

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLEGE OF  
LIBERAL ARTS  
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM)  
COMMITTEE**

Revised 2018

Approved by CLA PTRM Committee 9/28/18

Approved by College faculty 11/2/18

Approved by Dean 11/2/18

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEE

I.	Membership of the Committee	4
	Composition, Election, Term	4
	Vacancies	5
II.	Policies, Duties, and Procedures of the Committee	5
	General Procedures, Quorum	6
	Voting Procedures, Confidentiality	7
	Notification, Publication of Decisions, Appeal Procedures	8
	Review of Document, Changes in Policies	9
	Annual Report	10
III.	Evaluation by More than One Department or Committee	10
IV.	Materials for Faculty Evaluation	13
	Evaluation Portfolios: General Guidance	12
	Evaluation Portfolios: Content Requirements	13-14
	Information Added to the Portfolio	15
	Summative Portfolio for the Provost	16
	Student Evaluation Forms	17
	Peer Evaluations	17
	External Evaluations	18
V.	Standards and Criteria	18
	General Expectations for Annual Review or Evaluation	18

Evaluation of Teaching	18
Evaluation of Advising	22
Evaluation of Scholarship	23
Evaluation of Service	25
Evaluation of Chairs	26
Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor	27
Expectations for Promotion to Professor	27
Evaluation for Merit	28
VI. Departmental Responsibilities	29
VII. Calendar	33

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEE**

*Note to Faculty: For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy of Towson University and its appendices, as well as the document providing guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit for your department.*

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

A. Composition of the College of Liberal Arts PTRM Committee

In accordance with the provisions of the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty (02-01.00), the CLA PTRM committee shall consist of one representative from each department. The dean will serve as a non-voting member of the committee.

B. Election, Term, Eligibility

Committee members will be elected at large by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the college for a term of three years. The elections should be concluded no later than the first Friday in May. The three-year terms are to be staggered in such a way that approximately one-third of the committee is chosen each year and continuity is maintained. Eligible members include tenured faculty at the rank of either associate or full professor. A member may serve no more than two consecutive terms.

Department chairs are not eligible to serve on the College PTRM committee. College PTRM committee members who are presenting files for promotion may not serve during the year in which any decision is being made relative to their review. If a department does not have a faculty member eligible to serve, a

faculty member from another department may be chosen to serve on behalf of the department lacking a representative by agreement of the department chair, the dean, and the college PTRM committee chair.

C. Vacancies

If a member is unable to serve for a year because of a sabbatical leave, faculty exchange, promotion consideration, or for any other reason, the college electorate shall choose a replacement before the college PTRM committee begins its work. The member replaced may return to the committee the following year if that year would have been part of the term to which the member was originally elected; the replacement year shall not extend the member's term. A member resigning from the committee before the expiration of the member's term shall be replaced through a college-wide election. Should a member through accident or sudden change in circumstance be unable to serve, and such circumstances arise when there is insufficient time for an election before the work of the committee begins, a temporary replacement for that year may be named through selection by the department and approval by the chair of the CLA PTRM committee and the dean.

II. POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE

A. General policies and procedures

Because members are elected at large, it is their responsibility to act in the best interests of the college, not as representatives of their departments.

At its first formal meeting of the academic year, which shall be held no later than the second Friday in September, the committee will elect each year two officers, a chair and a secretary. Officers retain the duties of their positions until new officers are elected.

The CLA PTRM committee reviews departmental and chair recommendations and makes its own recommendations on promotion and on the granting or denial of tenure. The college PTRM committee also receives and responds to substantive appeals of departmental recommendations on PTRM matters, as provided for the Appendix 3 to the Towson University ART policy. In cases in which a department has fewer than three members eligible to serve on a PTRM committee, the college PTRM committee will select additional faculty members to serve on the departmental committee in accordance with the procedures specified in Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

The CLA PTRM committee evaluates candidate files and reviews the recommendations of departments and chairs in relation to the standards and expectations established for faculty in the Towson University ART policy, the criteria of the College of Liberal Arts, and the criteria of the candidate's department. The committee will reach a recommendation in each case and will produce a concise but detailed statement in support of its recommendation with reference to each category evaluated, including teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. If the committee reviews materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process consistent with the guidelines for such actions in University policy, the committee will note that it has done so in its statement. The chair of the committee will convey these recommendations to the dean. The dean prepares an independent recommendation in each case and includes these recommendations and those of the committee in candidate files before transmitting them to the Provost.

