

---

## **The College of Business And Economics**

---

### **Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Procedures and Standards**

---

Prepared:	May, 1985
Adopted:	May, 1985
Revised:	March, 1990
Revised:	April, 1990
Approved:	April 15, 1993
Revised:	December, 1995
Approved:	January, 1996
Revised:	October, 1999
Approved:	November, 1999
Approved:	November 22, 1999 University P&T Committee
Revised:	December 20, 2007
Approved:	January 24, 2008
Revised:	November 18th, 2010
Approved:	March 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2011
Revised:	October 1, 2013
Approved:	November 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2013
Revised:	October 5, 2018

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Composition.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Election, Eligibility, Term .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Duties/Procedures .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Evaluation Procedures.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Standards for Evaluation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Confidentiality.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Notification .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Standards for Merit Recommendation .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Materials Required for Submission by Departments and Faculty Candidates</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Appeal Procedures.....</b>	<b>16</b>

**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS**  
**Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee**

**Composition**

The College of Business and Economics Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee (CBE PTRM) shall be composed of faculty members elected by and from the CBE through college-wide elections. The number of persons to be elected to the CBE PTRM shall be established on the basis of one member from each of the departments within the college.

The Dean of the CBE or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting, *ex officio* member of the CBE PTRM Committee.

**Election, Eligibility, Term**

In accordance with the [Faculty Handbook](#), all eligible CBE tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote for representatives to the CBE PTRM Committee. The College Council shall administer an election no later than the first Friday in May to staff any committee vacancies and subsequently announce the results to the faculty.

Those elected shall be tenured members of the faculty at the rank of associate or full professor. Department chairpersons are not eligible to serve. If a department does not have one or more faculty eligible to serve, an exception to the policy may be made and approved by the College Dean and the University PTRM Committee.

The faculty department representative shall present the position of the department regarding recommendations. However, members of the CBE PTRM Committee are expected to serve as representatives of the College and University and not as delegates from a particular department. Personal bias should be avoided.

Faculty members who serve as members of the CBE PTRM Committee and who are presenting themselves for promotion and/or tenure shall not serve during the year in which any decision relative to their review is undertaken. In such cases, the CBE Council will administer a special interim election to staff the vacant position.

Faculty members who are categorized as transitional (e.g., to retirement) are not eligible to serve.

Faculty members who are presenting their materials for comprehensive five-year reviews are eligible to serve.

Members of the CBE PTRM Committee elected from departments shall serve for a term of three years but no more than two consecutive terms.

Terms of members of the CBE PTRM Committee shall be staggered among departments to prevent the necessity of electing a completely new committee in any year.

The Committee, at the first meeting of the academic year, shall elect its own chairperson and secretary who will serve for a term of one year.

### **Administrative Duties/Procedures**

- a. The CBE PTRM Committee shall appoint tenured faculty members from other departments within the CBE to serve on tenure, rank, and comprehensive review committees in cases when a department does not have three members at the appropriate rank. The additional tenured faculty members shall be selected by the CBE PTRM Committee from a list of named individuals submitted by the faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The faculty member shall submit the list of named individuals on or before the third Friday in June. The department chairperson and the Dean shall review the list and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The CBE 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.
- b. The Committee shall develop a PTRM document that adheres to the university standards, criteria, and/or expectations pertaining to annual review, reappointments, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review. Each college shall develop its own specific standards and expectations. These must be accompanied by clear criteria for evaluation and must not conflict with those established by the university. The process shall include:
  - The CBE PTRM document pertaining to standards, criteria, and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the CBE PTRM Committee. The CBE PTRM document must be distributed to all tenured and tenure track faculty in the CBE for input at least 10 business days prior to the CBE PTRM Committee vote on the documents. Final approval shall be by a simple majority vote of CBE tenured/tenure track faculty. Except for faculty who are on sabbatical or leave from the university, the signature of each tenured or tenured track faculty member will signify that he/she has voted on the CBE PTRM document.
  - The CBE PTRM document shall be approved by the CBE Dean who shall be responsible for transmitting the document with any proposed changes to the University PTRM Committee by the second Friday in October.
  - The CBE PTRM document must be approved by the University PTRM Committee. The CBE PTRM Committee must formally respond to changes and/or recommendations resulting from the review by the University PTRM

Committee and submit a clean copy by the due date specified by the University PTRM Committee. Once the University PTRM Committee has approved the CBE PTRM document, it will forward a copy of the approved document to the CBE Dean.

