

A. James Clark School of Engineering APT Policy

This policy details changes to the A. James Clark School of Engineering APT procedures, which are consistent with the University of Maryland APT Guidelines dated 11/23/15. This report should be read in conjunction with the University APT Policy, approved by the President and the Chancellor June 8, 2015, and only deals with the specifics of College procedures where these are not spelled out in the University APT Guidelines.

(1) Revisions of Clark School APT policy will be consistent with campus APT policy.

(2) Numbers of Letters to be requested for each candidate for appointment or promotion.

(a) **Assistant Professor Hiring.** The procedure to be followed in hiring a new Assistant Professor is not within the purview of the University APT guidelines. Each department in the College can decide on the number of letters that should be requested, with a minimum of four. Since potential new Assistant Professor hires do not in general have a comprehensive record of research, teaching, and service, it is up to each Department to decide from whom letters should be solicited. Letters from thesis advisor(s), mentors, and collaborators need not be excluded. A minimum of three letters should be received. These numbers could be adjusted upward by individual departments depending on their tradition.

(b) **Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.** A minimum of 8 letters, equally split between committee and candidate choices, should be requested. A minimum of 6 letters from external reviewers should be received, with at least half from committee choices.

(c) **Promotion from Associate to Full Professor.** A minimum of 8 letters, equally split between committee and candidate choices, should be requested. A minimum of 6 letters from external reviewers should be received, with at least half from committee choices.

(d) **Appointment to Tenured Positions at the Associate or Full Professor Level.** A minimum of 8 letters, equally split between committee and candidate choices, should be requested. A minimum of 6 letters from external reviewers should be received, with at least half from committee choices.

(3) Letters from External Reviewers who have been Collaborators, for example mentors, co-authors or jointly funded individuals. Such selection will follow University APT policy and will require a letter justifying the selection of such an external reviewer in each instance. To quote the University APT Guidelines: "The committee will also heed closely the comments of evaluators who are documented as among the outstanding leaders in the field. It is suggested that, at a minimum, six of the letters be selected from evaluators who are not the candidate's mentors and collaborators. Up to two additional letters (for a total of at least eight) may be from a mentor or collaborator as long as sufficient explanation is provided by the Chair of the APT Review Committee and/or Department Chair."

(4) External Funding Level required of Candidates for Promotion. The candidate for promotion should demonstrate sufficient external funding to support a quality research program into the future.

(5) Ph.D. Graduates Candidates for promotion should demonstrate that they have either served as the principal advisor to graduate students who have been awarded Ph.Ds and/or have sufficient Ph.D. students in the pipeline to show that they have a viable research program. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should not be required to have graduated any Ph.D. students, but should be strongly encouraged to have done so. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor should have graduated a sufficient number of Ph.D. students to show that they have been operating a successful, productive, research program.

(6) Peer Evaluation of Teaching. Each candidate for promotion should receive at least two peer evaluations of their teaching in the year in which they are requesting promotion, as well as an additional peer evaluation of their teaching in the two year period preceding the year in which they request promotion. The written teaching evaluations should discuss in-class observation of the candidate's teaching, and comments on contributions to curriculum development made by the candidate. The candidate should have an opportunity to respond in writing to these teaching evaluations, and these responses will be included in the teaching dossier.

(7) Teaching Dossiers. The teaching dossier should include examples of course syllabi, examples of homework assignments and examinations, and the scores from the University Teaching Evaluations, including student comments. The teaching dossier should also include peer evaluations and any written responses to these evaluations from the candidate. No teaching dossier information should be sent to external reviewers.

(8) College APT Committee Quorum. The Clark School APT Committee will have 15 members, one Full Professor and one Associate Professor member from each department, with the exception of Fire Protection Engineering, which will have one Professor member. There will be no alternate members.

(a) All members of the APT Committee are required to attend all APT meetings . A member can attend virtually by Skype, FaceTime, Connect, phone or other means.

(b) In emergencies, when some members of the APT cannot make a meeting, the meeting can proceed provided there is a quorum.

(c) For appointments of and promotions to the rank of Associate Professor, a quorum requires 11 voting members at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. (Committee members from a candidate's department are not voting members.)

(d) For appointments of and promotions to the rank of Professor, a quorum requires 6 voting members at the rank of Professor.

(e) The quorum rules for the College APT Committee set forth in subsections (a) through (d) apply for all faculty appointments, including appointments outside the normal APT process. These quorum rules modify the prior rule establishing a quorum at 2/3 of the voting members of the APT Committee.