#### B. Quorum

A quorum will consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee present.

### C. Voting Procedures

All votes regarding tenure or promotion shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair will forward to the dean a signed, dated report of the results of the vote along with the committee's recommendation. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded under separate cover to the Provost.

Votes involving appeal of department decisions taken by the committee shall be by confidential ballot and tallied by the committee chair. The results shall be entered on a single sheet of paper labeled with the name of the faculty member being evaluated, the department name or college name, and the date. Members of the committee will each sign the report to confirm their participation and the result as recorded. The record of the vote will be forwarded to the Dean who shall maintain these documents for three years.

A majority of those voting must support the granting of tenure or promotion, or must support action to sustain an appeal, for the committee to reach a favorable recommendation. Because a tie vote does not constitute a majority decision, any proposal met with a tie vote fails. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

### D. Confidentiality

Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

E. Notification of Candidates

The written statement of the college PTRM committee, including the committee's recommendation and a record of the vote count, shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the College PTRM chair and submitted to the dean by the first Friday in January, and it shall be delivered (or mailed, as below) to the faculty member by the third Friday in January as provided for in the University ART policy. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the dean or sent by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to the faculty member's last known address, with a postmark date no later than the third Friday in January. A copy of the recommendation shall also be sent to the chair of the faculty member's home department.

F. Publication of Decisions

Recommendations of the college PTRM committee are not publicized by the committee. When the evaluation process is complete and the decisions of the President and Provost have been communicated to the candidates, the dean may communicate the results to the college if that function is not assumed by the Provost's Office.

G. Appeal Procedures

Faculty members may appeal to the college PTRM committee negative judgments made at the department level on questions of tenure, promotion, comprehensive review, reappointment, and merit, if the appeal is on substantive grounds.

Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by the department committee or chair in evaluating the faculty member's performance.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The faculty member shall have 21 calendar days from the date that a negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of a certified letter to file an appeal. The appeal must clearly state in



writing the grounds for the appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under consideration with any statement, evidence, or other documents believed to present a more valid perspective on performance.

Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of college decisions to the Provost shall be copied to the college dean and the college PTRM committee.

Within fifteen days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the college PTRM committee shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of the committee's response will be provided to all parties copied on the original appeal letter, as above.

Note: Faculty members may also submit procedural appeals to the university PTRM committee, or appeals alleging unlawful discrimination, as provided for in the university ART policy, Appendix 3, and Towson University policy 06-01.00.

#### H. Review of Document

Every three years after the first approval of the PTRM policies and procedures document, the CLA PTRM committee will review this document and submit evidence of this review to the dean and to the UPTRM committee.

#### I. Changes in Policies

All policies at the college level shall remain in effect until changed according to the procedures that are specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy and that include approval by the college PTRM committee, approval by a majority of CLA tenure line faculty, approval by the dean, and approval by the UPTRM. Faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the college PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they were first appointed to a tenure-track position.

J. Annual Report

The secretary will submit an annual report to the chair of the college PTRM committee and to the dean for their review and, after any corrections or adjustments are made, will submit copies of the final report to the college PTRM chair, the dean and the CLA Council. The annual report should summarize all actions taken by the committee during the year, **including the number of:** recommendations on tenure and promotion; actions on appeals; approvals of departmental review committee members, when required; reviews of departmental PTRM statements; reviews of these policies and procedures; and any other actions. The summary should not identify faculty by name in reporting negative recommendations or actions on appeals.

