**Checklist for AEP Policies for PTK Faculty**

**From the Office of Faculty Affairs and provided by Hugh Bruck**

**12/28/2020**

[Click here to view UMD Guidelines for AEP of PTK Faculty](http://faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/UM_Guidelines_for_PTK_Appointments.pdf)

[Click here to view Engineering AEP Policy](https://clarknet.eng.umd.edu/sites/default/files/documents/PTK_Appointment_Promotion_ENGR_Policy.pdf)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Section.Paragraph citations for items listed below refer to relevant sections and paragraphs of [UM Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty](http://faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/UM_Guidelines_for_PTK_Appointments.pdf). |  |
| 1. The AEP policy specifies that new hires 1.) will receive a copy of the unit’s evaluation and promotion policy, or 2.) will be provided the URL where the unit’s AEP policy can be found. (II.C.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy provides for PTK faculty voting representation on committees that are tasked with creating, adopting, or revising policies on the appointment, evaluation, and promotion of PTK faculty. (III.B.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy specifies the qualifications and evaluation criteria for appointment and promotion. If broad qualifications as stated in the University APT policy are referenced, any exceptions relevant to PTK faculty are clearly identified. (III.C, III.E; IV.C; V.D.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that first-level reviews (conducted by the department or the College) shall be conducted by a committee. PTK faculty at the same or higher rank than the one being sought are included with voting representation on the committee. (III.C.) The policy specifies how the unit will handle reviews if there are no PTK faculty at the necessary rank.
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy includes a full description of the application and review process, including but not limited to: (IV.A.)
 |  |
| * 1. The materials to be submitted by the faculty member;
 |  |
| * 1. To whom the faculty member submits the materials;
 |  |
| * 1. Application deadlines and maximum time to review; and
 |  |
| * 1. Where appropriate, separate guidelines are provided for different tracks (research, clinical, instructional).
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that the unit will use the online contract management system to ensure that all contracts contain necessary elements, including a clear description of assignments and expectations associated with the appointment, as well as information on how to access unit-level PTK policies and professional resources. (IV.A.; IV.B.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that the specific faculty title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee’s effort, as indicated by the assignments and expectations. The rank shall be appropriate given the unit’s specific criteria for such rank. (IV.C.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that whenever possible, PTK faculty should be given progressively longer contracts. (IV.D.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy includes a mentoring plan, or a mentoring plan for PTK faculty is referred to as separate document (i.e. with a link). (V.B.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy either provides minimum/typical/maximum time in rank between evaluation for promotion if such expectations exist, or the policy states that such expectations do not exist. (V.C.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy specifies the process for transmittal of written promotion decisions. (V.H.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states the process for appealing a negative decision. (V.H.)

College policies reference the process as established by the Office of Faculty Affairs; unit level policies can do the same. |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that negative decisions for promotion do not preclude renewal of the existing PTK appointment; i.e., PTK faculty appointments are not “up or out”. (V.I.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that promotions cannot be rescinded. (V.K.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy states that decisions on promotion shall be made based on the evaluation criteria and the reviewee’s performance. (V.L.)
 |  |
| 1. The AEP policy specifies the process for handling promotion reviews when reviewee has appointments in more than one unit. (V.M.)
 |  |