

**University Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee
Annual Report 2017-2018**

Submitted by

Dr. Mary Lashley, Chair

The UPTRM Committee is a standing committee of the University Senate charged with administering the system of faculty evaluation, reviewing college and department PTRM policy documents, and addressing faculty appeals due to procedural error. The Committee includes seven faculty members, one member elected from each college and one appointed by the Senate. Members' terms run from June 1 - May 31. The Committee meets the second Friday of each month, 10 a.m. to 12 Noon and as needed.

Copies of Meeting Minutes (See Appendix)

Policy Statements Approved by Committee

No new policy statements were approved by the UPTRM Committee this year.

Committee Roster

Committee membership for the 2016-2017 academic year included:

Dr. Mary Lashley – Chair, CHP Representative: Term expires May 2020
 Dr. Morna McNulty – Secretary, COE Representative; Fall 2017- Term expired Dec 2017
 Dr. Keri-Anne Croce – COE Representative, Spring 2018; Term expires Dec 2020
 Dr. Amanda Burnham – University Senate Representative; Term expires May 2018
 Dr. Jaye Knutson – COFAC Representative – Fall 2017; Term expires May 2019
 Dr. Katherine Broadwater – COFAC Representative – Spring 2018; Term expires May 2018
 Dr. Tamara Woroby – CBE Representative – Term expires May 2018
 Dr. Jay Nelson – FCSM Representative – Term expires May 2018
 Dr. Katia Sainson – Secretary Spring 2018, CLA Representative – Term expires May 2018
 Dr. Susan Picinich – Deans/Provost Representative – Appointed by Provost as needed.

Incoming Committee Chair for AY 2018-2019

Dr. Jaye Knutson (COFAC)

Annual Report

The Committee had an active year reviewing department and college PTRM documents and providing input to the TU ART Review Committee. Following is a list of Committee activities and accomplishments:

1. Discussed TU ART review policy issues related to the role of the chairperson in the PTRM process, penalties for failure to submit PTRM materials, appeal for base merit, adding a 4th level of merit, and requiring external reviews for faculty seeking promotion to full professor.
2. Reviewed librarian procedural appeals proposals and discussed role of UPTRM Committee in librarian procedural appeal process.
3. Evaluated status of research on faculty retention.
4. Met with Provost to discuss issues related to the PTRM process and identify Committee priorities for the academic year. At this meeting, the Provost provided updates on the TU ART review process, faculty retention, the status of online student evaluations, and an update on the Faculty Salary Review Committee.
5. Maintained UPTRM Committee website to ensure that all University, college, and department PTRM related documents are up to date and reflect current UPTRM approval dates. The UPTRM website serves as a one-stop shop for faculty seeking information on current PTRM policies.
6. Completed reviews of 3 college PTRM documents (one in COFAC and two in CHP) and 12 department PTRM documents to ensure that documents were congruent with TU ART (CHP - 6 depts.; COFAC - 6 depts). CLA and COE are next in the three year review cycle and will be reviewed in AY 2018-2019.

The following general recommendations were made when conducting the reviews:

- Cross check pagination between PTRM document and pages listed on UPTRM checklist and table of contents.
 - College Dean to upload a clean document and a document with track changes to the UPTRM Sharepoint site that includes a title page, table of contents, and UPTRM checklist. This is to be done for all documents during the review year regardless of whether changes have been made or whether the document was recently reviewed.
7. Participated in the Provost's Annual Spring PTRM Workshop. Committee members served as small group facilitators to address priority PTRM issues.
 8. Provided UPTRM Committee Chair representation on the TU ART Review Committee.

Pending Priorities for Next Academic Year

1. Review COE and CLA College and Department PTRM documents.
2. Continue to provide input to TU ART Review Committee.
3. Maintain UPTRM Committee website to ensure that all college and department PTRM documents are up to date and easily accessible to faculty.

