interest, such as an amorous or spousal relationship with a candidate, in which instance the faculty member or administrator involved shall not participate in the candidate's review of any level. A dissertation mentor of a candidate shall not serve in a voting capacity on the DP&TC, but may submit a written statement which would be treated as an external review, if that is consistent with the custom in the candidate's department.

In other situations, a faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair, may petition the Dean to be excused from the DP&TC. The Dean will transmit the petition and a recommendation to the Provost who will rule on the request. An appeal may be made to the President.

If service by faculty members or administrators would create a conflict of interest and the individuals do not recuse themselves from the process, any member of the DP&TC, of the UFRC, or the appropriate Dean may suggest to the Provost. After consulting with the individual in question, the candidate, available members of the DP&TC, and the appropriate Dean, the Provost will decide the issue. Appeal may be made to the President. If the challenge is to the Provost, the President will follow the same procedure.

6.3.7 University Faculty Review Committee (UFRC)

6.3.7.1 Charge

The UFRC shall be advisory to the Provost. The UFRC is to review all cases involving tenure decisions, promotion to rank of associate professor or professor, and those contract renewal cases in which a negative recommendation has been made at any level of review. The UFRC also is to review all librarian promotion and permanent status cases but shall restrict its review of these cases to ensuring that all required procedures have been followed per section 6.3.7.3.1 and that the evaluation of the candidate is fair per section 6.3.7.3.2.

6.3.7.2 Composition

The UFRC shall consist of seven members (with the rank of professor) serving staggered two year terms. The seven member committee shall consist of one delegate from the arts and humanities, one from the social sciences, one from the natural sciences and mathematics, and one from engineering and information technology with the other three delegates chosen with the objective of broadening the range of disciplines represented. Department chairs shall not serve on the UFRC.

In September of each year, the Provost shall solicit from departments nominations of professors who have had at least one full year of service at UMBC (regardless of rank) and who are willing to serve on the UFRC. The Provost shall submit the names of two candidates for each UFRC vacancy (observing the programmatic distribution mandated by the current procedures). At its November meeting, the Faculty Senate (which retains the right to make additional nominations from the floor) shall elect UFRC members by a majority of those present and voting.

The Provost shall convene the first meeting of the UFRC and be present to conduct the nomination and election of the UFRC's chairperson. Members of the UFRC shall be available for UFRC meetings during the Spring semester.

No member of the UFRC shall participate in the deliberations or voting for a candidate on whose DP&TC the member has served. It is the responsibility of each member of the UFRC to determine that consideration of a candidate does not create a conflict of interest. The Provost may excuse a member of the UFRC from deliberations and voting for a candidate. (See [Section 6.3.6](#), Conflict of Interest, above.)

6.3.7.3 Functions

1. The first function of the UFRC is to conduct a procedural review concerning each candidate to ensure that all required procedures have been followed. If the UFRC concludes that required procedures have not been followed and that such failure may result in negative consequences to the candidate or the University, it shall so inform the Provost.
2. The second function of the UFRC is to ensure that the department has applied standards of scholarly or creative activity that are nationally recognized as appropriate in the candidate's field(s) and consistent with the UMBC criteria found above in 6.2. The UFRC shall rely on consultation with the Dean, the Department Chair, and the DP&TC for this purpose. If the UFRC finds evidence of failure to apply such standards, it shall so inform the Provost.
3. The third function of the UFRC is to ensure that the evaluation of the candidate is fair. It should be free from personal animosity or favoritism or from bias with regard to age, sex, race, religion, or national origin. If the UFRC feels that additional information is required in this assessment, it shall so inform the Provost. If the UFRC finds evidence of unfairness, it shall recommend to the Provost that the matter be referred to the Faculty Grievance Committee, which shall be constituted as the Faculty Board of Review. If the matter cannot be resolved by the Faculty Grievance Committee, the Provost shall constitute a new advisory committee.
4. The fourth function of the UFRC is to evaluate the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure and to vote on those qualifications. The UFRC shall rely on the information in the candidate's dossier for this purpose. If it wishes additional information, it should consult with the DP&TC. If the UFRC finds that the DP&TC, the Department Chair, and/or the appropriate Dean has failed to apply standards described in paragraph 2 above, it shall so inform the Provost.

Based on these substantive deliberations, the UFRC shall vote by secret ballot on each candidate at a meeting announced in writing to all members at least five days before the meeting and shall issue a written recommendation to the Provost concerning each candidate. The chair of the UFRC shall retain the ballots until notice is received that the case has been completed. The UFRC report should include a vote tally and signatures of all members of the UFRC. The cover sheet (routing form) requires the voting tally and signatures of all members of the UFRC. The UFRC report shall be submitted to the Provost, the appropriate Dean, the Department Chair and to the candidate by May 1 of that academic year. The UFRC shall also write a Summary Report including the results of the UFRC's deliberations and recommendations regarding the DP&TC process should they have any ideas that would benefit the process. The Summary Report should be addressed to the Provost and copied to the President of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

6.3.8 Candidate's Rights

The candidate shall receive and may submit a written response including clarifying documentation, within one week of receipt, the reports of the DP&TC, the Department Chair, the respective Dean, the UFRC and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Material not referenced in the original Dossier may not be included in this written response. This right shall not extend to confidential reports from referees. To assure confidentiality, referees' reports should not be excerpted or directly quoted in the successive reports in the P&T process such that the identity of the

reviewer can be deduced. The candidate's comments should be directed to the next review authority, who shall make no recommendation until receiving such comments or until the allowed time has elapsed. Copies of the candidate's comments shall be transmitted to each succeeding level of the review process.

The candidate may meet personally with any of the following reviewing authorities: the DP&TC, department chair, Dean of the candidate's college, Provost, or President. The UFRC will not accept requests to meet personally with a candidate.

A candidate may have recourse to the Faculty Grievance Committee in accordance with procedures detailed elsewhere in the *Faculty Handbook* at any point where a procedural error or deviation from the prescribed process is alleged to have prejudiced fair consideration. Initiation of a grievance does not operate to dislodge or delay any formal notification concerning contract non-renewal or termination.

6.4 EVALUATION OF TEACHING

(Adapted from M.D. Wang & B.C. Schumann, *Student Course Evaluation Guide*, October 1980; Amended by the Faculty Senate March 14, 2006)

Formal Procedures for the evaluation of teaching for Promotion and Tenure were established by the UMBC Faculty Senate May 4, 1971. These Procedures were amended on May 10, 2016 and May 9, 2017.

In 1971, the Senate established asserted four principles of faculty rights in teaching evaluation:

1. A faculty member must have the right to petition that a given method of evaluation is not applicable to his or her situation and the right to propose an alternative method of evaluation.
2. A faculty member must have the right to see and respond in writing to all formal teaching evaluations.
3. Whenever possible, evaluations of a faculty member's teaching should not be used for promotion, tenure, or contract decisions until the instructor has had the opportunity to alter his or her teaching in the same course.
4. The faculty member has the right to expect that the questionnaire will be administered so as to minimize the possibilities of respondent bias.

6.4.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching

In 1971 the Senate established formal procedures for student evaluation of teaching. At that time, the Senate approved the Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the free response questionnaire (blue sheet). The Senate also established a Student Course Evaluation Committee and a set of procedures for the administration of student evaluations. The Committee's responsibilities included directing the administration and processing of student evaluations, approving requests for exemptions, and making recommendations for revision or modification. The SCEQ was substantially revised by the Student Course Evaluation Committee (comprised of faculty and students) and adopted by the Senate in 1976.

In 2016, the Senate approved the implementation of an online delivery system for student course evaluations and a validated survey instrument: the Student's Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ), which was renamed the SCE (Student Course Evaluation).

6.4.1.1 Structure of the Student Course Evaluation (SCE) Questionnaire

The SCE is a validated instrument used to obtain student feedback on teaching quality and effectiveness. The SCE consists of 32 standardized questions that were developed iteratively with feedback from students and teachers and represent factors related to teaching effectiveness. Many studies have confirmed that teaching effectiveness is a multidimensional concept not captured by any single question or factor. Questions are grouped with others that students answer similarly based on extensive and repeated analysis.

The first part of the SCE consists of 29 questions organized under eight factors: Learning, Enthusiasm, Organization, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Breadth, Examinations, and Assignments. These questions are formative questions that provide faculty with diagnostic feedback about their teaching. The average score for each factor (e.g. Learning, Organization) and the individual, global questions 30-32 are summative scores that provide a summary of overall teaching effectiveness. The SCE also provides open-ended Direct Instructor Feedback Form (DIFF) questions, which are available only to the instructor and are not considered in formal evaluations.

6.4.1.2 Administrative Procedures

The online platform and the distribution of the SCE are maintained and supervised by the Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support. Within each department, one person, a faculty or staff member, is designated by the department chairperson as SCE coordinator. The coordinators act as liaisons between the faculty and the Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support in several phases of the evaluation process and in the preliminary processing of the completed questionnaires.

Under unusual circumstances, exemption from student course evaluation may be requested from the department chair. If such exemption is granted, this should be communicated to the SCE coordinator as early in the semester as possible.

