

**Procedures, Standards, and Sources of Evidence for  
Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment in the  
College of Education at the  
University of Maryland, College Park**

## PREAMBLE

This document describes the procedures, standards, and sources of evidence that are used by the *College of Education (COE) Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) committee* (simply *College APT Committee* hereafter) when it performs the second-level review of a candidate for promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The articulations of the procedures, standards, and sources of evidence are based on the *University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) Policy on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty* (<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/umpolicy.html>) and the *University of Maryland System (UMS) policies and procedures* as first approved by the president on February 16, 1993 (<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii100a.html>).

The guiding philosophy behind the articulation of the standards, in particular, was a desire to make overt (1) the various competency dimensions that are being assessed by the College APT Committee for each candidate based on his or her electronic dossier, (2) the ways in which evidence for each dimension can be identified, and (3) the ways in which evidence can be weighted and combined across dimensions to create a comprehensive competency profile for the candidate. Thus, the emphasis of this document is on supporting discussions amongst members of the College APT Committee, members of departmental APT Committees, and faculty in the College at large about how to think through, implement, and evaluate a candidate's electronic dossier.

Consequently, this document does not contain any quantification of evidence (e.g., counts of numbers of classes taught, articles published, or grants received) even though quantifications are required in parts of any electronic dossier (see, e.g., the required provision of numeric teacher evaluations, impact rates and rejection rates for journals, and amounts of funding for grants). Instead, qualitative descriptors are used carefully in this document to communicate aspects and levels of performance. Differences between standards for promotion from *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor* and from *Associate Professor* to *Professor* are articulated briefly at the end of each section. These differences reflect, in general, a broadening and deepening of the comprehensive performance trajectory that is assumed to have been initiated by candidates upon appointment as *Assistant Professor* at UMD. This document also contains standards for appointment to *Professor of the Practice*.

## **Section 1 - Composition and Role of the College APT Committee**

As the second-level review committee, the work of the College APT Committee is informed by the procedures, standards, and sources of evidence that govern decisions about APT at the departmental review stage. These have been specified by each of the three departments: *Counseling, Higher Education and Special Education (CHSE)*; *Human Development and Quantitative Methodology (HDQM)*; and *Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership (TLPL)*.<sup>1</sup>

### **Composition of College APT Committee**

The College APT committee will consist of two faculty members at the rank of *Professor* from each of the three COE departments for a total of six faculty members; these faculty will be selected by each of the three departments consistent with their *Plans of Organization*. The College APT committee will elect a chair and an alternate chair; the latter shall serve as chair when a candidate from the chair's own unit is under discussion. Each year the *Dean* will provide the list of College APT Committee members to all tenure-track faculty.

### **Responsibilities of the College APT Committee**

The College APT Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in the following three general areas: (1) teaching, advising, and mentoring of students; (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity; (3) professional service to the department, College, university, the profession, or the community (APT Policy 360-403, pp. 667-677; USM policies II-1.00(A), p. 11). This document describes the procedures, standards, and sources of evidence for these three areas.

The College APT Committee must prepare a report that includes (a) an independent evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for future contributions, (b) a record of the vote of the Committee, (c) the Committee's recommendation to the Dean and the justification for it, (d) the membership of the Committee, and (e) the date of the decision meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> These new departments represent the seven (7) former departments before the College of Education reorganization in 2011: Counseling and Personnel Services; Curriculum and Instruction; Human Development; Education Leadership, Higher Education, & International Education Policy; Measurement and Statistics; Policy Studies; and Special Education.

## **Section 2 – Standards and Sources of Evidence for College APT Committee Reviews**

The College is committed to achieving the status of a premier center for interdisciplinary research in education. Its mission is to both create new knowledge that advances education and to produce the next generation of exceptional scholars, practitioners, and transformative leaders. In accordance with its status as both the land grant and the state's research university, the College expects that faculty who are promoted to higher ranks will demonstrate consistently high quality in three core areas of their professional work: (1) teaching, mentoring and advising, (2) research and scholarship, and (3) service within the department, College, campus, and broader professional communities.