4. Formulate best practice list to guide department and college PTRM committees in developing PTRM documents.

UPTRM Committee Members Record of Attendance

Committee Member Attendance: (X= attended; 0= absent-excused; S- excused sabbatical; blank= not yet appointed/ elected; *online, E = Term expired)

Member	09.08	10.13	11.10	12.08	02.09	03.09	04.28	05.11
Mary Lashley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Katia Sainson	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jay Nelson	S	S	S	X	X	X	X	X
Tamara Woroby	S	S	S	S	X	X	X	0
Morna McNulty	X	X	X	X	E	E	E	E
Jaye Knutson	X	X	0	X	S	S	S	S
Kerri Anne Croce					X	X	X	X
Katherine Broadwater						X	X	X
Susan Picinich	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Amanda Burnham		X	X	0	X	X	X	X

Guests included: Provost Timothy Chandler, Maggie Reitz, Shana Gass

APPENDIX

UPTRM Committee Meeting**Minutes****9/8/17****ADM 333****10 a.m. to 12 Noon**

I. Call to Order

Susan Piccinich, Jaye Knutson, Mary Lashley, Katia Sainson
Special guest: Shana Gass (librarian)

II. Welcome to Committee Members

III. Election of Officers – Chair, Secretary

Jaye needs replacing in fall 2017- will forgo representation for the fall

We will find out who our senate rep is after the 11th of Sept—by Oct

Mary will continue as UPTRM chair

Morna will continue at secretary

On the calendar: Reviewing COFAC and CHP Docs due in December

Jaye is on sabbatical in spring 2018

IV. UPTRM Schedule for P&T Document Reviews (This year - CHP, COFAC)

Question: How will changes to the ART policy affect the doc revisions for the college? Currently just align with the old....not sure when the new changes are coming out.

New ART policies: First to senate, and legal council. Library section is done.

Next is faculty piece. Issues are: Merit, calendar,

V. Librarian Procedural Appeals –Role of UPTRM? Shana Gass on library procedural appeals. Appendix 2. Should UPTRM serve on *procedural*

appeals for library? Should there be a library rep on UPTRM committee?

Probably not-given the cope and size. But someone from the library would represent in the instances of procedural appeals.

We generally agree-next steps-decide what the specific process will be to

move forward. Can UPTRM receive an appeal before the policy is changed?

No- we have to go by the document that is in effect. But we can re visit this after the document has been changed.

Shana will submit a procedural proposal. Take the questions to senate.

And check with Senate by laws to see if we can proceed.

VI. PTRM Committee Goals – AY 2017-2018

Review College ART docs that are up for review

Procedural appeals if needed

Facilitate PTRM workshop in spring-what do we want to do? Facilitation? Presenter?

January faculty development conference?

VII. Meeting with Provost?

Issues to Address

1. Merit preparation/scope of the reviews, time it takes, and to what end? Ask him for an update of the status of Merit in relationship to TU ART doc.
2. Ask for report in faculty salary review committee. Also ask Senate Rep for this.
3. Improve on student evals for courses/faculty.
4. Research on Faculty of Color retention and promotion
5. discussion of the spring PTRM workshop

VIII. Additional Business?

Students wants access to online course evaluations. We do make recommendations about the evaluations to the Senate. Would we recommend this to the senate or not? Numeral averages of the data made public. Ask SGA to propose some questions to incorporate into the evaluation instrument?

IX. Adjourn

Next meeting is Oct 13th 10-12

UPTRM Committee Meeting

Minutes

10.13.17

ADM 333

10 a.m. to 12 Noon

Attending: Mary Lashley, CHP, Chair; Katia Sainson, CLA; Jaye Knutson, COFAC; Amanda Burnham, ART, Senate Representative; Timothy Chandler, Provost; Maggie Reitz, Associate Provost; Susan Picinich, Dean, COFAC.