The SCE's are made available to students two weeks before the end of classes unless a department has opted to change when the survey is launched. The secure online system grants students 24/7 access during the evaluation period, and can be accessed by any device (desktop, laptop, tablet, smartphone). Although students have unlimited access during this period, all faculty members at UMBC are encouraged to set aside 15-20 minutes in their classes to enable students to take the survey. On the day chosen for the administration of the SCE, faculty members will make the following announcement:

“The Student Course Evaluation (SCE) is a standardized course evaluation instrument used to provide measures of an instructor's teaching effectiveness. The results of this questionnaire will be used by promotion and tenure committees as part of the instructor's evaluation. The Direct Instructor Feedback Forms (DIFFs) were designed to provide feedback to instructors and they are not intended for use by promotion and tenure committees. The responses to the SCE and the DIFFs will be kept confidential and will not be distributed until final grades are in.” Faculty members must leave the room while the students are completed the survey.

6.4.2 Additional Qualitative Measures for Evaluation of Teaching

A multi-pronged analysis of teaching contributes to an equitable review of the candidate's teaching effectiveness and helps to minimize student and institutional bias in the areas of racism, sexism, ageism, classism, and other forms of discrimination. For this reason, UMBC also requires at least two qualitative measures of teaching effectiveness in addition to the quantitative data through student evaluations for promotion and tenure. Each department will decide what kinds of measures are appropriate for their field or fields of study, and must indicate these measures in their departmental policies.

6.4.3 Departmental Review Procedure

(Approved by the Faculty Senate in 1971, amended March 14, 2006, and May 9, 2017)

In 1971 the Senate approved guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching, suggesting that faculty members submit statements of course objectives, as well as supplementary materials such as a list of readings, a course syllabus, tests, and quizzes, and written assignments. In 2017, the Senate approved the requirement of an additional two qualitative measures of teaching. These documents plus the results of the student course evaluation questionnaire would be included in the dossier which is reviewed by promotion and tenure committees.

Each department must develop a written policy to allow for evaluation by the DP&TC of a faculty member's teaching. The written policy prepared by the department shall be kept on record in the department office and made available to department faculty.

To allow for evaluation by the DP&TC of a faculty member's teaching, in addition to the submission of SCE's, at least two qualitative measures of teaching effectiveness are required. Each department policy must include a statement regarding the kinds of specific qualitative measures that the department will use to evaluate teaching. Documentation from a minimum of 3 courses (the exact number to be determined by each department) should also be included. Ideally these would be courses at different levels (lower division/ upper division/ graduate) or different types (lecture/discussion). Documents may include, for example, the syllabus, written assignments, exams, examples of feedback to students, or other documentation that the department deems appropriate.

If a department decides to use classroom observations as part of its review of teaching, proper procedures need to be adopted for conducting such observations. The department needs to provide a written document indicating the procedures followed for conducting classroom observations.

6.5 REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

6.5.1 UMBC Policy on Departmental Annual Review of Tenured Faculty

(Approved by UMBC Faculty Senate, April 14, 1998; approved by the University System of Maryland, March 3, 1999. Section headings and paragraph style adapted to the format of this *Handbook*.)

The University System of Maryland Policy on the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty assumes the existence of annual departmental salary and workload reviews of faculty (II-1.19, principle 5). Therefore, each department shall establish a statement of policies and procedures for Departmental Annual Review of tenured faculty that is consistent with the following stipulations.

6.5.1.1 Annual Review Procedures

The department chair or program head shall be responsible for the annual review process. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed each year during the Spring Semester. Department chairs shall be reviewed with respect to their faculty responsibilities. In such cases, the appropriate dean shall fulfill the role of the department chair as described in the following procedures. The chair may consult with an appropriately constituted peer review committee at any point during this process, but is not required to do so. The general criteria for the Annual Review of tenured faculty should include those used for workload and merit pay reviews and should be consistent with the departmental statement of Performance Expectations.

6.5.1.2 Required and Prohibited Documentation for the Annual Review Process

1. The principal instrument of the annual review of tenured faculty shall be the Faculty Annual Report.
2. Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires (SCEQs) from the previous two semesters may be included, but blue sheets shall be excluded.
3. Statements may not be solicited from current or former students specifically for the purposes of this review.
4. Statements from extra-mural referees shall be excluded.

6.5.1.3 Post Review Procedures

If the Departmental Annual Review indicates that the faculty member's performance meets or exceeds minimum expectations, then no further action is required.

If the Department Annual Review indicates that the faculty member has failed to meet the minimum expectations set down in the departmental statement of Performance Expectations, this finding shall be stated in a memorandum written by the department chair and delivered to the reviewed faculty member by June 30 of the calendar year when the review occurs. The reviewed faculty member may respond to this memorandum, but is not required to do so. Any such written response must be received by the department before September 15 of the same calendar year. A copy of the chair's memorandum and any written response from the faculty member shall become part of the faculty member's personnel file.

6.5.1.4 Implementation

Each department (no later than December 1, 1998) shall submit its statement of policies and procedures for the Departmental Annual Review of all tenured faculty to the Faculty Senate, the appropriate dean and the provost for review and approval.

6.5.2 UMBC Policy for Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty

(Approved by UMBC Faculty Senate, April 14, 1998; approved by the University System of Maryland, March 3, 1999. Section headings and paragraph style adapted to the format of this *Handbook*.)

6.5.2.1 Preamble

In accordance with *The University System of Maryland Policy on the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty* (II-1.19, July 12, 1996) “the Board of Regents requires that each institution shall establish a policy on the comprehensive review of tenured faculty, and procedures to implement such a policy.”

The Regents require that "Comprehensive review of faculty shall be part of a larger faculty development program at each institution, designed to enhance the professional abilities of the faculty as teachers and scholars and members of the academic community. To enable the comprehensive review process, institutions shall commit resources not only to the process itself, but also to its accompanying faculty development program." This comprehensive review process may not be substituted for the USM and institutional policies and procedures relating to the termination of tenured appointments, which are in no way amended by this policy.

This document describes the procedures to be followed for the comprehensive review of tenured faculty at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC). For the purposes of this document, "tenured faculty" shall be understood to include regular faculty who have been granted tenure.

6.5.2.2 Guiding Principles

The fundamental premise for this policy is that members of the UMBC faculty are productive and successful professionals who are committed to scholarship, teaching, and service to local, state, national and international communities.

Within the context of the purposes of the review as listed below, it is deemed essential that the policy should minimize duplication of other methods of evaluating faculty performance; that it should not unduly divert faculty from their primary areas of productivity; and that it should protect the rights of the faculty. Comprehensive review is undertaken for purposes that are quite distinct

from those of promotion and tenure review, and it uses a different set of criteria to evaluate faculty performance. This policy therefore requires the establishment of performance expectations that are specific to each academic department or program.

This policy makes a serious commitment to faculty development, both to augment the efforts of productive faculty, and to help those whose performance may be less than satisfactory. Because the achievement of this purpose is dependent upon the existence of a development fund, this comprehensive review policy cannot be fully effective until an adequately financed development fund is established.

6.5.2.3 Purposes and Procedures

The purposes of the comprehensive review of tenured faculty are to: 1) recognize long-term meritorious performance, 2) provide a mechanism by which individual faculty may periodically request resources for initiatives related to professional development, 3) identify and remove impediments to faculty productivity, and 4) provide an effective, collegial mechanism for identifying and helping those few faculty members whose productivity may have waned.

Each department shall establish a statement of policies and procedures for Departmental Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty that is consistent with the following stipulations.

6.5.2.3.1 Frequency of Reviews

Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed once every five years during the Spring Semester according to a schedule to be established by the department, unless a Special Review is initiated. A Special Review will be initiated if two consecutive Departmental Annual Reviews indicate that a faculty member has failed to meet the minimum expectations set down in the departmental statement of Performance Expectations. Faculty on sabbatical or leave during the year they are scheduled for review should be reviewed the year they return to campus. A favorable review for promotion in rank will substitute for this review. Department chairs shall be reviewed with regard to their faculty responsibilities. If possible, such reviews should be held in the same year as the review specified in the chair's letter of appointment, but not more frequently than once every five years, unless a Special Review is initiated. In such cases, the appropriate dean shall fulfill the role of the department chair as described in the following procedures.

6.5.2.3.2 Required and Prohibited Documentation for the Comprehensive Review File

1. The principal instruments of the comprehensive review of faculty shall be Faculty Annual Reports and course syllabi for the previous five years, a current *curriculum vitae*, and any annual review memoranda, together with faculty responses to these memoranda that have been filed since the last comprehensive review.
2. A brief personal statement not to exceed three printed pages in length may be included. Faculty who wish to formulate a plan for professional development should use the personal statement to provide a general description of the goals of the plan.
3. Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires (SCEQs) from the previous five years may be included, but blue sheets shall be excluded.
4. Statements may not be solicited from current or former students specifically for the purposes of this review.
5. Statements from extra-mural referees shall be excluded.

6.5.2.4 Peer Review

The department shall establish a peer review committee comprised of tenured faculty for each faculty member under review. The department chair may not be a member of the peer review committee. The faculty member being reviewed is to be notified of the composition of the committee, and may object to any member to the department chair. The reason for any such objection shall be held confidential, and the chair shall evaluate and act on the substance of the objection. Where the faculty member holds a joint appointment, the relevant chairs and/or deans shall determine an appropriate ad hoc mechanism for establishing a committee.