III. EVALUATION BY MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT OR COMMITTEE

- A. In order to foster and facilitate interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and cross disciplinary teaching and scholarship, faculty may be appointed to more than one department or program. Of the units to which the appointment is made, one department or program shall be designated the home department/program and the other shall be designated the host department/program.
- B. All reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit recommendations shall be made by the home department/program after consideration of input from the host department/program. This input shall be in writing and shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation file. A copy will be provided to the faculty member being evaluated.
- C. The home department shall provide the host department with fair and timely opportunities to examine the faculty member's evaluation file.

- D. A host department shall reach an assessment of the faculty member through its PTRM committee and its regularly established PTRM procedures. The chair of the host department will provide a letter of evaluation. The chair of the host department will convey both the committee letter and the chair letter to the chair of the home department and to the faculty member.
  
- E. To participate in the evaluation of faculty holding a joint appointment in interdisciplinary studies, an interdisciplinary program must constitute, on its own or in concert with other interdisciplinary programs, a promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit committee from among the faculty who teach in the program(s). The interdisciplinary promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit committee must follow all University rules for such committees, formulate its documents and procedures according to the rules of the University Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Committee, and be constituted as a promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit committee within the structure of the college. An interdisciplinary PTRM committee will conduct an assessment of the faculty member through its regularly established PTRM procedures. The chair of the interdisciplinary PTRM committee will convey the committee letter to the chair of the home department and to the faculty member.
  
- F. Letters from the host department/program must be delivered to the home department program for inclusion in the faculty member's file at least one week before the deadline for submission of the file from the home department PTRM committee to the chair.
  
- G. Faculty members from the home department who are also members of an interdisciplinary PTRM committee must recuse themselves from consideration of a home department colleague by the interdisciplinary committee and may not take part in discussion or vote on that colleague in the interdisciplinary evaluation.

- H. The faculty member may make a substantive appeal to the college PTRM committee based upon the recommendation letter of the interdisciplinary committee.

#### IV. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

- A. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.
- B. Guided by the chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as s/he deems appropriate in his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
- C. All material and documentation used in making recommendations for the annual review process (which includes the Annual Review, reappointment, third-year review, merit consideration, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review) shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role and expectations of faculty in the university, as well as the faculty member's college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process.
  - 1. Departments should address in their departmental PTRM policies and procedures portfolio requirements for third year review and comprehensive review consistent with University ART policy. The portfolio requirements for Annual Reviews, which provide the basis for all formal reviews, and for tenure and promotion reviews considered by the CLA PTRM committee are defined below.

2. Large items, such as books that cannot be secured in a binder, may be submitted separately. If there is more than one such item for a faculty member, all such items pertaining to that faculty member should be enclosed in a manila envelope or a box of suitable size and the envelope or box labeled with the name of the faculty member and a list of its contents. All such items submitted shall be considered part of the evaluation portfolio.
  3. Faculty who wish to submit work created digitally as part of their portfolio should, whenever possible, include in their file in printed form all of the work product or substantial examples conveying its substance and quality. Digital addresses of web pages, blogs, sites, or other locations may be included but there can be no expectation that reviewers will visit these sites as a required part of the process. Materials that cannot be printed, such as films, may be included on a DVD in the portfolio within a protective binder sleeve or as an accompanying item comparable to books as above.
- D. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder (or submitted as an electronic portfolio if the University creates an approved format for doing so). Binders should be organized using dividers with tabs to identify the sections (electronic portfolios should be organized with similar clarity, based on University standards once developed and using the technologies available). Although the faculty member has freedom to include materials deemed pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:
1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:

- a. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) forms.
  - b. current *Curriculum vitae*. The *curriculum vitae* should summarize the candidate's education, teaching, and professional employment; specific courses taught at Towson; honors and grants; scholarly publications; professional presentations, associations, and activities; and record of service to the university, the profession, and the community.
  - c. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review.
  - d. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
    - (i) student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.
    - (ii) grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect.
  - e. documentation of scholarship and service. This documentation should include a copy of any publication, review, presentation, grant application, or other item identified by the faculty member as part of the faculty member's scholarly activity.
2. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:
- a. all of the above items listed in D.1.
  - b. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.
3. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
- a. all materials listed above in D.1. and D.2. from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.