The following sections outline the sources of evidence that applicants can provide for demonstrating that they have met or exceeded the standard for each of the three areas.

## **Standard 1: Superior Teaching, Mentoring and Advising**

Superior teaching, mentoring, and academic advising are critical to the mission of the College and are essential in promotion and tenure decisions. The standards that need to be met for tenure and / or promotion include: (1) a consistent record of teaching and advising at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels; (2) above satisfactory ratings of teaching and/or advising by students and faculty peers, and (3) a demonstrable contribution to student learning.

### **1.1 Sources of Evidence for Superior Teaching Performance**

*1.1.1 Evidence from course loads.* A consistent record of teaching can be demonstrated by documenting the number of courses and associated enrollment of each, along with a description of how these numbers relate to the benchmarks for other faculty in the department.

*1.1.2 Evidence from student evaluations.* An above-satisfactory teaching performance and demonstrable contribution to student attainment of learning outcomes can be documented through evaluations by students. Student evaluation data from the campus-wide standardized course evaluations may be supplemented with additional student evaluations that have been solicited from the departmental APT committee.

*1.1.3 Evidence from peer evaluations.* An above-satisfactory teaching performance and demonstrable contribution to student attainment of learning outcomes can also be demonstrated through peer evaluations, which speak to the candidate's teaching performance as observed first-hand by colleagues. These can include actual classroom observations but may also include peer assessment of syllabi, instructional materials, and assessment strategies.

*1.1.4 Evidence from external means of recognition.* Additional evidence of attention to and quality of teaching may include College-wide, campus-wide, or external professional awards, citations, or similar forms of formal recognition.

*1.1.5 Evidence from professional development activities.* Additional evidence of attention to and quality of teaching may include candidates demonstrating their commitment to excellence in teaching via participation in professional development activities offered by the *Center for Teaching Excellence* on campus, the *Office of Information Technology* in the College, other initiatives at the College or the campus at large as well as at institutions outside of campus (e.g., workshops at conferences such as AERA and other academic conferences).

### **Difference between Promotion to *Associate Professor* and Promotion to *Professor***

Promotion from *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor* requires that the candidate have *consistently taught* a course load that is in alignment with the expectations of the department. The teaching evaluations must be *at or above the satisfactory in trend*. That is, the ratings must be either consistently at or above the satisfactory level or show a trend toward this benchmark coupled with appropriate professional development activities such as participation in college or campus-wide initiatives such as those offered by the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Promotion from *Associate Professor* to *Professor* requires that the candidate must have a record of teaching evaluations that are consistently above satisfactory, if not exceptional. Moreover, the candidate should be able to demonstrate superior teaching performance through *external means of recognition*, including peer observations and ratings of the candidate's teaching as well as peer assessment of syllabi and use of instructional materials and approaches.

Additional evidence of quality teaching may include awards or citations or similar college or campus recognition.

## **1.2 Sources of Evidence for Mentoring and Advising**

*1.2.1 Evidence from advisees.* Evidence for effective mentoring and advising can be provided by the number of candidate's advisees or co-advisees that have successfully completed their degrees as well as the number of dissertation and thesis committees that the candidate has worked on in a non-advisory role. These numbers can be supplemented with descriptions that document how they are similar to, or different from, benchmarks set in a department.

*1.2.2 Evidence from placement of graduates.* Evidence for effective mentoring and advising can also be provided by the placement of the graduate students after completion of their degrees, especially in academic positions, prestigious professional organizations, or sought-after educational positions.

*1.2.3 Evidence from professional recognition of the candidate.* Moreover, recognition of the candidate's effective advising and mentorship ability (e.g., awards for outstanding mentorship) can be used as evidence.

