

## Department of Philosophy

# APT policy

### 1. Procedures governing promotion

The *Philosophy Department Review Committee* shall consist of all eligible members of the Faculty. Eligible members of the Faculty are those faculty, excluding the Chair, who have tenured or emeritus appointments in the Department and who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. Emeritus members have voice but no vote. Professors from allied disciplines may be invited to participate without vote; the candidate may suggest names of such faculty members.

The Review Committee shall normally establish an *Advisory Subcommittee*, but it is the vote of the entire eligible faculty participating in the selection process that shall be considered the recommendation of the Review Committee.

The Chair of the Advisory Subcommittee (if different from the Department Chair) shall normally also serve as author of the Review Committee's report, and as spokesperson for the Review Committee to higher levels in the APT review process. If the Department Chair serves as Chair of the Advisory Subcommittee, then the department spokesperson shall be a member of that subcommittee.

Though not an eligible member of the Faculty within the meaning of this policy, the Chair shall participate in the promotion or tenure review as a non-voting member of the Review Committee, and he or she may, if a majority of the Review Committee so determines by secret ballot, chair the Review Committee and/or the Advisory Subcommittee. The Chair is expected to share his/her evaluations of the candidate's merits with the rest of the committee during the course of its deliberations.

Recommendations involving tenure or promotion shall go forward to the college level provided at least fifty percent of the Review Committee vote cast is favorable, or the Department Chair's recommendation is favorable, or both.

### 2. Procedures governing the appointment of external candidates

Procedures for recommending the appointment of external candidates will be similar to those for recommending tenure and/or promotion, outlined above. But there will be some differences.

In accordance with Campus policies on search and selection of faculty, a Search Committee will be established, charged with selecting candidates to bring to campus for interview, and with making recommendations on appointment to the department as a

whole. The Chair of the Search Committee shall normally be someone other than the Department Chair, and shall serve as the author of the Review Committee's report and as spokesperson for the Review Committee at higher levels in the APT process if required.

Once all invited candidates have visited campus, the faculty as a whole shall meet to discuss them. (Emeritus faculty have voice but no vote.) This meeting will normally be chaired by the Department Chair. Following discussion, two separate sets of votes will be taken.

The first task will be for all faculty (including the Department Chair) to vote on the appropriate ranking of candidates.

The second task will be to vote, in respect of each ranked candidate, on their suitability for appointment at a given level. In this second exercise the Department Chair has voice but no vote. Where a candidate seeks appointment at the level of Associate Professor or above, two successive votes will be taken whenever necessary. The first will be a vote of all faculty. The second will be a vote of all faculty at or above the level of appointment to which the candidate aspires. At least fifty per cent support in *both* votes (together with the support of the Chair) will be necessary for a positive recommendation to be made to the Dean and College; and both votes will be reported in the body of the Review Committee's report.

### **3. Criteria for appointment or promotion**

At all levels of appointment, the criteria concerning research and publishing shall be given the greatest weight by the Review Committee, followed by criteria for teaching and advising, and then service.

#### *Assistant Professor*

The appointee shall have qualities suggesting a high level of teaching ability in philosophy, and shall provide evidence of potential for superior research and scholarship. Because this is a tenure-track position, the appointee shall at the time of appointment show promise of having, at such time as he or she is to be reviewed for tenure and promotion, the qualities described under 'Associate Professor' below. An appointee to the rank of Assistant Professor shall, not later than the effective date of the appointment, have earned and received the Ph.D. degree or some equivalent.

#### *Associate Professor*

The appointee shall have demonstrated teaching and advising of high quality, and shall have demonstrated substantial research accomplishments of high quality, which should include a body of work that makes a significant contribution to the field, which is recognized by outstanding scholars in the profession, and which includes publications in highly respected journals and presses. The appointee shall show promise of continuing to produce work that will make a significant contribution to the field, shall be competent to

offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research, and, if promoted from within, shall have served the campus, the profession, or the community in some useful way in addition to teaching and research. Promotion to the rank from within confers tenure; appointment to the rank from without may confer tenure.

*Full Professor*

In addition to having the qualifications of an Associate Professor, the appointee shall have established a wide reputation within the English speaking world for philosophical work of outstanding quality, and a distinguished record of teaching. There must also be a record of continuing evidence of relevant and effective professional service. The rank carries tenure.