The peer review committee shall consider only materials included as part of a Comprehensive Review File. The faculty member being reviewed shall be allowed to inspect the contents of this file prior to its viewing by the peer review committee. The committee shall prepare, sign, and forward to the chair and faculty member, a written Peer Review Committee Report on its evaluation of the

faculty member's performance during the period under review. When performance is below the minimum departmental expectations, the Peer Review Committee Report will include a recommendation to the department chair that a professional development plan be formulated for the purpose of improving specific aspects of performance. For cases in which a faculty member's personal statement includes a proposed professional development plan designed either to improve performance, or to further enhance satisfactory performance, the Peer Review Committee Report will include an assessment of the proposed plan in the context of past performance. This report must be completed by June 30 of the calendar year when the review occurs.

One copy of the Peer Review Committee Report shall be forwarded to the department chair along with the Comprehensive Review File. At the same time a copy will be delivered to the faculty member under review, who may respond in writing to the chair, but is not required to do so. Any such response must be received by the department before September 15 of the same calendar year.

The review is concluded at this point.

6.5.2.5 Implementation

Each department (no later than December 1, 1998) shall submit its statement of Performance Expectations and its statement of policy and procedures for the Departmental Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty developed in response to this document to the Faculty Senate, the appropriate dean and the provost for review and approval. A schedule for the first round of comprehensive reviews shall be included. This schedule should be updated annually and reported to the dean.

6.5.2.5.1 Performance Expectations

Each department shall establish a written statement of performance expectations for tenured faculty. These expectations in research, scholarship, creative activity, teaching, and service shall be consistent with campus and unit missions and with related policies, such as departmental, UMBC, and BOR workload policies. They should be sufficiently flexible and comprehensive to accommodate faculty with differing interests and responsibilities, and different ranks and conditions of appointment. Each department may reconsider its statement of performance expectations at any time; any changes shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate, the appropriate dean and the provost for review and approval.

6.5.2.6 Post Review Procedures

1. In cases where the Peer Review Committee Report concludes that performance meets or exceeds expectations, no action is required of the department chair. The report shall be conveyed to the faculty member and may be used as the basis for an informal discussion between the faculty member and the chair concerning future plans.
2. In cases where the Peer Review Committee Report concludes that performance does not meet expectations, or upon the specific request of the faculty member, a plan for professional development shall be worked out among the department chair, the individual faculty member, and, depending on the resources required, the appropriate dean. The plan should include proposed funding, and should be designed to enhance performance and, where appropriate, to address identified problems. This plan shall include a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals and shall be signed by all parties.

In the event of substantive differences among the committee, the chair, and the faculty member under review, the dean will meet with all parties and either accept the Peer Review Committee Report or file a written dissent from its findings. The dean may likewise accept the plan for professional development as written or make revisions to the development plan. After consultation with the provost, the dean's decision with regard to the terms of the development plan will be final. The faculty member will have access to the university grievance procedure should he/she choose to appeal.

6.5.2.7 Confidentiality

All annual, special, and comprehensive review proceedings, documents, reports, and written responses are considered to be confidential personnel files and are therefore subject to all state and federal laws and regulations that govern the confidentiality of such files.

6.6 UMBC LIBRARY FACULTY RANK, PROMOTION, AND PERMANENT STATUS REVIEW PROCEDURES

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 13, 2001; Amended October 8, 2013, Section headings and paragraph style adapted to the format of this *Handbook*)

6.6.1 Introduction

The mission of the Library entails close relations between librarians and the academic programs of the University; the librarians thus constitute a distinctive group within the University and are allied with the faculty in accomplishing instruction and research objectives. In order to better realize these evolving objectives, librarians are expected to continue study and research in their field and to advance themselves professionally. This perception of librarianship at UMBC is intended to

promote continued professional accomplishment, to encourage and reward higher standards of performance, and, ultimately, to benefit the University.

Library faculty are employed within the context of two systems: (a) a system of functional position categories and (b) a system of faculty ranks. Each library faculty member holds a position based on job responsibilities (both technical and administrative). Initial assignment to a specific position and any subsequent reassignments are made administratively by the Director of the Library or designee in accordance with applicable USM and UMBC policies.

In addition to a position assignment, each library faculty member holds a title denoting faculty rank, which is independent of the position and which reflects the level of professional achievement of the individual. Initial assignment and any subsequent promotion in rank are administered through the system described below.

Individual's salaries reflect the interaction of these two systems. In brief, an individual's salary at any point in time is governed by two factors: (a) the character of the position held and responsibilities assumed, and (b) the individual's rank and performance. The maintenance of standards and the recognition of achievement are the responsibility and privilege of the profession as a whole and are shared by each of its members. To provide UMBC librarians the opportunity to discharge this responsibility, peer evaluation is one element of the promotion procedure. Although final authority within the Library for appointment, promotion, and retention decisions rests with the Director of the Library, a committee of peers helps to keep the evaluation process consistent, systematic, broad-based, and fair.

6.6.2 Library Faculty Ranks

6.6.2.1 Ranks and Degree Requirement²

The only librarian ranks with non-tenure faculty status are Librarian I, Librarian II, Librarian III, and Librarian IV and such other ranks as the Board of Regents may approve. These titles are to be granted to a limited number of appointees who fulfill roles defined by professional graduate training, such as librarian, curator, archivist, and information scientist. In the overwhelming number of instances, the professional graduate training required is an M.L.S. degree, which is considered the terminal degree in the practice of academic librarianship, from the American Library Association (ALA)-accredited program. However, each constituent institution may define instances when other graduate degrees may substitute for or augment the ALA-accredited M.L.S. Such exceptions will be based on and required by the functional needs of USM libraries.

6.6.2.2 Librarian I

This rank is assigned to librarians just entering librarianship with little or no professional library experience but who have been judged to have demonstrated an understanding of the basic tenets of librarianship and a potential for professional growth. A Librarian I is not eligible for permanent status.

²Excerpted from [Board of Regents Policies and Procedures II-1.00](#) - University System Policy on

6.6.2.3 Librarian II

Appointment or promotion to this rank signifies that the librarian has demonstrated effective professional knowledge and skills significantly above those expected of a Librarian I. Normally, a minimum of three years of professional experience is required.

6.6.2.4 Librarian III

Appointment or promotion to this rank signifies that the librarian has mastered the skills, knowledge, and techniques of librarianship and has made meaningful contributions to the library, the institution, the library profession, and/or an academic discipline. Normally, a minimum of six years of professional experience is required, three of which must be at a level comparable to the rank of Librarian II at the appointing USM institution.

6.6.2.5 Librarian IV

Appointment or promotion to this rank is exceptional. This rank is awarded to those librarians who have made distinctive contributions to the library, the institution, the library profession, and/or an academic discipline. This rank normally requires a minimum of nine years of professional experience, at least three of which must be at a level comparable to the rank of Librarian III at the appointing USM institution.

6.6.3 Evaluation Criteria for Rank, Permanent Status, and Promotion

The general criteria for initial assignment and any subsequent promotion in rank or determination to grant or deny permanent status measure the librarian's contributions to the University and librarianship. These include: quality of performance in the area of the candidate's responsibility, quality of service on library committees and task forces, library instructional activities, professional activity outside the library, research and academic achievement, and participation in University affairs. The criteria are not of equal significance and the degree of importance given to any one of them may vary from one candidate to another.

Advancement in rank and attainment of permanent status are not automatic upon accumulation of years of experience, but are based on formal assessment of the performance and attainments achieved by the librarian. It is the intent of the faculty rank system to foster the professional development of the individual through external activity and study in conjunction with, but not at the expense of, fulfillment of responsibilities to the UMBC library. Consistently high-quality job performance must be demonstrated for any promotion. In promotion from ranks I to II job performance is typically the single most important factor. In promotions from ranks II to III, and III to IV, other factors in addition to job performance are ordinarily given increased weight. The specific criteria listed below indicate the basic factors considered in making recommendations for promotions in rank and determinations to grant or deny permanent status. They apply to all levels of ranks, although expectations of growth and demonstrated accomplishment increase at each level.

6.6.3.1 Job Performance

The candidate is expected to demonstrate competence and diligence in his or her assigned areas of responsibility, such as collection or systems development, bibliographic organization, management, reference, reader service, or some combination thereof. The supervisory evaluation is a key element in the determination of the quality and consistency of performance. Among the factors to be considered are: consistency of performance, ability to innovate, ability to plan and organize work, initiative, ability to work effectively with others, responsibility, thoroughness in the execution of any plan or project, ability to coordinate a variety of responsibilities to accomplish assignments within set deadlines, ability to relate job functions to the more general goals of the library and University, response to criticism, dependability, accuracy, oral and written skills, judgment, professional attitude, adaptability and leadership.

The quality and extent of contributions made to the solution of library problems through service on internal committees, task forces, and the instructional program will merit consideration for promotion, even though such service may be unrelated to the individual's primary area of responsibility. Among the factors to be considered: are fulfillment of basic obligations of attendance and participation, working relations with other members, membership/chairmanship of sub-committees, timely completion and quality of committee assignments.

6.6.3.2 Professional Activities, Continuing Education, Research, Publications and Teaching

Meaningful participation in professional activities on local, state, regional, and national levels will be considered in promotion. Examples of such participation include offices held, committee assignments, papers presented, external consulting, awards received and leadership of seminars and workshops. The candidate is expected to demonstrate continued study and research in relevant fields. Involvement in continuing education activities, such as formal courses, seminars and workshops, as well as advanced degrees obtained or in progress will be considered in promotion. Professional contributions such as books, articles, book reviews, editorships, bibliographies, handbooks, teaching appointments and lectures will also be considered. The candidate's degree of responsibility for jointly produced scholarship and creative works shall be considered in the evaluation.