X. Call to Order @ 10:04am.

XI. Welcome to New University Senate Representative – Amanda Burnham

XII. Approve Minutes of September 8. Approved Unanimously.

XIII. Meeting with Provost

- Follow up on status of study on retention of faculty of color.

Data collection was reviewed for last year. Current collecting data for this year. The data is too limited to draw conclusions at this time. More minorities are being hired. 65% of faculty are 65 years & older. This category of faculty is less diverse. An exit interview is being developed as an instrument for data collection. 8% minority faculty currently; 42% student body; national, 22%.

- Follow up on status of instrument for student evaluation of faculty

Gary Levy and Tim Bibo are preparing a white paper on the status of this instrument. Length and content of questions are a concern. The response rate is a continuous concern. It is currently approximately 30%. The obvious incentives are fraught with disadvantages, i.e., withholding grades, focus groups, etc.

- Update on TU ART Review process and status of merit discussion in relation to TU ART.

Extraordinarily thorough and thoughtful. The enormity of the document precludes a very laborious process. A couple of items are for the UPTRM consideration:

1. External Reviews required for all Full Professors. Reasoning: two important criteria includes 1) sustained high quality work as both a teacher & scholar presumes that non-local colleagues are in a position to objectively determine this.
 - a. Q: What is the proportion of internal to external reviews?

- b. Q: Does this further elevate the bar of performance?
- c. Q: Is the Provost observing a predominance of mediocrity in the performance of the Professoriate?
No; but to demonstrate objectively that a national reputation & strengthen the case for this outside of the local peer group.
- d. Q: Might there be a system at the 5-year review a salary increase would incentivize a better preparation of their dossier?
- e. Q: Is this the best method for improving the quality of the content of the portfolios submission?
- f. Q: What is the attitude of the ART Review Committee?
- g. Q: How would this new requirement be integrated into the current calendar.
- h. Q: Is there an appeal process for the external reviews?
- i. Q: Do peer institutions mandate an external review?
Unknown.
- j. Q: Have these letters been open or closed? Open.
- k. Q: How are they weighted?

- Update on Status of Faculty Salary Review Committee

This is a Senate Committee chaired by Jennifer Scott. Some analysis has been completed annually since its inception. No evidence of compression to date. There is a continued effort to dedicate discretionary funds towards rectifying existing inequities. Towson U is the only USM school that *doesn't* offer a benefits package to lecturers. Might faculty development & leadership into Administrative roles might be incentivized by an increase of salary, i.e., succession planning.

- Merit Discussion. The Provost has relented on his position. The conflation of merit and COLA make this not feasible at this time.

XIV. TU ART Review Committee Update

XV. Additional Business?

XVI. Adjourn. Next Meeting: November 12, 10am-12pm. Note location change: Admin 310.

UPTRM Committee Meeting

Minutes

11.10.17

ADM 310 (Please note room change)

10 a.m. to 12 Noon

Present: Mary Lashley, Katia Swanson, Sue Piccinich, Amanda Burnam, Morna McNulty

Minutes completed by Morna McNulty

XVII. Call to Order

XVIII. Review of October 13 Minutes

Approved

XIX. Review of CHP P&T Document – Katia, Susan

A. Katia- question about Composition of the Committee. Q: is it only tenured faculty or is it tenure track as eligible as well? Are tenure track allowed to serve? We do not believe so. It is not a proposed change from the old document-but it needs to be clarified. If they do want track faculty it needs to be supported by the ART language. (i.e cannot vote for tenure and promotion but can be on the committee). College committee doesn't do merit. **We recommend they delete the language “tenure track faculty” and include only TENURED.**

Susan- checklist. Add the name of the College. P. 4 “eligibility and term”- recommend they add “during the year the review is conducted” to address faculty going up for review during the 3 years they may be serving. **If they are serving in a 3 year service in PTRM during which they are up for review, the department recommends and the college elects an alternate one-year replacement during the year for which they are under review. (refer to ART 3-30 under college committee).**

Change “follows” to “*Following* the dept guidelines” on p. 5 C #3

p. 7 sec 3 II. Take out the word “new” evaluation forms....it's not new anymore.