- b. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.
4. If confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.
5. If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to his/her file rebutting or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled —Information Added. All documentation used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than November 30.
6. If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, other than his/her evaluation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but will be forwarded under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Document Review Transmittal Form. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

- E. In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion or tenure shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost that shall accompany the full evaluation portfolio from the beginning of the process. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. In each section of the binder, documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed as follows:

Section I

- *Curriculum vita.*
- A copy of *one* recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity.

Section II

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Report (AR I & II) or Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR I & II) Forms arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section III

- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using departmental forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time
- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- Peer teaching evaluations.

Section IV

- Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

Section V



- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party at the appropriate stage).
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form.
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson.
- Additional recommendations to be added by the college P&T committee and the academic dean.

#### Section VI

- Information added (if needed), as specified in IV, D, 5 above.

- F. Student evaluation forms used in the College of Liberal Arts shall ordinarily be the University evaluation forms tabulated by the Office of Assessment. A department that wishes to use another form for student evaluation, whether as an entire department or in selected courses not effectively evaluated by the university form, shall include any such alternate form in its departmental PTRM policies and procedures document along with a rationale for its use and the process to be used for its administration. The form will be subject to review and approval by the CLA PTRM committee and the UPTRM committee. Any such student evaluation form may not be changed without formal review and approval through the process provided for the departmental PTRM document as a whole.
- G. Peer evaluations are a required part of the review process. Departments should address in their PTRM policies and procedures documents the specific criteria or guidelines for performing and reporting classroom observations. Peer evaluations should include assessment of the following, as appropriate to the situation:
- evaluation of course syllabi
  - evaluation of textbooks
  - evaluation of classroom performance
  - evaluation of special projects or assignments
  - evaluation of examinations

- evaluation of feedback to students
- evaluation of grading methods and standards

H. External evaluations may be conducted as part of a faculty member's tenure or promotion evaluation in the College of Liberal Arts so long as the process for inviting and handling those external evaluations complies with University policy on external evaluations. Departments wishing to make use of external evaluations must include in their statement of PTRM policies and procedures whether external evaluations will be used in all tenure and promotion evaluations or, if not, how the determination of when to seek external evaluations will be made and by whom.

## V. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

- A. As specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy, the standards and expectations in this College of Liberal Arts PTRM document pertain to the evaluation processes associated with annual reviews, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review.
- B. All faculty are responsible for meeting University standards and expectations, including but not limited to those listed in this section. Meeting the general expectations specified below is essential for a faculty member's performance to be judged satisfactory in an annual review or, cumulatively, across a longer period of evaluation.
1. A faculty member shall fulfill his/her workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service; shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours; and shall meet all classes as scheduled.

2. A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship. —Collegiality and academic citizenship refer to the role and responsibility of faculty in shared decision making through open and fair processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on matters that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background, expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and administrators.
  3. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance. Faculty members must make themselves available to participate in the work of the department, of assigned committees, or of college and university processes in which faculty play an essential part (admissions activities and graduation could stand as examples of such wider processes).
  4. A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of annual review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTRM calendar.
- C. The evaluation of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in

preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal advising. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom. Teaching as a sphere of evaluation includes the use of technology, the development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, attention to pedagogy connected with the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It includes as well service as an assigned academic advisor, advising through student groups, and informal advising of departmental majors or students in any professional context.

- D. The evaluation of teaching shall be based on materials provided in the evaluation portfolio. The assessment of teaching effectiveness will give close attention to (1) the faculty member's self-evaluation in the reflective statements included in the portfolio, (2) syllabi and other teaching materials presented by the faculty member, (3) student evaluations, (4) peer evaluations, (5) the evaluation of student learning outcomes for the faculty member's courses where possible, and (6) the judgment of faculty performance made by prior evaluating bodies.
1. Self-evaluation and course materials
    - a. The faculty member's evaluation of his/her own teaching effectiveness will include a narrative statement covering teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching strategies and efficacy. This statement should highlight any evidence in the materials of the portfolio to which the faculty member wishes to call attention and should contain an interpretation of student, peer, and chair evaluations as appropriate.
    - b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are parts of the required Annual Review reports and are included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey to students a clear

overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and should contain those elements specified for course syllabi in university policy.