6.6.3.3 University Service

Consideration will be given to relevant University service, such as participation in campus governance or committees, and other University organizations.

6.6.4 Procedures for Assignment of Rank upon Initial Appointment

Announcements of a library faculty vacancy shall state the rank or range of ranks within which it is anticipated the vacancy would be filled.

At the conclusion of a search, the library faculty shall poll the Library faculty on the search committee, who recommend in writing to the Director an appropriate initial faculty rank. During this process, the Director of the Library may poll other librarians with expertise in the leading candidate's record of professional accomplishments and attainments for a recommendation of appropriate initial rank.

The Director of the Library shall either endorse this recommendation or recommend an alternate faculty rank, which is, in the Director's judgment, commensurate with the individual librarian's prior professional accomplishments and attainments.

The Director or designee shall forward both the faculty's recommendation and the Director's recommendation to the Provost or designee, together with the UMBC personnel requisition and other supporting documentation relevant to the candidate recommended to fill the vacancy. The Provost writes the formal letter of appointment to the candidate, specifying rank, etc., as provided in the UMBC Faculty Handbook.

Following the candidate's acceptance of appointment, the Director or designee shall also provide the librarian with a copy of the present document.

6.6.5 The Professional Review Committee

The Professional Review Committee (PRC) assesses and reports on the accomplishments of each candidate within the criteria defined in this policy and provides, to the Director of the Library, an objective and thorough evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or permanent status.

- A. The PRC shall consist of all Library faculty members with permanent status who are senior in rank to the candidate, are present on campus, and for who service on the PRC does not create a conflict of interest (see below). The Director of the Library and the candidate's current supervisor(s) shall be ineligible for service on the PRC. When the PRC is greater than five in number, it may opt to select an ad hoc subcommittee of no fewer than five members to present a summary of the candidate's dossier to the full PRC; in any case, the final recommendation shall be of the entire PRC.

No PRC member may be present at or participate in discussion or vote on his or her own application for promotion or permanent status, or that of his or her spouse or for any other individual with whom there may be a clearly defined conflict of interest. It is the responsibility of each faculty member eligible to serve on the PRC to determine that his or her service on the PRC does not create a conflict of interest. In the event that a conflict of interest is apparent, the faculty member shall inform the Chair of the PRC and recuse him or herself immediately from all PRC proceedings. If service by faculty members or administrators would create a conflict of interest and the individuals do not recuse themselves from the process, any member of the PRC or the candidate may appeal to the Director of the Library. After consulting with the individual in question, the candidate, and available members of the PRC, the Director of the Library will decide the issue. Further appeal may be made to the Provost or designee.

- B. In cases where the Library has fewer than five faculty members eligible for the PRC, the Director of the Library, in consultation with the faculty and the candidate, shall solicit the names of faculty outside the department who are willing to serve on the PRC. The number of nominees on this list shall be two greater than the number

needed to create a five member PRC. The nominees shall have expertise in the candidate's field and may be either from related departments at UMBC or from outside UMBC. The Provost or designee shall select the outside members of the committee from among these nominees.

- C. The Director of the Library or designee shall call the PRC to meet no later than September 30, at which initial meeting the PRC shall elect a chair. The term of the chair is a single year, but a chair may be reappointed.
- D. Members of the PRC must regard their work to be of the utmost confidentiality. Any discussion or disclosure of matters that come before the Committee to anyone not on the Committee or discussions of these matters in public areas or in unofficial meetings is inappropriate. Any and all such behavior shall be regarded as a serious breach of confidentiality and shall be subject to sanction.

6.6.6 Procedures and Calendar for Promotional and Permanent Status Review

The following procedures and sequence of operations are to be followed by all candidates and by all committees. The procedures have been established to promote consistency of application from one year to the next and to guarantee full and fair hearings for all candidates.

Note: The review and promotion procedure coincides with the UMBC fiscal calendar rather than with the anniversary of the candidate's appointment. If a candidate's initial appointment date falls between July 2 and June 30, this period shall not be counted toward years in rank. In effect, years in rank are counted beginning with the first July 1 an individual is employed at the UMBC Library. It is understood that dates specified in this section of the document indicate the most immediate following working date.

6.6.6.1 Promotion and Permanent Status Review Sequence

- A. The Director or designee shall notify all librarians who are in their required review year no later than July 15, that they must undergo permanent status or promotional review. (See [Section 6](#) "promotional review timetable" below)
- B. Except as provided in paragraph a, above, Librarians are responsible as individuals for tracking their own eligibility for permanent status or promotional review (consulting if and as needed with the Director or designee), and for initiating the review process at the appropriate time, if they so elect.
- C. The candidate for permanent status or promotional review must request review in writing specifying the review(s) sought and submit a dossier to the Director or designee by August 15 (See Appendix A: "Dossier Contents and Responsibilities"). The Director or designee shall confirm receipt of the dossier in writing to the candidate. The Director or designee shall add to the Dossier the current position description and copies of the two most recent UMBC supervisory evaluation

forms completed. The Director or designee shall make the candidate's dossier available for use by the Chair of the PRC and for PRC committee members thereafter under secure and confidential conditions. All parties are responsible for maintaining security and confidentiality of these materials. The Director or designee shall prepare a checklist of dossier contents and update the checklist as additional materials are added to the dossier.

- D. The Chair of the PRC forwards a copy of the updated curriculum vitae from the dossier to the candidate's current supervisor(s) and requests a detailed written assessment of the candidate's job performance and any other areas that the current supervisor(s) may be able to address. In those cases in which the current supervisor has been in the position for less than one year, the past immediate supervisor(s) will be contacted as well.
- E. In order to provide the PRC and responsible administrators with broad-based documentation of achievements, candidates must supply the Committee with sufficient references to document their entire range of achievements, for both job performance and professional development as outlined in Appendix B "Evaluation Criteria." Candidates holding rank of Librarian I seeking permanent status and promotion to Librarian II must provide three or four references; candidates holding rank of Librarian II seeking permanent status or promotion to Librarian III must provide the names of four to six references; candidates holding rank of Librarian III seeking permanent status or promotion to Librarian IV must provide the names of five to seven references. The PRC may solicit additional references to ensure that the PRC receives a full picture of the candidate's activities. The candidate shall be informed of the names of these references. All letters of reference shall be kept in strictest confidence so as to protect the privacy of the candidate and to encourage references to be frank and accurate in their descriptions of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. Under no circumstances shall the candidate see the letters nor shall the contents of the letters be made public.
- F. The supervisor's written assessment of job performance and all letters of reference shall be submitted to the Chair of the PRC by October 15. This material becomes a part of the candidate's dossier. It is considered confidential material for the use of the PRC. In the event letters of reference or the supervisor's assessment are not received by October 15, the Director or designee will be advised of the situation.
- G. After allowing sufficient time for the PRC members to review the dossier, the Chair of the PRC shall convene the PRC in order to commence deliberations.
- H. Should the PRC determine that the dossier lacks key evidence which the Committee believes the candidate may be able to supply, the PRC will submit a written request to the candidate to which the candidate must reply within 10 working days. The candidate is under no obligation to answer the Committee's questions and need only respond in writing to the PRC's request indicating that he or she chooses not to

respond. In such cases, the PRC should proceed with its deliberations. The PRC's request and the candidate's response will be added to the dossier at this point.

- I. Voting: In considering a candidate's application for permanent status or promotion, PRC members shall base their deliberations on the information presented in the dossier. PRC member faculty must certify having read the dossier by signing a sheet. Library faculty members who have not read the reports should not participate in the vote for promotion. A quorum consisting of 75% of the eligible PRC members must be in attendance and vote. The PRC will use a sign-in sheet to verify and permanently record attendance. The Committee shall complete its consideration and reach a decision by secret ballot.
- J. The PRC majority report justifying the PRC's recommendation shall be written by a member or members of the PRC, other than the Director of the Library. This report shall be a narrative statement commenting on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in each area of consideration. The vote tally shall be indicated on the PRC's recommendation. Signatures of PRC members shall be appended to the report. If desired, a minority report also may be appended to the PRC recommendation.
- K. The Chair of the PRC shall add the PRC's written report(s) to the dossier, and shall forward the dossier to the Director of the Library no later than December 1. A copy will also be forwarded to the candidate.
- L. The Director of the Library receives and evaluates the dossier. The Director shall recommend acceptance or rejection of the request for permanent status or promotion and shall provide reasons for that recommendation to the candidate and the PRC in writing by December 15. This letter shall become part of the dossier, which the Director shall forward immediately to the Provost or designee. A copy of the letter will also be forwarded to the candidate.
- M. The Provost or designee receives the dossier and forwards it to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The Director of the Library or designee shall also provide the Chair of the University Faculty Review Committee (UFRC) with a copy of these Procedures by February 1, in order to facilitate UFRC review to ensure the proper application of the review procedures. The Provost or designee shall, after consulting with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the University Faculty Review Committee, make a recommendation which normally will be transmitted to the President and the candidate by May 15.