*1.2.4 Evidence from advisees and mentees.* Evidence for effective mentoring and advising can also be provided by letters from current and former advisees and mentees. This can include a documentation of advising and mentorship in activities such as research apprenticeships and student organizations.

### **Difference between Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor**

Promotion from *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor* requires that the candidate must be *involved in* the advising and, potentially, co-advising of a number of graduate students that is commensurate with expectations in the department.

Promotion from *Associate Professor* to *Professor* requires that the candidate demonstrate a *consistent record* of graduates, including those who have taken on prestigious positions and have received other types of professional recognitions.

## **Standard 2: Exceptional Research and Scholarship**

Research and scholarship are of great importance in the consideration of promotion and tenure and must be considered as a principal factor in those decisions. Standards for promotion and / or tenure include: (1) a consistent record of high scholarly productivity and (2) a consistently favorable judgment of the quality and impact of that scholarship by peers.

### **2. 1 Sources of Evidence for Exceptional Research and Scholarship**

*2.1.1 Evidence from publications.* The indicators of a candidate's consistent record of high scholarly productivity is the number of articles in peer-reviewed journals, books, chapters, monographs, and other forms of publications.

*Evaluation of evidence from publications.* There are different criteria for judging the quality of publications and the College APT Committee relies on a combination of generally accepted standards (e.g., peer-review) as well as department-specific standards for its decision-making. Publications are generally evaluated along the following dimensions, (a) frequency of publications, (b) types of publications, (c) stringency of the peer-review process, (d) prestige of publication outlet, (e) diversity of audiences served by publications, (f) evidence of impact of the publications, and (g) the overall composition of the publication portfolio.

There are no fixed guidelines for a single appropriate portfolio of evidence but in general, peer-reviewed publications are preferred over other forms of publications.

More competitive publication outlets are generally viewed as more prestigious; this competitiveness can be documented by indicators such as acceptance and rejection rates. Candidates should make every effort to bring to bear as many of these indicators as possible to provide convincing evidence of the competitiveness of the outlets.

Collaborative and interdisciplinary research and scholarship, while not required, is viewed positively as evidence of productive scholarship in the College. However, multi-authored publications and multi-investigator research projects are evaluated in terms of the role that the candidate had in producing the research and associated knowledge.

Presentations at local, national, or international conferences are generally seen as helpful but not sufficient, indicators of quality scholarship and research.

*2.1.2 Evidence from funded research.* An important source of evidence for the excellence of scholarship and research is obtaining funding from internal and external sources.

*Evaluation of evidence of funded research.* Evaluation of funded research should consider evidence regarding how it contributes to the candidate's overall research and scholarship.

*2.1.3 Evidence from peer recognition of scholarship.* Another important source of evidence for the excellence of scholarship and research is editorships of journals, service on editorial boards,

invited presentations at major conferences, invited workshops that serve important constituents, and other types of peer recognition such as awards.

**Difference between Promotion to *Associate Professor* and Promotion to *Professor***

Promotion from *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor* requires that the candidate must have established a research program *with high potential* for having a significant impact on establishing the individual as a recognized scholar nationally and/or internationally.

Promotion from *Associate Professor* to *Professor* requires that the candidate must demonstrate an *established* national or international reputation in their area of research and scholarship.

### **Standard 3: Notable Service to the Department, College, Campus and Professional Communities**

Faculty members in the College are expected to provide service to their department, the College, the campus, as well as state and local community or other professional communities. Standards that need to be met for successful promotion or tenure include: (1) a consistent record of service, (2) breadth of service within the department, College, campus, and, ideally, local communities, and (3) leadership within the service roles.

#### **3.1 Sources of Evidence for Notable Service to the Department, College, Campus, and Professional Communities**

*3.1.1 Evidence for a consistent and broad record of service.* The candidate should demonstrate consistent participation in a variety of committees or continuous involvement in a select few committees at the departmental, college, campus, and/or professional levels of service. For professional communities, the range of evidence can include providing professional development services such as training initiatives, reviewing manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals, reviewing proposals for external funding agencies, and serving as program chair or co-chair for a local, national, or international conference.