- c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios assessment outcomes related directly to the faculty member's work or copies of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations, community engagement, effective educational practices, or other qualities the faculty member wishes to place in consideration.
- d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, shall be made available to faculty members for review and shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio. These reports should be considered in relation to standards expressed in departmental and college objectives, the faculty member's self-evaluation, course syllabi, and the evaluations of students and peers.

2. Evaluation of teaching by students

- a. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.
- b. Student evaluation forms, with a description of the method of administration that assures confidentiality of the student, shall be included in the department PTRM document submitted to the college and the university PTRM committees for approval. Student evaluations shall be tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or another administrative entity.
- c. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.

3. Evaluation of teaching by peers

- a. Classroom or teaching site visits are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the person is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, or tenure. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the comprehensive five-year review.
  - b. Departments must develop discipline-specific criteria or guidelines for performing and reporting classroom or teaching site observations. These should be included in the department PTRM document submitted to the college and university PTRM committees for approval.
  - c. A minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted per review period **for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review evaluations**. The department PTRM committee will approve the peers selected for the review.
  - d. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.
4. Evaluation of advising
- a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.
  - b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class-teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate thesis committee, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.

- c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included in the evaluation portfolio.
  - d. Judgments about the sufficiency and quality of a faculty member's advising will be based on assessment of the preponderance of evidence assembled at the department level.
  - e. Each department will further define how it will evaluate advising and will identify forms of evidence to which it will attribute greatest weight. These may include the evidence of regular and reliable records of the advice given, discussion of advising by the faculty member in Annual Review reports, logs of advising appointments, peer or chair review of advising, examination of exit interview responses, notable instances of positive advising contributions or of advising errors, letters of recommendation written on behalf of students, research mentoring beyond the expectations of course supervision, definable contributions through organizational or group advising, evidence of significant contributions to career advising, or other advising contributions for the benefit of students as the department may determine.
- E. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and of continuing professional development and demonstrated scholarly growth. Scholarship may take many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration, or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field, as affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly materials in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- 1. The major forms of scholarship may be defined as follows:

- a. **Scholarship of Application** – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university.
  - b. **Scholarship of Discovery** – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake.
  - c. **Scholarship of Integration** – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
  - d. **Scholarship of Teaching** – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning.
2. In presenting their scholarship for review or in evaluating the work of others, faculty shall be guided by the definitions of scholarship noted above and further articulated by their department (s) on the basis of disciplinary or interdisciplinary intellectual interests.
  3. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues. A faculty member's portfolio sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion should demonstrate a pattern of completed work consistent with the nature of the faculty member's appointment.



4. Scholarly papers accepted for delivery at conferences external to the University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions whether domestic or international, and similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers may all provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development. Scholarly papers may mark progress toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may not substitute for the pattern of completed work required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
  5. Faculty reviews of all types, including annual reviews, merit reviews, third-year reviews, and comprehensive reviews, should give due attention to evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and to evidence of the faculty member's continuing professional development. Although some faculty may emphasize teaching or service more heavily in their workload assignments, all faculty are responsible for continuing to develop disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and for providing evidence of professional growth in their annual reviews or review portfolios. Reports on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, papers presented to colleagues, systematic preparation for teaching topics new to the faculty member, collection and analysis of data or information for a community purpose, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the department, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews, although they may not substitute for the evidence required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
- F. The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions consistent with the proportion of time allocated for service in the faculty member's workload agreements. To the extent possible, evaluation should

consider the extent and quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a position held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for judgment of its extent and its relation to the mission of the university.