Ultimate approval of all recommendations for granting permanent status and promotion rests with the President of the University. The President shall notify the candidate and the Provost and the Director of the Library of his/her decision by June. The President may grant an additional year without change of academic status if the final administrative decision on the candidate cannot be reached by the end of the

academic year. Further, under extraordinary circumstances, reconsideration of a negative recommendation may be possible.

The dossier shall be treated as described below (item n). Should the candidate apply for promotion at another time, there shall be no discussion of or reference to any previous application by the candidate. Each application for promotion is to be considered solely on its own merits at the time it is submitted.

- N. When the review process is concluded, the dossier and all related correspondence and notes must be retained in its entirety by the Director or designee. This supporting documentation shall be sealed and kept in a separate secure promotion file apart from the candidate's personnel file. Appropriate records retention procedures and schedules will be followed.

6.6.6.2 Appeal of Promotion and Permanent Status Decisions

Library faculty may appeal promotion and permanent status decisions through the UMBC Promotion and Tenure Reconsideration Procedures as outlined in the *UMBC Faculty Handbook*.

6.6.7 Promotional and Permanent Status Review Timetable

6.6.7.1 Promotion from Librarian I

Review for promotion and permanent status is mandatory for librarians at this rank and shall occur no later than in the sixth consecutive year of continuous full-time (or full-time equivalent) employment as a faculty Librarian I at UMBC.

Promotion to Librarian II, if granted, is announced immediately and becomes effective as of the following July 1.

If permanent status and promotion from Librarian I to Librarian II are denied during the employee's sixth consecutive year of full-time employment as a Librarian I, the individual's appointment will be terminated in accordance with applicable provisions of UM personnel policies and regulations.

6.6.7.2 Promotion from Ranks of Librarian II and Librarian III

Promotional review is neither mandatory nor automatic for librarians at these ranks. To be considered for promotion the individual librarian must initiate the process described above through submission of a dossier to the Director or designee by the required date.

6.6.7.2.1 Promotion from Librarian II to Librarian III

Review for promotion to Librarian III normally begins after at least six years of professional experience (three of which must be at a level comparable to the rank of Librarian II at UMBC). Except as provided below under “Initial Implementation”, the PRC shall consider the candidate’s achievements and experience since attainment of Librarian II or comparable rank.

Promotion to Librarian III, if granted, is announced immediately and becomes effective as of the following July 1.

If a staff member is denied promotion to Librarian III, he or she shall not be reviewed in either of the next two review cycles.

6.6.7.2.2 Promotion from Librarian III to Librarian IV

Review for promotion to Librarian IV normally begins after at least nine years of professional experience (three of which must be at a level comparable to the rank of Librarian III at UMBC). The PRC shall consider the candidate’s achievements and experience since attainment of Librarian III or comparable rank.

Promotion to Librarian IV, if granted, is announced immediately and becomes effective as of the following July 1.

If a staff member is denied promotion to Librarian IV, he or she shall not be reviewed in either of the next two review cycles.

6.6.7.3 Permanent Status Review

Permanent status is an institutional commitment to permanent and continuous employment to be terminated only for adequate cause (for example, professional or scholarly misconduct; incompetence; moral turpitude; or willful neglect of duty) and only after due process in accordance with relevant USM and campus policies.³

Permanent status decisions will be based on the candidate’s entire career. The candidate’s record must demonstrate consistency of job performance, continuing development, significance of contributions, and potential for continued excellence and professional growth.

³Relevant policies include [Board of Regents Policies and Procedures II-1.00](#) - University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty and the *UMBC Faculty Handbook*, sections on Candidates’ Rights, Grievances, and Separation.

Permanent status can be awarded only by affirmative decision based upon a formal review.

Except in cases of initial appointment, candidates applying for promotion to the rank of Librarian III or Librarian IV shall be considered for and automatically granted permanent status upon promotion to those ranks. Separate reviews for permanent status follow the same application and review process as for promotion in rank.

Regardless of rank held, one who has completed his or her fifth consecutive year of full-time (or full-time equivalent) employment as a member of the UMBC Library faculty must undergo mandatory review in the next available review cycle. It is mandatory for the Librarian I to apply for promotion and permanent status; this application should be initiated no later than the end of the fifth consecutive year (i.e., the dossier must be submitted by August 15 of the year following completion of five full years of service. Service years are counted from the first July 1 of UMBC employment. Therefore, if the library faculty member were appointed on July 2, his or her first year of employment for counting years of service would start on the *following* July 1 and would run through the subsequent June 30). Such review shall follow the form and timetable established in these procedures and shall yield a decision to confer or deny permanent status to the individual.

If permanent status is denied, the individual's appointment will be terminated in accordance with applicable provisions of UM personnel policies and regulations.

6.6.7.4 Initial Implementation

Individuals granted permanent status and librarian rank under the *UMBC Implementation of the USM Board of Regents' "Policy on Librarians"* (BOR Policy VII-2.15, superseded April 7, 2000, by BOR Policy II-1.00) shall retain permanent status and their previously attained librarian rank.

For purposes of promotional review of those librarians having achieved permanent status and rank of Librarian II on or before May 5, 1998, the period of review to be considered by the PRC during such librarian's first candidacy for promotion shall be their entire period of professional Librarian service at UMBC with emphasis on the most recent seven years.

6.6.8 Appendices

6.6.8.1 Appendix A: Dossier Contents and Responsibilities

1. Items to be supplied by the candidate at onset of review:
 - a. Letter requesting review, specifying review sought.
 - b. Résumé
 - c. Personal Statement and Concise Summary of Professional Activities during the Review Period -- prepared by the candidate.

Transcript(s) – Original Transcript(s) documenting any formal continuing studies during the review period.

- d. Publications – Copies of up to five (5) professionally relevant publications, or documentation of presentations, or grants.
 - e. List of References -- The candidate must submit a list of individuals from inside or outside the Library who will be asked for additional information concerning the candidate's professional capabilities and accomplishments. The list may include librarians, faculty members or other colleagues who have had sufficient contact with the candidate during the review period to be able to evaluate the candidate's skills and performance. Candidates should ensure that their references can, collectively, document the full range of requirements outlined in Appendix B.
2. Items to be supplied by others during the course of review
- a. Current Approved Position – Added to the dossier by the Director or designee.
 - b. Performance Appraisals – the two most recent annual performance appraisals completed by the librarian's supervisor(s) using standard UMBC forms. Added to the dossier by the Director or designee.
 - c. Letters of Reference – correspondence to and from references, including those suggested by the candidate (section 1. f. above) and others contacted by the PRC.
 - (1) letters from PRC soliciting references assessing the candidate's accomplishments,
 - (2) letters of reference received
 - d. Supervisor's(s') Written Assessment(s) of Performance – The supervisor's letter should include substantive information about the candidate such as examples of weaknesses, strengths, and examples of significant projects completed.
 - e. Other – Additional information from inside and outside the Library in order to complete documentation needed to make a recommendation.
 - (1) letter(s) from PRC to candidate requesting information
 - (2) candidate's response(s)
 - (3) other documents deemed appropriate by the candidate
 - f. Recommendations and Actions
 - (1) Majority report of PRC including vote tally and member signatures supplied by PRC Chair
 - (2) Minority PRC report if desired
 - (3) Decision of Director of the Library
 - (4) Decision of Provost by designee

-
3. Items to be supplied by others during the course of review
 - a. Current Approved Position Description -- Added to the dossier by the Associate Director for Administrative Services.
 - b. Performance Appraisals – the two most recent annual performance appraisals completed by the librarian’s supervisor(s) using standard UMBC forms. Added to the dossier by the Associate Director for Administrative Services.
 - c. Letters of Reference – correspondence to and from references, including those suggested by the candidate (section 1. f. above) and others contacted by the PRC.
 - (1) letters from PRC soliciting references assessing the candidate's accomplishments,
 - (2) letters of reference received
 - d. Supervisor’s(s’) Written Assessment(s) of Performance
 - e. Other – Additional information from inside and outside the Library in order to complete documentation needed to make a recommendation.
 - (1) letter(s) from PRC to candidate requesting information
 - (2) candidate’s response(s)
 - (3) other documents deemed appropriate by the candidate
 - f. Recommendations and Actions
 - (1) majority report of PRC including vote tally and member signatures supplied by PRC Chair
 - (2) minority PRC report if desired
 - (3) decision of Director of the Library
 - (4) decision of Provost or designee
- 6.6.8.2 Appendix B: Guidelines for Application of Evaluation Criteria for Promotion of Librarians:
- 6.6.8.2.1 Requirements for attainment of Librarian II Rank

Candidates must meet all of the following requirements during the review period except as noted.

- A. Job Performance:
 - (1) Meets or exceeds standards in all categories of evaluation in two most recent annual performance appraisals or proof that any “below standards” ratings were fully addressed and corrected before the submission of the candidate’s dossier.

- (2) Demonstrates competence and diligence in area(s) of responsibility including documented examples of the following:
 - ability to plan and organize
 - thoroughness in the execution of any plan or project,
 - ability to relate job functions to the more general goals of the library and University
 - ability to work effectively with others to enhance library services
 - ability to coordinate a variety of responsibilities to accomplish assignments within set deadlines
- (3) Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of specialties within areas of responsibility (established by supervisor and references) as appropriate to serve UMBC's mission
- (4) Demonstrates broad knowledge of librarianship and professional perspective which candidate shall have applied in assisting others in solving Library-wide problems through projects or active participation in and documented material contributions to the work of UMBC Library, UMBC IT, or USM library committees.