- The Dean of the CBE shall be responsible for assuring that the approved CBE PTRM documents are posted on the Towson University website.
- c. All policies at the college level shall remain in effect until changes according to the procedures described herein. However, faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the College PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they are first appointed to a tenure track position.
- d. Beginning with the AY 2011–12, the CBE PTRM Committee shall review its document every three years and submit evidence of such review to the CBE Dean and to the University PTRM Committee.
- e. Revisions to department PTRM documents are to be approved by the CBE PTRM Committee and the Dean of the College prior to submission to the University PTRM Committee. Revised department PTRM documents, with the approval forms, shall be submitted to the CBE PTRM Committee by the first Friday in December. Each department shall develop its own specific standards and expectations with clear criteria for evaluation, ensuring that they are not in conflict with those established by the university and/or college. Following approval by the CBE PTRM Committee and the Dean, the department PTRM document shall be delivered by the Dean to the University PTRM Committee chairperson by the second Friday in February.

## Evaluation Procedures

- a. **Notification.** Faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure shall notify their respective department chairperson in writing by the third Friday in September of the academic year *preceding* the academic year in which they intend to submit material for promotion and/or tenure.
- b. **Quorum.** All voting members of the CBE PTRM Committee shall be present at all meetings except under unusual circumstances. However, under no circumstances shall the Committee meet if fewer than four members are present.
- c. **Review/Evaluation.** The CBE PTRM Committee shall review and approve or disapprove all recommendations from departments for promotion and tenure. The Committee shall not rule on department recommendations for renewal of contract of faculty in their second probationary year. The Committee shall review upon appeal department merit, reappointment, and comprehensive five- year review judgments and forward its recommendations to the Provost, the CBE Dean, the department chairperson, and the faculty candidate.

The CBE PTRM Committee shall examine the materials submitted by each department for faculty recommended for promotion and/or tenure and shall decide whether to support or deny the recommendations. Information used for the decision are teaching performance; academic training and earned degrees; scholarship, especially publications in peer-reviewed journals, external grants and contracts; and service to the department, college, university, and community. The decisions should be consistent with the Faculty Handbook, CBE mission, standards and expectations for teaching, scholarship and service as outlined in this document, collegiality issues, and any other areas pertinent to the decision.

The Dean and department chairs shall submit written independent recommendations addressed to the Provost that shall become part of the candidate's file, going forward. The department chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the department PTRM committee(s). The recommendations should not only be communicated to the Provost, but also to the CBE Dean, the department chairperson, the CBE PTRM committee chairperson, and the faculty candidate.

**d. Voting.** During meetings of the full CBE PTRM Committee, subject to the quorum conditions above, a vote shall be taken on each departmental recommendation. This vote shall be considered final if a majority of the members present for the deliberations agree. There will be no tie votes. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit and/or comprehensive five-year reviews taken by the Committee shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member and tallied by the Committee chair. No Committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

## **Standards for Evaluation**

### **a. Teaching and Advising**

Teaching takes a variety of forms, including but not limited to, the use of technology or classroom-based research to improve teaching, the development of new courses and programs, faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, and involvement in online learning.

The primary purposes of faculty academic advising are to assist students in the development of meaningful educational and career plans that are compatible with their life goals. Faculty advising can also take the form of mentoring colleagues in effective teaching or academic advising as well as mentoring student scholarship (e.g. independent study projects or theses).

*1) Evaluation of teaching by students:* student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. Such an evaluation is one kind of assessment and should be considered in concert with all other measures of teaching effectiveness. Tenured and probationary faculty shall be evaluated by students for all courses taught, every semester, inclusive of the summer semester.

2) *Evaluation of teaching by peers*: classroom visits are encouraged for the purposes of professional growth and are required when the faculty member is being considered for rank advancement, tenure, comprehensive five- year review, three-year review or reappointment. A minimum of two peer observations shall be conducted per review period. The department PTRM Committee will approve the peers selected for the review. Advance notice of at least one week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.

3). *Self-evaluation* of teaching and/or advising effectiveness by faculty being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure, three-year reviews, or comprehensive five-year reviews, shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.

4). *Developmental plan*: in the event that a faculty member has consistently unsatisfactory student or peer evaluations of instruction, the department chairperson shall generate a developmental plan in consultation with the faculty member. The plan may include mentoring, additional classroom visitations, participation in appropriate university and college developmental workshops, and/or counseling for improvement of teaching effectiveness. A plan shall be developed regardless of the rank and/or tenure status of the faculty.