1. University service involves substantive participation in the shared governance activities of the department, college and university.
  2. Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university's mission.
  3. Professional service includes activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance the university's mission.
- G. Chairs, who are responsible for supervising faculty, shall be evaluated in the additional category of leadership. Chair activities are reported as part of their annual review on the CAR form and constitute a minimum of fifty percent of the chair's workload by university policy. Departments shall recognize in their evaluation of chairs a distribution of responsibilities and expectations consistent with the chair's workload agreements. Evaluators will recognize that chair responsibilities may involve personnel matters or dealings with students governed by confidentiality, as well as other activities not readily visible to colleagues; such matters may not be reported or documented in detail. Evaluators will nevertheless make judgments about the consistency, creativity, and fairness with which a chair has carried out the responsibilities of leadership, consistent with university policies and the responsibilities defined for the chair. Program directors who

supervise faculty and who prepare annual reports on their activities may also be evaluated for leadership consistent with the proportion of their time committed to such work under their workload agreements.

H. The expectations for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor in the College of Liberal Arts shall include the following.

1. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University's mission. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards of dissemination and validation, and shown competence to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research when applicable. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service, as defined in section F above.
2. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. The faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher during the period since promotion to Associate Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Professor at least equivalent to the pattern of completed work meeting the standards of dissemination and validation expected for the prior rank. The scholarly work as a whole should reflect a degree of cohesion consistent

with establishing a sound scholarly reputation. The faculty member shall have presented evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession in the period after promotion to Associate professor.

3. Any exceptions to the standards outlined above shall be consistent with the provisions of the Towson University ART policy, and the specific rationale for any recommendation involving an exception shall be spelled out in the appropriate letter of recommendation in the faculty member's evaluation file.

I. Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. There are three (3) categories of merit.

1. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.
2. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
3. Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.

A rating of satisfactory shall mean at minimum that (a) the faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in V.B of this document; (b) the faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching as evidenced in the sources of evidence appropriate to annual review as described above; (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly work through the annual report, whether that work has been completed or is in progress; (d) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service as defined in section F 1 , 2, 3 above.

A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of V.B of this document or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.

A rating of excellent shall mean that the faculty member has clearly met the expectations for a satisfactory rating in all categories of evaluation and has demonstrated accomplishment distinctly above the satisfactory level in at least one category. Evaluation of accomplishment meriting a rating of excellent shall be made in accordance with the proportion of a faculty member's time allocated to each area of responsibility in the annual workload assignment.

Each department will define the above categories for use in merit deliberations, including distinctions acknowledging different workload allocations..

## VI. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. Departments are responsible for developing policies, procedures, and criteria governing tenure, promotion, and review decisions; for creating and sustaining a departmental PTRM committee or committees; and for carrying out the responsibilities designated in the Towson University ART policy, consistent with the standards and procedures articulated in that document and in the Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts Promotion and Tenure Committee. Departmental policies, procedures, and criteria documents must be reviewed every three years, with evidence of that review provided to the CLA PTRM committee and the dean of the college. Changes may be made only through the process defined in Appendix 3 of the ART policy, including a vote by tenure line members of the department, approval of the college committee, the dean, and the UPTRM committee.

- B. In order that at least three (3) tenured faculty opinions be considered in promotion and tenure recommendations, in addition to the department chairperson, departments with fewer than three (3) tenured faculty members shall supplement the committee with tenured faculty members from other departments within the college or from the appropriate department if the faculty member being reviewed has a joint appointment, including a joint appointment between colleges. The additional tenured faculty members shall be selected from a list of at least three (3) faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review. The faculty member shall submit the list of recommended faculty members on or before the third Friday in June. The department chairperson and the dean will review the list from the appropriate college and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The college PTRM committee will select the additional faculty member(s) to be added to the committee on or before the third Friday of September of the review year.
- C. The department PTRM committee(s) will evaluate faculty each year for merit through the annual review process. The committee will examine annual review portfolios, make considered judgments, and prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations, as set forth in the department PTRM document. Departments should include a copy of departmental merit criteria with each year's recommendations.
- D. Departments shall specify in their PTRM documents the policies and procedures for carrying out reviews that do not normally advance to the CLA PTRM committee: annual reviews, reappointment, third-year reviews, and comprehensive reviews. In conducting these reviews, departments should provide for an assessment of faculty performance that calibrates expectations and judgments to the proportion of time allocated for each area of responsibility in the

faculty member's workload. A faculty member who regularly allocates 25 percent of time to scholarship, for example, should meet significantly higher expectations for scholarly outcomes than a faculty member with 15 percent of time allocated to scholarship, and a faculty member allocating 15 percent of time to service should be providing notably more extensive service than would be expected of a faculty member allocating 5 percent to this sphere.