B. Professional Activities, Continuing Education, Research, Publications and Teaching:

- (1) Evidence of active membership in at least one relevant professional organization.
- (2) Documented attendance at professional meetings
- (3) Evidence of continuing study and ongoing enhancement of candidate's knowledge level in areas of responsibility, for example: participation in workshops, seminars, courses of study, etc.
- (4) Evidence of significant sustained analysis and presentation of ideas relevant to librarianship, for example: completed projects, significant reports, or publications, for which the candidate bears primary responsibility or authorship. Examples of such written work must be included in the dossier.

C. University Service:

It is expected that library faculty at rank of Librarian I will ordinarily have focused their efforts on the Library -- see "Job Performance," section A-4, above.

6.6.8.2.2 Requirements for Attainment of Librarian III Rank

In addition to meeting all the requirements for Librarian II, above, candidates must demonstrate all of the following during the review period:

-
- A. Job Performance
- (1) Demonstrates within areas of responsibility expertise, leadership and initiative beyond those of a librarian ranked Librarian II.
 - (2) Demonstrates increased leadership and initiative in applying broad professional knowledge and perspective in solution of Library-wide problems or projects.
 - (3) Successful documented completion of a major relevant project (approved in advance by the library administration) or improvement within the library or in a regional or national library context.
- B. Professional Activities, Continuing Education, Research, Publications and Teaching:
- (1) Demonstrates increased leadership or very high quality participation in professional activities. Evidence that the candidate has shared his or her expertise or broad professional knowledge to advance USM, regional, or national librarianship or library services can be demonstrated through either:
 - (a) documented leadership and initiative in projects and assignments which extend beyond areas of responsibility, equivalent to chairing a library committee or task force at the USM, regional, or national level;
 - or
 - (b) research and scholarship in librarianship or other relevant academic fields as represented by at least three of the following, one of which must have been peer-reviewed: publications (or works accepted for publication), presentations, or creative projects. A significant grant won for which the candidate took primary responsibility may be substituted for the peer-reviewed item above.
- C. University Service:
- Successful service on at least two non-library UMBC, USM or regional committees, governing bodies, task forces, or projects.

6.6.8.2.3 Requirements for Attainment of Librarian IV Rank

In addition to meeting all the requirements for Librarian III noted above, the candidate must have made contributions to the Library, the campus, or the profession which clearly set the candidate among the top librarians of the profession. This would include three or more of the following:

- A. Providing regional or national leadership through holding high office in professional associations or otherwise producing significant progress in the field.
- B. Winning a major grant and successfully completing the grant project.

- C. Producing major campus-wide, USM-wide or regional improvements for UMBC, the USM or regional organizations, or chairing a group which realized such improvements.
- D. Achieving unusual formal recognition, honors or awards for outstanding service, teaching or leadership or for an exceptional achievement.
- E. Consistent leadership within the Library in which other staff members, the Library or USM libraries, or the campus have benefitted over a long period of time from the candidate's work to effect major change(s).
- F. An outstanding publication record.

6.6.8.3 Appendix C: Policy History

10/6/95	USM Board of Regents approved BOR policy VII - 2.15 "Policy on Librarians".
9/6/96	Original "UMBC Implementation Procedures" completed by Library and submitted to UMBC administrators for review.
11/96	UMBC approval of "Implementation Procedures" obtained.
12/5/96	Registered with USM System Administration.
5/26/98	Revised per agreement at Associate Staff meeting.
7/98	UMBC approval of revisions obtained, additional revision by counsel incorporated in final documents dated 7/17/98.
7/17/98	Revised "UMBC Implementation Procedures for BOR Policy on Librarians" registered with USM System Administration
4/7/00	USM Board of Regents approved amendments to BOR Policy II-1.00 "Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty" superseding BOR policy VII - 2.15 "Policy on Librarians."
11/1/00	Draft "UMBC Library Faculty Rank and Review Procedures" finalized per agreement at Library Faculty meeting.
3/13/01	UMBC Faculty Senate approved with UFRC amendment.
TBA	UMBC approval of draft obtained.
TBA	Revised "UMBC Library Faculty Rank and Review Procedures" registered with USM System Administration

6.7 UMBC EARLY (NON-SCHEDULED) TENURE REVIEW POLICY (revised June 7, 1989)

Tenure review is a time-consuming process that involves many individuals. Since resources are not infinite, the policy at UMBC is one that permits, but does not necessarily encourage, early tenure review. This policy provides an opportunity for early tenure consideration “without risk,” but places limits on the timing and number of such reviews.

1. A full-time faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor who has completed three but fewer than six consecutive years of service at the University is eligible to be reviewed for tenure at the initiative of the department and with the approval of the appropriate Dean.
2. Such a review may be initiated by the Department, with the consent of the faculty member. Upon such initiation and consent, the department chair will notify the appropriate Dean at (or preferably before) the beginning of the academic year in which the review will take place.
3. Upon obtaining the Dean’s approval, the department chair will follow the procedures specified for normal P&T reviews.
4. The President of UMBC has the final authority to award or deny early tenure.
5. If the outcome of the review procedure is negative, the faculty member’s existing contract agreement will remain in force, and the faculty member will still be entitled to a scheduled P&T review during the sixth year of continuous service to the University.
6. Except in unusual circumstances, early tenure review during an Assistant Professor’s initial three-year contract will not be allowed; further, tenure review will not be permitted more than one time prior to the scheduled review in the sixth year. Tenure reviews not in accord with this policy will require the authorization of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

6.8 UMBC GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF SENIOR LECTURER

(Approved by the Faculty Senate May 11, 2004; Amended October 11, 2011. Section headings and paragraph style adapted to the format of this *Handbook*.)

6.8.1 Background

Full-time non-tenure-track instructional faculty at UMBC are generally appointed to the rank of Lecturer. Initial appointments are for periods up to three years and, unless specified otherwise at the time of appointment, are renewable. On February 21, 2003, the University System’s Board of Regents approved an amendment to the *University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty* creating the faculty rank of Senior Lecturer. The present guidelines provide for the implementation of the rank of Senior Lecturer at UMBC.

6.8.2 Eligibility

Candidates for appointment as Senior Lecturer must have all of the qualifications of a Lecturer, must have completed at least six years as a Lecturer (or in a comparable) rank, and shall have established a record of teaching excellence and a record of service.

6.8.3 Criteria

6.8.3.1 Teaching

Criteria for the evaluation of teaching should be consistent with those employed by the University in evaluating candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

A Senior Lecturer is expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and teaching leadership, which may include development of new curriculum, teaching innovations, scholarship, and/or creative works.

6.8.3.2 Service

Faculty members typically engage in service activities of many types. These include service at the department, institution, and University System levels; service to professional organizations; service to local, state, and national agencies; and service to the public. Candidates for appointment to the rank of Senior Lecturer should have a significant and continuing record of service in one or more of these categories.

6.8.4 Procedures

Procedures for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer are consistent with those used for promotion to other faculty ranks and follow the university's calendar for non-scheduled promotion reviews. The steps in the procedure, with specific provisions for this rank, are as follows:

1. The candidate directs a request for consideration for promotion to the Department Chair not later than May 22 of the year preceding the review.
2. The candidate prepares a dossier consisting of course syllabi, teaching materials, and a self-assessment in the areas of teaching and service. The dossier shall also include evidence documenting excellence in teaching and a record of significant and continuing service, as well as any other materials deemed relevant by the candidate and the department. At a minimum, documentation of excellence in teaching must include in-class observations of the candidate by members of the department or appropriate outside evaluators, with an observational report summarizing the candidate's classroom technique and effectiveness, and SCEQ results for the past five years.
3. The Chair shall convene a Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (DP&TC) consisting of all tenured faculty members and all Senior Lecturers in the department. For evaluation of teaching, two students shall participate with voice and vote, in conformity with the existing University procedures for Promotion and Tenure reviews.
4. The remaining steps in the procedure (recommendations of the Department Chair, Dean, University Faculty Review Committee, and Provost) are the same as for non-scheduled promotion and tenure reviews of tenured and tenure-track faculty.

6.9 UMBC GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PRINCIPAL LECTURER

(Section 6.9 Approved by the Board of Regents May 8, 2019)

6.9.1 Eligibility

This is the highest rank for full-time non-tenure track instructional faculty at UMBC, and the appointment should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's professional and leadership accomplishments and promise of continued growth. In addition to the qualifications required of the Senior Lecturer, candidates for promotion to Principal Lecturer must have a distinguished and sustained record of teaching excellence over the course of at least five years since promotion to Senior Lecturer. Candidates for promotion to Principal Lecturer must also meet appropriately higher expectations in terms of the scope, range, or impact of professional activities.

6.9.2 Criteria

6.9.2.1 Teaching

Criteria for the evaluation of teaching should be consistent with those employed by the University in evaluating candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of Full Professor. A candidate for appointment to the rank of Principal Lecturer should have a record of outstanding leadership in the educational programs of the university; a record of involvement in obtaining financial support for education initiatives; or have established an outstanding record of scholarship on teaching and learning.

