

## Department of Philosophy

# APT policy

### 1. Procedures governing promotion of tenure track (TTK) faculty

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 appointments in the Department and who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. 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 process that shall be considered the recommendation of the Review Committee.

The Advisory Subcommittee will solicit feedback from graduate students regarding the teaching and mentoring of faculty seeking promotion. The Advisory Subcommittee will contact all current graduate students over email (or similar channels) and request that they return feedback for use by the Review Committee. As the graduate students will be notified, faculty members up for promotion will be able to review an anonymized version of this feedback, and have two weeks, should they wish, to respond in writing concerning it to the Review Committee before it meets. The Advisory Subcommittee will arrange that there be sufficient time for the graduate students to provide feedback, for the faculty being considered for promotion to reply to an anonymized version of the feedback, and for the Review Committee to consult this version of feedback and any faculty reply in advance of the Review Committee meeting.

Review Committee meetings will normally be scheduled in person, and eligible members of the faculty are normally expected to attend the meetings (often two for tenure cases) in person. Faculty are expected to have studied the candidate's dossier, attend the whole meeting(s), and participate in discussions. Faculty who are unable to attend a meeting scheduled in person may, with permission of the Chair, participate and vote by videoconference. The Chair will normally not permit more than one or two faculty members to attend remotely a meeting scheduled in person. In extraordinary circumstances and in accordance with University guidelines, Review Committee meetings may take place remotely.

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 the Chair 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 their 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 to TTK positions**

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. In the context of the appointment of external candidates, the Review Committee shall consist of all TTK faculty. The Chair of the Search Committee shall serve as the author of the Review Committee's report and as spokesperson for the Review Committee at higher levels in the appointment process if required.

Once all invited candidates have visited campus, the Review Committee shall meet to discuss them and vote on their candidacy. This meeting will normally be chaired by the Department Chair, who will have voice but no vote. Votes shall be by secret ballot.

The first task will be for the Review Committee to vote, in respect of each candidate, whether they are appointable to the position. At least fifty percent support in that vote, together with the support of the Chair, will be necessary for a candidate to remain under consideration. The second task will be for the Review Committee to determine through vote the ranking of those candidates who remain under consideration. A final task will be for the Review Committee to vote on whether to recommend to the Dean that its top ranked remaining candidate(s) should receive an offer of appointment.

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

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

We take philosophy to be defined as much by its methods of careful theorizing and rigorous reasoning as by its subject matter. Many philosophers do heavily-interdisciplinary work, which can be evaluated in the same manner as work that is more narrowly philosophical. (See the standards of evaluation specified below.) More rarely, philosophers engage in work that belongs *within* another discipline. For purposes of appointment or promotion of faculty having or aspiring to have their tenure home in the Department of Philosophy, this work cannot by itself substitute for well-regarded work in philosophy. However, where a candidate has a significant

amount of high-quality work within philosophy, work belonging to another field can contribute to a decision in their favor. Such work must be published (or accepted for publication) in venues of a similar level of prestige in the outside field as the level expected in philosophy, and the work must be assessed as of high quality by outside evaluators. In addition, the work must be philosophically relevant.

#### *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. Because this is a tenure-track position, the appointee shall at the time of appointment show promise of having, when they are 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*

We are committed to building an outstanding Department of Philosophy at the University of Maryland, comparable to programs among the top 20 in the United States. In accord with this goal, we expect candidates for the rank of associate professor to meet the following standards of research, teaching, and service:

**Research:** The candidate shall have produced research of very high quality, comparable to that produced by tenured associate professors in programs among the top 20 in the United States. This research should include a body of work that makes a significant contribution to the field, that is recognized by outstanding scholars in the profession, and that includes publications in highly respected journals or presses. Further, the candidate shall show promise of continuing to produce work that will make a significant contribution to the field.

In helping us to assess whether a candidate for promotion to associate professor meets these standards for research, we ask ourselves the following questions:

1. What are the significant contributions that Dr X has made?
2. What is the quality of the venues in which Dr X has published?
3. What is Dr X's reputation in the field and in their particular area of expertise?
4. Based on Dr X's past work and plans for the future, is it likely that Dr X will have a significant influence on their field?
5. How does Dr X measure against other individuals in Dr X's discipline at a comparable stage in their career?

**Teaching:** The candidate shall have exhibited a pattern over several years of teaching of high quality, and shall be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research.

**Service:** The candidate shall normally have served the profession or community in some useful way in addition to research and teaching, and, if promoted from within, shall normally have effectively performed service duties assigned in the department.

Promotion to the rank from within confers tenure; appointment to the rank from without may confer tenure.

### *Full Professor*

**Research:** The candidate shall have produced research of very high quality, including a body of work that has made a significant contribution to the field, that is recognized by outstanding scholars in the profession, and that includes publications in highly respected journals or presses. If promoted from within, a significant portion of this work (e.g., several articles in highly respected journals or a book manuscript with a highly respected press) should normally have been accepted for publication after the candidate originally gained tenure, whether at the University of Maryland or elsewhere. Finally, the candidate shall have established a wide reputation for philosophical work of very high quality and shall show promise of continuing to produce work that makes a significant contribution to the field.

**Teaching:** The candidate shall have exhibited a pattern over several years of teaching of high quality, and normally shall have engaged in advising of high quality.

**Service:** The candidate normally shall have served the profession or community in some useful way in addition to research and teaching, and, if promoted from within, normally shall have fulfilled College or University service obligations and effectively performed service duties assigned in the department.

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 Manual and Guidelines, when they first enter 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 need to be cognizant of the University’s expectations, specified in its APT

Manual and Guidelines, regarding the evaluation of teaching. Each semester an assistant professor is teaching at UMD, a tenured faculty member should assess their performance through a classroom visit or the equivalent online observation, as well as through examination of syllabi and other materials such as exams or paper topics. The tenured professor should send a memo summarizing the assessment of the assistant professor's teaching performance to the Chair. Several different faculty should perform assessments of an assistant professor's teaching. At any time, an assistant professor may request that the Chair assign a tenured professor to evaluate their teaching.

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 in that it will include assessment of research, teaching, and service. But letters from outside evaluators will not be called for and feedback from graduate students will not be solicited. 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 their tenure prospects. The Chair will explore with the prospective candidate possible measures to improve their 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 normally 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 tenure review in that it will include assessment of research, teaching, and service, but letters from outside evaluators will not be called for and feedback from graduate students will not be solicited. The Review Committee shall normally appoint an Advisory Subcommittee, as described in #1 above. 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.

Associate professors need to be cognizant of the University's expectations, specified in its APT Manual and Guidelines, regarding the evaluation of teaching. Each academic year an associate professor is teaching at UMD, a tenured faculty member should assess their performance through a classroom visit or the equivalent online observation, as well as through examination of syllabi and other materials such as exams or paper topics. The tenured professor should send a memo summarizing the assessment of the associate professor's teaching performance to the Chair. Typically, several different faculty will perform assessments of an associate professor's teaching. At any time, an associate professor may request that the Chair assign a tenured professor to evaluate their teaching.

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

Any tenured or tenure-track member of the Faculty may request by February 1 of any year that a formal review for the purpose of recommending tenure or promotion for them be held during 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 March 1 indicating whether the formal review will be held and, if not, summarizing the reasons for the negative decision of the Eligible Faculty.

*Revisions approved by Department, 29 January 2021*  
*Revisions approved by Department, 3 December 2021*  
*Revisions approved by Department, 4 March 2022*