- E. Departments shall meet the expectation that for every type of evaluation, including annual review, the faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read the evaluation. The signature shall not necessarily be taken to convey agreement with the evaluation. Failure to sign shall not prevent the documentation from being forwarded to the next evaluation level.
- F. Departments will affirm through their policies and practices that all material placed in a file, including challenge material, becomes part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio. No materials shall be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators, provided the material inclusion process has been adhered to with respect to notifying the faculty member and adhering to the review process timeline. Documents or statements prepared by a faculty member or evaluation committee and included in the file should remain in the file in their original form, with any changes handled through the processes provided in the ART policy, Appendix 3.
- G. The chair of the department PTRM committee(s) shall be responsible for delivering letters of evaluation and recommendation to the department chair by the second Friday in October and shall be responsible for delivering evaluation portfolios inclusive of letters of recommendation to the dean's office by the second Friday in November.

- H. The department chairperson shall maintain a copy of all official documents concerning evaluation recommendations. Copies of all recommendations shall also be sent to the faculty member and the dean of the respective college.

Note: The CLA PTRM committee suggests that letters of evaluation and recommendation, other than those for the third year review, should be addressed to the Provost. Those resulting from the third-year review should be addressed to the faculty member.

## VII. CALENDAR

The College of Liberal Arts will abide by the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar as published in Appendix 3 of the ART policy. The calendar is included in this document as an appendix with the understanding that if the published university calendar changes, the CLA calendar may change without formal amendment of the CLA Policies and Procedures document.

Approved by the College Of Liberal Arts PTRM Committee 11/22/10

Approved by vote of the tenure line CLA faculty 12/3/10

Approved by the Dean of CLA 12/6/10

Approved by UPTRM 2/11/11

Revision approved by CLA PTRM and Dean, 10/12/12 (to align voting procedures with ART changes)

Revision approved by CLA PTRM and Dean, and reviewed without objection by the College faculty, completed 11/2/18, to make two minor clarifications



## **Appendix A**

### **College of Liberal Arts Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar**

#### **The first Friday in May**

Department and college PTRM committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

#### **The Third Friday in June**

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

A. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chairperson and dean.

B. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.

#### **August 1 (USM mandated)**

Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a of Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

#### **The First Friday in September**

Department chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the department tenure and/or promotion committee

#### **The Second Friday in September**

University PTRM committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee's Member-at-large of the committee members and chairperson for the academic year.

#### **The Third Friday in September**

A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

B. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary).

C. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a.

D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

**The Fourth Friday in September**

Department chairperson notifies department faculty, dean, and Provost of any department faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

**The Second Friday in October**

A. Department PTRM committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.

B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

**The Fourth Friday in October**

A. Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

B. The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

C. The department PTRM committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

**The Second Friday in November**

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the department PTRM committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTRM chairperson to the dean's office.

**November 30th**

A. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

B. The dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

**The First Friday in December**

Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have been made.

**The Second Friday in December**

First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson.

**December 15th (USM mandated date)**

Tenure-track faculty in the second academic year of service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

**The First Friday in January**

A. The department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

B. The college PTRM committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

**The Third Friday in January**

A. The dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

B. The college PTRM committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

C. The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.

D. All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.

E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

**The First Friday in February**

A. The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

B. The dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

**The Second Friday in February**

A. The dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

B. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM committee.

C. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.

**March 1**

First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the university President.

**First Friday in March**

Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.

**Third Friday in March**

Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTRM committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and dean of the college.