6.9.2.2 Service

Candidates for the rank of Principal Lecturer should have demonstrated leadership in the category of service within the University and the academic profession. These accomplishments may include by are not limited to leadership in curricular development, revision, and assessment or leadership in College/University governance and committees or elected or appointed leadership in professional or community organizations.

6.9.2.3 Procedures

Procedures for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer are consistent with those used for promotion to other faculty ranks and follow the university's calendar for non-scheduled promotion reviews. The steps in the procedure, with specific provisions for this rank, are as follows:

1. The candidate directs a request for consideration for promotion to the Department Chair no later than May 22 of the year preceding the review.
2. The candidate prepares a dossier consisting of course syllabi, teaching materials, and a self-assessment in the areas of teaching and service. The dossier shall also include evidence documenting excellence in teaching and a record of significant and continuing service, as well as any other materials deemed relevant by the candidate and the department. At a minimum, documentation of excellence in teaching must include in-class observations of the candidate by members of the department or appropriate outside evaluators, with an observational report summarizing the candidate's classroom technique and effectiveness, and SCE results for the past five years.
3. The Chair shall convene a Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (DP&TC) consisting of all tenured faculty members and all Principal Lecturers in the department. For evaluation of teaching, two students shall participate with voice and vote, in conformity with existing University procedures for Promotion and Tenure reviews.

4. The remaining steps in the procedure (recommendations of the Department Chair, Dean, University Faculty Review Committee, and Provost) are the same as for non-scheduled promotion and tenure reviews of tenured and tenure-track faculty.

6.10 DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Approved by the Faculty Senate October 14, 2008. Section headings and paragraph style adapted to the format of this *Handbook*.)

6.10.1 Preamble

Each department shall specify in writing those members of the department who have the authority to establish the Departmental Guidelines.

6.10.2 Research

- i. Establish research performance standards for successful promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor.
- ii. Describe the minimum required materials to be included in the Research dossier.
- iii. Note who may write external review letters.
- iv. Describe the review criteria communicated to external reviewers. The letter to external reviewers is modeled by the Dean, but adapted by the department.
- v. Establish principles for the description and weighting of collaborative research.

6.10.3 Teaching

- i. Describe the documentation required in the Teaching dossier.
- ii. Outline the expectations related to teaching effectiveness.
- iii. Describe the process employed to assess teaching effectiveness, e.g. observation, evaluation of SCEQs, student preparedness in other courses, etc.
- iv. Describe how faculty and or student reports on teaching effectiveness are produced and communicated to the candidate and the DP&TC.
- v. Describe the SCEQ questions that are of particular interest.
- vi. Describe the role of the Faculty Development Center, if any, in mentoring effective teaching within your department.

6.10.4 Student Participation In Teaching Reviews

- i. The process for selecting student members of the DP&TC should be specified in Departmental guidelines.
- ii. Describe the process for student involvement in reviews, including undergraduate and graduate member (as applicable) selection and voting.
- iii. Specify the instructions on confidentiality conveyed to students.
- iv. Include a question template applied in the surveying process, if any.
- v. Prescribe the manner in which students contact peers.
- vi. Indicate how findings are conveyed to the DP&TC.

6.10.5 Service

- i. Describe the required documentation of Service conveyed in the dossier and CV.
- ii. Describe the Service expectations of the Department for promotion to both Associate Professor and Professor.

6.10.6 Mentoring of the Candidate

- i. Describe the criteria that mark successful progress toward promotion to Associate Professor as well as promotion to Professor.
- ii. Describe the weight and focus accorded to the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service.
- iii. Describe the expectations for teaching, research, and service.
- iv. Outline the junctures at which candidates receive guidance on progress toward promotion and tenure, e.g., Hiring, 1st Year Review, 3rd Year Review, Post-Tenure Review, regular meetings, etc.
- v. Explain who mentors candidates, and whether the mentor is elected, assigned, or a volunteer.
- vi. Describe the interaction and frequency of meetings established between the Department Chair and the Candidate.

6.11 PROMOTION AND TENURE RECONSIDERATION PROCEDURES (Approved by the UMBC Faculty Senate, May 10, 2016)

6.11.1 Purpose

The purpose of these procedures is to ensure that every candidate for promotion or tenure shall receive a fair and thorough review. The Faculty Review Committee shall serve as an advisory committee to the President of the University (“President”). The responsibilities and powers carried out by the Faculty Review Committee shall not abrogate the role of the UFRC during the promotion and tenure process.

6.11.2 Faculty Review Committee Membership

The Senate and the President will solicit names for the Faculty Review Committee from academic departments, the Deans of the Colleges, and the Senate Executive Committee for review of any request for reconsideration filed under these procedures. The Senate shall submit at least two nominees for at least half the positions on the Faculty Review Committee, and the President shall submit two (2) names for each remaining seat on the Faculty Review Committee. At its May meeting, the Faculty Senate shall elect all the Faculty Review Committee members by a majority of those present and voting. The Faculty Review Committee shall be a standing committee composed of five (5) tenured faculty members, with representation from each of the academic colleges (CAHSS, CNMS, COEIT), if possible, and two (2) additional at-large members. Appointment to the Faculty Review Committee shall be for two (2) years. The term of appointment of all members shall be staggered and members may not serve two consecutive terms. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee shall be elected by majority vote annually in May of each year from among the members of the Faculty Review Committee and shall be a voting member. No one currently serving on the UFRC or who has served on the UFRC in the immediate preceding academic year shall serve on the Faculty Review Committee.

6.11.3 Grounds for Reconsideration

The grounds for reconsideration of a decision to deny promotion or tenure shall be based upon “exceptional circumstances,” limited to new evidence of violations of substantive due process and/or procedural due process. Violation of substantive due process means that: (a) the decision was based upon an illegal or constitutionally impermissible consideration, e.g. upon the candidate's protected status as outlined in the University's Notice of Non-Discrimination or on the candidate's exercise of protected First Amendment freedoms (e.g., freedom of speech); or (b) the decision was arbitrary or capricious, e.g. it was based on erroneous information, or the decision was clearly inconsistent with the supporting

materials and information contained within the dossier. Violation of procedural due process arises when the decision was negatively influenced by a failure during the promotion and tenure review to take a procedural step or to fulfill a procedural requirement established in promotion and tenure policy or review procedures of a department or college.

6.11.4 Burden of Proof

The burden of proof rests with the candidate requesting reconsideration at all times. The candidate requesting reconsideration bears the burden of supporting via the preponderance of the evidence that a substantive due process violation and/or procedural due process violation occurred. Preponderance of the evidence means that the existence of the fact in issue is more probable than not, is based on the more convincing evidence and its probable truth or accuracy, and not on the amount of evidence. The preponderance of the evidence standard would be met where the Committee members find that the evidence supporting the allegation(s) in the request for consideration are more convincing than the opposing evidence.

6.11.5 Guidelines and Procedures for Requests for Reconsideration

Upon notification from the President that promotion or tenure was not awarded, the candidate may request that the President submit the matter to the Faculty Review Committee for consideration, by submitting a request for reconsideration. The request for reconsideration shall be in writing and submitted to the President, via hand-delivery or mail and electronic mail, within twenty (20) University business days of notification of the negative decision. The request must detail the basis for the reconsideration with specificity and include evidence to support the claims. The request for reconsideration shall also include any requests for removal of Faculty Review Committee members, including the Chair, and state with specificity the reasons for the requested removals, as detailed in Section 7 below. The President will determine, within ten (10) University business days of receipt of the request for reconsideration, whether to grant the request based on the criteria stated in Section 3 above. If the President grants a request for reconsideration, the Faculty Review Committee will be convened. The President shall notify the candidate and the Faculty Review Committee in writing, via mail and electronic mail that the request has been granted and the accepted grounds for the reconsideration request. If the President declines a request, the President's decision and rationale shall be sent, via hand-delivery or mail and electronic mail, to the candidate. Upon receipt of notice from the President that the request has been granted, the Faculty Review Committee Chair, or a designee from the Faculty Review Committee, shall notify the relevant administrators, department chair, UFRC chair, and DP&TC chair, within in five (5) University business days, in writing via mail or electronic mail of the accepted ground(s) for the reconsideration request. The candidate will then have an additional twenty (20) University business days in which to submit any additional supporting materials, via hand-delivery, mail, or electronic mail, related to the request to the Faculty Review Committee, unless this date is otherwise extended by the President because of circumstances beyond the control of the candidate. The Faculty Review Committee Chair or a designee from the Faculty Review Committee shall send the candidate an electronic mail message acknowledging receipt of the additional information within seven (7) University business days of receipt. The candidate should be aware that the materials submitted with the request for reconsideration will be shared with parties against whom allegations are made and any other persons deemed necessary by the Faculty Review Committee to carry out their responsibilities. Faculty members with questions regarding this process should contact the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

6.11.6 Request for Extension of Time

A request for extension of time for filing the request for reconsideration or for filing additional supporting materials shall be submitted, in writing, to the President via hand-delivery or mail and electronic mail. The burden rests with the candidate for establishing a reasonable basis for requesting an extension of time. The President shall make a determination of whether the request for extension of time is reasonable, and shall respond to the candidate in writing, within seven (7) University business days, whether the request for extension of time will be granted.