#10 page 6 “solicited external reviews” It repeats #7 (above in same list)—collapse those into one statement

Add the statement about 5th year review additional information-“future plans” statement (under section 4 statement) “for comprehensive review this should also include future goals” (find language in the ART doc and copy if that helps).

P. 8 letter G under “Role of committee chair” #2. ART does not mandate this so delete that statement. Revise as an annual statement report of their activities? Recommend: let the college P and T committee know this is not a requirement. Notify them that it is optional. Check Senate by-laws (with Jenn Ballingee). Q: Who do college P and T committees send their reports to?

Under III CHPS scholarship and service letter A number 6 (p. 11): Add in “off load/summer/mini mester” Revise: ALL evaluations that come from the assessment office must be included.

XX. Standards for teaching and advising letter B: revise the grammar of the statement. Criteria “on” is incorrect (letter B and Letter C and under Promotion to professor Letter B and Letter C) change to “criteria FOR”.

XXI. Second para CHPS PTRM committee sentence, Add “FOR promotion to Professor...”

p. 20 chart (appendix A and B): it needs to be clarified-the two appendices do not align well in their language-there’s a disconnect.

Under Scholarship they mention juried presentations as possible evidence. Decide to keep in or out. Streamline or align criteria of what is in A and B. Revise and clarify the headings.

Vote to accept the document pending suggested revisions and review by UPTRM chair.
TU ART Review Committee Update:

- Merit levels – Add a 4th level? (Outstanding (Merit+), Excellent (Base), Satisfactory/Acceptable (fully meets responsibilities of position), Unsatisfactory

We recommend rejecting the suggestion of a 4th level

- Role of Chairpersons in the PTRM Process
- Penalties for Failure to Submit PTRM Materials
- Do scholarly products for which faculty receive additional compensation “count” toward scholarship for merit/promotion/tenure? (Clinical faculty, tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty).

We believe they should count

- Appeal for base merit?

XXII. Additional Business?

Our Dec 8th next meeting

XXIII. Adjourn

UPTRM

12.09.17

ADM

10 a.m. to 12 Noon

Present: Mary Lashley, Katia Swanson, Susan Picinich, Jay Knudson, Jay Nelson, Morna McNulty

Minutes completed by Morna McNulty

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Nov 10th minutes: Approved

Correction: Name corrections

III. **Review of Documents:**

College of Health Professions

TU ART 3-30. No mention of 5 yr comprehensive of review cited.

Susan: it was more about clarification (p. 4D, 1A) Clarify- “DURING THE YEAR THAT THEIR UP FOR REVIEW”—place the word “DURING THE YEAR they are up for review” and remove the language “department chairs” (OR) make a separate bullet that “Dept Chairs may not serve”

Appendices: Additional work needs to be done but they need an extension, submit the revision next year. Accept with the proviso that the revisions to the appendices ongoing and forthcoming.

CHP CLINICAL faculty

9b and 10b (p.14) remove the T from PTRM or clarify if it’s a different committee.

P.6 B2 -- ADD end of first sentence “Unless they are permanent part time status”

Move to approve the document pending these minor changes. Motion approved.

New Business:

1. ART REVIEW COMMITTEE: 3 year reviews-

Can we extend the existing 3 year cycle? Move to every five years?

Or:

Have the College docs one year and the dept docs for the respective College docs the following year so they have a year to absorb the college doc changes? Stagger College and then Dept the year after?

We recommend the issue of brought forward by Susan to Council of Deans? And maybe inquire at College levels?

2. TU ART Review process-

Role of the chair in the PTRM process. Does this need to change to more or less than it is? College and Dept PTRM Chairs and Dept PTRM Chair need to coordinate/communicate more effectively (more support or explanation).

In ART: Add a statement that each college will make explicit what their respective roles/expectations will be.

