




MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 4, 2015

TO: Deans, Associate Deans for Faculty, Chairs, and Directors

FROM: Steven Marcus, 
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs *ad interim*

SUBJECT: Promotion and Tenure Deliberations

Please share the following memo with your College APT Committee Chairs and Department APT Committee Chairs and distribute it to the faculty serving on APT committees. Chairs of first-level APT Review Committees are responsible for ensuring voting faculty are aware of the contents of this memo, as well as the unit's guidelines for promotion and tenure, prior to or at the inception of the evaluative meeting.

The decision-making on promotion and tenure cases is both important to the individual faculty member and vital to the university's quest for excellence. The campus has devoted considerable effort to developing a set of policies designed to insure a thorough review of candidates and fair and impartial treatment of them. Three key elements contribute to the fairness of the decision making process: confidentiality with respect to the contents of decision-making meetings, careful attention to evaluative statements, and the avoidance of discussion of departmental political conflicts or personality traits irrelevant to APT criteria. Evaluation of the candidate may not be based on factors such as a candidate's sex, race, sexual orientation or other protected personal characteristics. In addition, neither a candidate's part-time status nor any extension of the mandatory tenure review year authorized pursuant to policy may be held against the candidate, and such candidates who have availed themselves of such policies shall be evaluated according to the same criteria applicable to other candidates. Our office stands ready to consult with faculty and administrators when questions arise.

If faculty members perceive that the deliberations about a candidate for promotion have been conducted inequitably or contained procedural violations, Senate Resolution 99-00-13 provides faculty members involved in these deliberations with two pathways to raise objections: (a) within the decision meeting itself, or (b) through confidential discussions with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs who

will investigate them thoroughly and seek a resolution. Such discussions with the Associate Provost do not constitute a violation of the confidentiality of the review meeting and are authorized by the Senate Policy.

The APT policies and implementation guidelines appear on the Faculty Affairs web page at <http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/APTManual.pdf>.