6.11.7 Conflict of Interest

Except in extenuating circumstances, the candidate may request the removal of no more than two (2) Faculty Review Committee members, including the Chair, for cause when the candidate believes the members and/or Chair would be unable to evaluate the request for reconsideration impartially. In filing a request for removal of a member and/or Chair, the candidate must state with specificity why the candidate believes the member and/or Chair would be biased or partial. The Faculty Review Committee will determine whether there is reasonable cause to remove/dismiss the member and/or Chair by simple majority vote. Any Faculty Review Committee member or Chair who feels that their participation may have the appearance of a conflict of interest should recuse themselves. Any member or Chair who feels they will have difficulty being objective in a given case shall recuse themselves. Members of the Faculty Review Committee, including the Chair, who are from the candidate's department or from interdisciplinary programs with which the candidate is affiliated, should recuse themselves. If recusals or removals of the Chair and/or members reduce the size of the Committee to fewer than five (5) members, the Faculty Senate President shall find replacements to return the Faculty Review Committee to full strength.

6.11.8 Responsibilities and Powers of the Faculty Review Committee

The Faculty Review Committee shall make a determination as to whether or not a substantive due process violation and/or procedural due process violation has been demonstrated via the preponderance of the evidence. The Faculty Review Committee shall not serve as an advocate for any party to the reconsideration process and shall not substitute its judgment on the merits of the candidate's dossier for the judgment of any divisional promotion or tenure committee or the President. The Faculty Review Committee shall conduct inquiries that are investigatory and strictly limited to the issues related to the accepted grounds for reconsideration. The Faculty Review Committee has investigative powers which include, but are not limited to, requesting and examining documents directly related to the promotion or tenure case under review, interviewing the candidate, and interviewing other individuals who have information relevant to the promotion or tenure case under review. The Faculty Review Committee shall examine all documents related to the candidate's promotion or tenure review and may request to have access to such other departmental and college materials as it deems relevant to the review. Whenever the Faculty Review Committee believes that a meeting could lead to a better understanding of the issues in the request for reconsideration, it shall meet with the appropriate party (with the candidate or with the relevant academic administrator, member(s) of the UFRC, member(s) of the DP&TC, and department chair). The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will preside over all meetings. If the Chair is unable to attend, or is recused or removed, the members will choose a temporary replacement, and communicate that information to the candidate and the President. The Faculty Review Committee shall make every effort to schedule meetings with the candidate as expeditiously as possible, with due regard for the candidate's academic and personal obligations. The Faculty Review Committee shall notify the candidate of meetings with the candidate, in writing or electronic mail at least five (5) University business days prior to the meeting date. The candidate is entitled to appear before the Faculty Review Committee to present the candidate's case orally in addition to the written presentation. There shall be no audio or video recordings of the Faculty Review Committee meetings. A designated member of the

Committee will take notes, which will become part of the official appeal record. If a candidate requires a disability-related accommodation, they shall immediately notify the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee. The Chair will refer the candidate to the University's Office of Human Relations to work in consultation regarding the disability-related accommodation request. The Faculty Review Committee will conduct separate interviews and follow-up interviews, if needed, of the candidate, witnesses, others having knowledge of the matter, and appropriate administrative officials. Meetings before the Faculty Review Committee will not be open to the public. The decision of the Faculty Review Committee shall be determined by a simple majority of its members. The Faculty Review Committee may decide to recommend to the President that 5 corrective action be granted, that a remedy be granted wholly or in part, or it may recommend denial of corrective action or a remedy. The Faculty Review Committee's decision is not binding, and serves only as a recommendation to the President.

6.11.9 Faculty Review Committee Findings and Recommendations

Except in extenuating circumstances, the Faculty Review Committee shall prepare a written report, including all supporting documentation, for the President, no later than November 1 of the calendar year in which the request for reconsideration is filed. The report shall include findings with respect to whether or not the grounds for reconsideration were supported by a preponderance of the evidence, and, where appropriate, recommendations for a remedy and/or corrective action. Such remedy may include the return of the matter back to the level of the review process at which the violation of substantive due process and/or procedural due process occurred and action to eliminate any harmful effects it may have had on the full and fair consideration of the promotion or tenure case. No recommended corrective action and/or remedy may abrogate the principle of peer review.

6.11.10 President's Decision Regarding the Request for Reconsideration

The President shall accord great weight to the findings and recommendations of the Faculty Review Committee. The President's decision regarding the request for reconsideration shall be final. Except in extenuating circumstances, the President's decision and rationale shall be transmitted to the candidate, in writing, within ten (10) University business days from the date the Faculty Review Committee report is received.

6.11.11 Implementation of President's Reconsideration Decision

When the President grants a remedy and/or corrective action regarding a request for reconsideration, the Provost has the responsibility for oversight of the implementation of the remedy and/or corrective action the President requires to be taken. Except in extenuating circumstances, the Provost shall formulate a plan and a timeline for implementing and monitoring the remedy and/or corrective action, within ten (10) University business days of receipt of the President's reconsideration decision.

6.11.12 Professional Conduct and Confidentiality

All those involved in the review process shall adhere to the highest standards of professional conduct, shall focus on factual information, and shall avoid practices that would conflict with their ability to be fair and unbiased. The material under review, the substance of the Faculty Review Committee discussions, and their final recommendation are confidential, except as disclosures are reasonably necessary in the reconsideration review process. However, confidentiality can only be respected insofar as it does not interfere with the University's obligation to address the reconsideration request, or to fulfill duties imposed by law, including but not limited to, the Maryland Public Information Act, responses to lawfully issued third-party subpoenas, and responses to discovery requests in litigation.

6.11.13 Legal Representation

Attorneys may not appear with or on behalf of the candidate, witnesses, or the University in proceedings before the Faculty Review Committee. It is assumed that either party may rely on legal counsel in the preparation of any documents or the collection of any evidence to be presented to the Faculty Review Committee.

6.11.14 Reconsideration File

The Faculty Review Committee will establish a confidential file as soon as a notice of the request for reconsideration has been received from the President, which will be maintained by the Office of the Provost. All collected documents, notes of interviews, the original request and any other relevant material shall be maintained in this file. Minutes of the Faculty Review Committee meetings will be a part of the confidential file. The confidential file is available only to members of the Faculty Review Committee and the candidate, subject to other University administrators and officials, on a need to know basis to carry out University obligations. Confidential files shall be kept for a period of five years or for the duration of any legal process, whichever is greater.

INDEX

Academic Advising..... 4

Administration 14-16, 35, 36

 Academic Affairs 13, 37

 Provost 3, 7, 11-14, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, 33, 37, 38

 Appeals 5

Appointment 3-6, 11, 19, 20, 22-26, 29-31, 35-37

 Faculty..... 5

Appointments

 Initial..... 24, 26, 31

 Renewable..... 37

Assignments..... 14, 16, 22, 24, 34, 35

Board of Regents..... 3, 4, 6, 18, 22, 30, 36, 37

Chancellor 4, 5

Confidentiality 5, 8, 13, 16, 21, 26, 27, 39

Conflict of Interest 9-12, 25

Consulting 11, 12, 24-26, 28

Correspondence..... 29, 33

Dean 6-14, 17, 19-21, 37-39

Degree

 Doctoral 5

 Terminal..... 5, 6, 22

Direct Instructor Feedback Form..... 16

Excellence 37, 38

Experience..... 15, 22, 23, 30

Faculty

 Non Tenure-Track..... 37

 Part-Time 15

 Tenure-Track..... 37, 38

 Tenured 4, 6, 7, 9, 15-20, 38

Faculty Ranks

 Librarian..... 3, 4, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29-35

 Other 3, 36, 37

 Senior Lecturer..... 36, 37

 Tenure Track, Instructional..... 3, 5-7, 11, 12, 14-16, 37-40

 Tenure Track, Research..... 3

Faculty Responsibilities 17, 19

Faculty Rights 14

Faculty Senate 6, 11-14, 16-18, 20, 21, 36, 37, 39

Files..... 21

Governance 24

Grievances..... 30

History..... 14, 36

Immigration

 Permanent Status..... 3, 4, 21, 23, 25-31

Leave..... 16, 19

 Sabbatical..... 10, 19

Mentoring..... 38

Moral Turpitude 4, 30

Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support..... 15

Personnel Requisition.....	25
Promotion and Tenure	3-8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 38, 40
Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	7-14, 16, 38, 39
Dossier.....	7-10, 13, 14, 25-29, 31-34, 38, 39
Outside Opinions.....	7
University Faculty Review Committee.....	7, 11-14, 28, 36, 38
Records	29
Reputation.....	5, 6
Review of Tenured Faculty	
Annual	16, 17
Comprehensive.....	16, 18-20
Sanction.....	26
Scholarly Misconduct.....	4, 30
Scholarship	4-7, 10, 18, 20, 24, 35, 38
Service.....	4-7, 9-12, 18, 20, 23-25, 31, 34-40
Student Course Evaluation	16
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	7, 14-16, 38, 39
Teaching.....	4-7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 34-40
Tenure.....	3-9, 11-20, 22, 30, 36-40
Termination of Faculty Appointments	
Faculty Board of Review	13
University of Maryland, Baltimore County.....	5, 6, 8, 9, 12-16, 18, 20-23, 25, 26, 29-37
University System of Maryland.....	3, 4, 16, 18, 22, 23, 30, 31, 34-36
University of Maryland, Baltimore County	18
Willful Neglect of Duty.....	4, 30
Workload.....	8, 16, 17, 20