3. Provost letter- Penalties for failure to submit PTRM materials? There is a document from the Provost’s office that explains this.

Mary will post on Share Point

4. **Appeal for Base Merit**- Add language: “TU ART appeal of any recommendations” not just non meritorious.

Business for Feb:

Defining community engaged scholarship

UPTRM Committee Meeting Minutes

February 9, 2018

ADM 333

Present: Amanda Burham (Senate Representative), Tamara Woroby (CBE), Susan Picinich (Dean's Representative), Katia Sainson (CLA), Keri Anne Croce (COE), Jay Nelson (FCSM), Mary Lashley (CHP, Chair)

1. Call to Order by Mary Lashley at 10 a.m.
2. Introduction of Keri Anne Croce, from the College of Education (COE)
3. Approval of Minutes of December 9th 2017 (Approved Unanimously)
4. Review of Documents:

COFAC: College of COFAC: Approved pending changes

Add reference to the ART: p. 8 III. D: Required materials for Promotion, Tenure, and other reviews—as well as the organization of these materials—are listed in the ART document “. This should refer to a specific location in the ART or include a hyperlink to the appropriate section in the ART.

In future make sure that page reference numbers align with submitted document.

Department of MUSIC: Approved pending the following suggestions

Clarification of the wording: p. 16: C “ each of half the PTRM membership” this phraseology is unclear, the committee suggests: See below SUBCOMMITTEE.

Add that there is expectation of confidentiality by committee members. On check list reference to Confidentially p. 16 but this does not appear on that page.

Change of wording p. 23, XII: Comprehensive Five-Year review: clarify that the “follow-up review” is referring to subsequent annual review in compliance with the ART document, Comprehensive Review: 3-29,3-30 I. 7. The sentence “ If affirmative, the Committee can recommend that the five-year review be considered satisfactory” is problematic. This needs to be restated according to the procedures outlined in the ART documents. A department cannot decide after the fact that the previous five-year review was satisfactory. They are only authorized to conduct a subsequent annual review.

Department of Dance Not approved (unanimous vote)

I.A p. 1 Composition: Clarify the number of members on the committee and maximum number of outside members. And it must be clarified that members up for promotion and tenure should not serve on the committee. This is different from members who are being considered for merit who do not participate in deliberation.

Verify that if dates are not in compliance with the TU ART document they must be not later than TU ART.

The schedule and procedures for third year review is lacking

Selection of chair of Committee, eligibility and election is not included.

Merit appeal is not in compliance with the TU ART.

Faculty are referred to the Faculty Handbook but not to the TU ART.

The student evaluation procedure is not electronic.

The Department PTRM committee is responsible for establishing the five-year review calendar, not the individual faculty member.

The COFAC Dean and Associate Dean will follow up with the department committee.

5. Suggestions for recommendations for a future reference for departments and colleges revising their documents :

Suggestion that hyperlinks be embedded.

Documents should specify the definition of a majority for voting procedures.

6. Question to be referred to the Senate: Role of UPTRM Committee

The Dean of College of Health Professions notified the committee that two departments are not making changes to their documents. The dean has informed the committee that they will not be submitting documents and not making changes in light of an impending reorganization of their departments. The committee also was notified that COFAC will not be submitting documents from departments that have made no changes to their documents. This led to a discussion of the UPTRM's responsibility for reviewing all documents whether they have had changes made or not in their review year.

Questions to be answered are: Does UPTRM review only changes made or the entire document? Should documents that have been approved remained approved, if no changes have been made?

Amanda Burham (Senate Representative) will bring up the issue to the University Senate for guidance. Until notification from Senate to the contrary this committee will continue to receive and review all PTRM documents upon cyclical review, whether or not changes have been made, as established in the ART IV A. 5 Duties and Procedures.

Next meeting is Friday March 9th at ADM 333 10 AM -12 PM.