*Evaluation of evidence for a consistent and broad record of service.* In order to demonstrate consistency and breadth, it is not necessary that the candidate has provided service at all levels every semester; however, service activities should be evident for each year of an individual's appointment. Serving as a consultant or as a technical advisory board member and activities similar to these can also be seen as service.

*3.1.2 Evidence for leadership within the service role.* Evidence of leadership is expected for some service activities. This can be demonstrated if a candidate has been a chair or co-chair of a committee, has taken charge of developing and implementing certain initiatives either as chair or member, and other activities that shape the direction of a particular institution or discipline. Evidence of leadership can include activities such as being an invited speaker at a policy forum or being a member of a commission.

Leadership in service may include serving in the roles of elected executive board members, chairs or presidents for special interest groups, divisions, or conference programs. Reviewing manuscripts as a member of an editorial board for a journal may also be considered service; whereas serving as a journal editor may also be considered as evidence of recognition of one's scholarship. Evidence can also include a record of creative work with colleagues that demonstrates that the professional knowledge and action has an impact on the schools, colleges, professional organizations, community agencies, or other institutions that it touches.

### **Difference between Promotion to *Associate Professor* and Promotion to *Professor***

Promotion from *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor* requires that the candidate provide evidence of *service* to the department, college or campus each academic year. Moreover, the candidate must provide evidence of a productive and promising engagement with the professional communities that the candidate is involved in.

Promotion from *Associate Professor* to *Professor* requires that the candidate must provide evidence of *sustained service* in multiple committees in the department, the College, and the campus. Moreover, the candidate needs to demonstrate evidence of *sustained leadership activities* within the candidate's professional communities.

## **Section 3: Standards for Professor of the Practice Reviews**

### **Standards**

The Professor of the Practice title is used to appoint individuals who have demonstrated excellence in practice as well as leadership in specific fields. The appointee shall have attained regional and national prominence and, when appropriate, international recognition of outstanding achievement. Additionally the appointee shall have demonstrated superior teaching ability appropriate to assigned responsibilities. As a minimum, the appointee shall hold the terminal professional degree in the field or equivalent stature by virtue of experience. Appointees will hold the rank of Professor, but, while having the stature, will not have rights that are limited to tenured faculty. Initial appointment is for periods up to five years, and reappointment is possible. This title does not carry tenure, nor does time served as a Professor of the Practice count toward achieving tenure in another title.

### **Sources of Evidence**

The dossier for Professor of the Practice reviews provide similar sources of evidence used in tenure track and many professional track appointments. As noted in the University APT Manual (2017) (p. 54), candidates for Professor of the Practice appointment will submit:

- (a) A Curriculum Vitae (signed and dated)
- (b) Student Evaluations of Teaching (if relevant to previous employment)
- (c) Mentoring, Advising, and Research Supervision (if relevant to previous employment)
- (d) The names and credentials of at least 6 external reviewers who could speak to the candidates' qualifications.

### **The Review Process**

Appointment to Professor of the Practice in a department requires review by the Department APT Committee, Department Chair, and Dean (not the College APT committee), followed by campus-level review and approval by the Provost and President. Campus level review consists of a committee composed of five Associate Provosts representing the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, Academic Planning and Programs, Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs.

Appointment to Professor of the Practice at the College level requires review by the College APT committee, Dean, Campus, and approval by the Provost and President.

The first level review committee receives candidate materials (a-d above) from the candidate and solicits 6 external letters of evaluation. Evaluators should be individuals who are able to provide an objective assessment of the candidate's qualifications as it relates to criteria set forth for Professor of the Practice appointments. The candidate should identify 6 individuals and the Review Committee will select three from that list.

After review of the candidate materials and evaluator letters, the committee completes a report including vote and submits the dossier to the next level of review.