**4. Further provisions concerning tenure-track faculty**

The Chair will give each Assistant Professor (or untenured Associate Professor – this qualification should be understood throughout the remainder of this section) a copy of the Department's APT policy, together with a copy of the University APT policies and procedures, when he or she first enters the Department; and the Chair will discuss with the Assistant Professor the requirements for tenure. At that meeting, or shortly thereafter, the Assistant Professor will be assigned a faculty mentor from amongst the tenured faculty other than the Chair. (The Assistant Professor will be invited to suggest possible mentors.) Mentors should encourage, support, and advise on matters of professional development and progress towards tenure.

Assistant Professors on tenure track are appointed for a term of three years in the first instance. In the Fall of the third year in post there will be a formal review, the outcome of which will either be a decision to renew the appointment for a further three years, or a decision to terminate the appointment after a fourth terminal year. (This decision rests with the departmental Review Committee.)

The third year review will take the same form as a tenure review, except that letters from outside evaluators will not be called for. The Review Committee shall normally appoint an Advisory Subcommittee, as described in #1 above. The report of the Review Committee will be transmitted to the candidate through the Departmental Chair, who shall also provide feedback and advice on the candidate's progress towards tenure. Communications to the candidate on the occasion of the third year review imply no commitment concerning future recommendations for tenure and promotion.

Since the outcome of the third year review is reported but not reviewed at higher levels, the Department Chair shall have both voice and vote on the Review Committee.

In years other than those of the third-year and sixth-year reviews, the Chair shall meet with the tenure-track faculty member in the spring to discuss his or her tenure prospects. The Chair will explore with the prospective candidate possible measures to improve his or her

prospects for tenure after broad consultation with the eligible faculty. A written record of the meeting will normally be kept.

### **5. Formal review of tenured Associate Professors**

There will be a formal review of each Associate Professor in the fifth year following their award of tenure. This review will take the same form as a promotion review (see #1 above), except that external letters of evaluation will not be solicited. The purpose of the review is to assess the candidate's progress towards promotion, and to advise the candidate on steps that should be taken towards promotion. The report of the Review Committee will be transmitted to the candidate through the Departmental Chair, who shall also provide feedback and advice on the candidate's progress towards tenure.

There will be further formal reviews of each Associate Professor at five year intervals thereafter, until the candidate receives promotion to Full Professor. Communications to the candidate on the occasion of the fifth year and subsequent formal reviews imply no commitment concerning future recommendations for promotion.

### **6. Promotion and review requests**

Any tenured or tenure-track member of the Faculty may request by April 1 of any year that a formal review for the purpose of recommending tenure or promotion for him or for her be held during the following academic year. (Likewise, an Associate Professor can request by April 1 that a formal advisory review should take place in the following academic year.) The Department Chair shall convene a meeting of the Eligible Faculty to discuss the request, and shall respond in writing by May 15 indicating whether the formal review will be held and, if not, summarizing the reasons for the negative decision of the Eligible Faculty.

### **7. Questions to be asked of outside evaluators in tenure cases**

Letters to outside evaluators will contain the following paragraphs:

“The University and the College are firmly committed to building an outstanding Department of Philosophy at the University of Maryland, comparable to the top 15 or 20 programs in the United States. In evaluating Dr X's work, we would therefore ask for your frank and honest answers to the following questions:

1. Can you identify any significant contributions that Dr X has made?
2. What is your assessment of Dr X's reputation in the field and his/her ranking in his/her area of expertise?

3. Do you feel that the quality and quantity of Dr X's work would merit promotion and tenure in the top 15 to 20 Philosophy Departments in the United States?
4. Based on Dr X's past work and plans for the future, do you believe that he/she is likely to have a significant influence on his/her field?

In the course of answering the above questions it would be particularly helpful if you could measure Dr X against others in his/her discipline at a comparable stage in their career, and if you could comment on the quality of the places in which Dr X has published.

Activities such as teaching, advising, and university, professional, and public service also enter into the evaluation of candidates. We do not expect, however that external referees will always have had the opportunity to judge these, and we therefore ask that you comment on these only as you feel you are able."

*Revised by unanimous vote of the department: 05/17/07*