Meeting Adjourned at noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Katia Sainson

Secretary

UPTRM Meeting Minutes

March 9, 2018

ADM 333

Present: Katherine Broadwater (COFAC), Amanda Burham (Senate Representative), Tamara Woroby (CBE), Susan Picinich (Dean's Representative), Katia Sainson (CLA), Keri Anne Croce (COE), Jay Nelson (FCSM), Mary Lashley (CHP, Chair)

1. Call to Order by Mary Lashley
2. Approval of Minutes of February 9, 2018. Approved unanimously.
3. Review of Documents:

COFAC: Mass Communication (MCCS)

The document was approved.

COFAC: Art (ART)

The document was approved.

COFAC: Electronic Media and Film (EMF)

The document was approved.

COFAC: Theater (THEA)

Approved pending the following changes:

Time table for Third Year Review is missing from the document and this needs to be included in calendar.

Evaluation materials to be included in the portfolio for Third Year, Promotion, Promotion and Tenure self-evaluation is required but not mentioned in the list.

The number of peer evaluations required for Five Year Review portfolio should be clarified. There must be at least two evaluations for a Five-Year Review and that at least one will take place within the final year of the period of evaluation.

CHP: Kinesiology (KNES)

The document was approved pending the following addition:

Add procedure for submitting procedural appeal.

CHP: Occupational Therapy (OT)

Will defer approval of the document. The committee requests that the department clarify which document is the most recent because it was not clear which was the document to be evaluated.

CHP: Nursing (NURS)

The document was approved pending the clarification of the rationale for the change in the description of Merit evaluations: NEEDS IMPROVEMENT is not consistent with the language in the TU ART document which cites the category NON MERITORIOUS.

CHP: Health Science (HLTH)

The Committee is delaying review of this document until the May meeting.

CHP: Inter-Professional Health Studies (IPHS)

Approved.

CHP: Audiology, Speech-Language Pathology, and Deaf Studies (ASLD)

Approved.

The next meeting will be scheduled for Friday May 11 in ADM 333 10 AM -12 PM. The Provost Annual PTRM Workshop will take place on Friday April 13th and committee members are asked to attend and serve as facilitators.

Meeting Adjourned at noon.

Katia Sainson

Recording Secretary

UPTRM Committee Meeting

Minutes

5.11.2018

ADM 333

10 a.m. to 12 Noon

Members Present: Mary Lashley (Chair), Katherine Broadwater, Amanda Burham, Kerri-Anne Croce, Jay Nelson, Susan Picinich, Katia Sainson (Secretary)

Members Absent: Tamara Woroby (Excused)

XXIV. Call to Order

XXV. Approval of Minutes of March 9, 2018

XXVI. Review of Documents

OTOS – Susan, Kerri Anne

- They need to add what defines a quorum for the committee to deliberate.
- The document should consistently refer to TU ART document rather than referring to the TU Faculty Handbook.
- (p.4) 6. c: include a procedure for procedural appeals.

Document was approved unanimously pending these changes.

DANC – Mary, Jay

- P. 5, II. A, 2 Regarding the composition of the PT committee, it should be clarified that the composition consists of ALL tenured faculty.
- A. 2 : Regarding department chair writing a separate letter, add “depending on the requirement of the type of review”
- The document should consistently refer to TU ART document rather than referring to the TU Faculty Handbook.
- P. 16 .M. 2. a : Peer evaluations: ART document states that faculty member being observed must be notified one week in advanced not 24 hours. See ART: II. D. ii. D Appendix 3, p.13)
- Include a procedure for procedural appeals.

Document was approved unanimously pending these changes.

HLTH – Amanda, Susan

Document was approved unanimously.

Documents Approved Pending –THEA (see 3/9 minutes), MUSC (see 2/9 minutes), COFAC P&T (see 2/9 minutes). Still awaiting final versions.

XXVII. Additional Business: None

XXVIII. Adjourn: 11:15 AM

Respectfully submitted, Katia Sainson