#### **Standards for Tenure and Rank Advancement to Associate Professor**

- Outstanding instruction as measured by student evaluations.
- Effective instruction as measured by an exemplary peer evaluation for each year of the most recent five-year period.
- Effective advising as measured by availability to students, accuracy of advice given to students and knowledge about programs, policies, procedures, and career opportunities.

The following additional evidence may be submitted to support evidence of excellence in teaching:

- If applicable, maintaining currency of licensure, certification and accreditation
- Incorporation of appropriate instructional technology in one's teaching
- Reflection and growth in teaching methodology
- Mentoring student scholarship
- Having met contractual obligations for approved off-campus activities such as international teaching exchanges and grant-supported research.
- Teaching awards

#### **Standards for Rank Advancement to Professor**

- **Excellent** instruction as measured by student evaluations.
- Effective instruction as measured by a minimum of two exemplary peer evaluations for the evaluation period of rank consideration.

- Effective advising as measured by availability to students, accuracy in advice given to students and knowledge about programs, policies procedures and career opportunities.

The following additional evidence may be submitted to support evidence of excellence in teaching:

- Unsolicited evaluations of instruction by both current students and graduates
- Incorporation of appropriate technology in one's teaching
- Reflection and growth in teaching methodology
- International teaching exchange, sabbatical or consulting contracts
- University instructional development grants
- If applicable, maintaining the currency of licensure, certification and accreditation
- Mentoring student scholarship
- Mentoring colleagues in effective teaching and academic advising
- Teaching awards

## **b. Scholarship**

Scholarship is widely interpreted and may take many forms, including, but not limited to, publications, presentations, or grants. Faculty conduct their scholarship in the development of new or the extension of existing knowledge. Other faculty engage in research that is applied, finding new ways to use knowledge for practical purposes, including pedagogy and published case studies. Faculty also engage in developing and publishing software for classroom uses. Interdisciplinary efforts where faculty work to expand their knowledge and apply it in new ways constitute yet another form of applied scholarship.

Expected scholarship standards include the following:

**Tenure and Rank Advancement to Associate Professor:** Faculty applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should meet as a minimum for the most recent five-year period:

- Three to four published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed articles in quality journals as recognized by published reputable sources<sup>1</sup>. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide information that would establish whether their publications are in quality journals. Information such as journal rankings, acceptance rates, number of citations received, and external letters of support are examples of information that would help establish the level of quality of a faculty member's publications. The following may substitute for one journal article: receipt of an external grant/contract of \$50,000 or more, the first edition of a course textbook or other significant intellectual contributions.

---

<sup>1</sup> A determination of whether three or four published or forthcoming peer-reviewed journal articles are expected shall be made on the basis of the level of quality of the journals. Quality of journals shall be determined by a published ranking of journals within the discipline.

- Other evidence of scholarship, including, but not limited to, peer-reviewed published proceedings or paper presentations at academic conferences, or published software, are expected of all faculty but may be waived with superior number and/or quality of published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed journal articles.

*Tenure and rank advancement decisions will normally be made concurrently; i.e., they are mutually inclusive and no favorable recommendation will normally go forward without having satisfied both decisions.*

**Rank Advancement from Associate Professor to Professor:** Faculty should have a **sustained** record of conducting and reporting research **with a distinction in the quality** in one's scholarship. Faculty applying for promotion to Professor from Associate Professor should meet the following minimum criteria in the most recent five-year period:

- Three to four published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed articles in quality journals as recognized by published reputable sources<sup>2</sup>. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide information that would establish whether their publications are in quality journals. Information such as journal rankings, acceptance rates, number of citations received, and external letters of support are examples of information that would help establish the level of quality of a faculty member's publications. The following may substitute for one journal article: receipt of an external grant/contract of \$50,000 or more, the first edition of a course textbook, or other significant intellectual contributions.
- Other evidence of scholarship, including, but not limited to peer-reviewed published proceedings, paper presentations at academic conferences, or published software, are expected of all faculty but may be waived with superior number and/or quality of published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed journal articles.

### c. Service

As faculty progresses through their career life cycles, it is anticipated that service will vary in terms of the roles and quality of commitments that are made to the institution, the profession and the greater community. Service is an important element not only in improving the quality of life of various stakeholders, but can also potentially make a significant contribution in the professional and personal development of the individual.

#### **Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:**

- Involvement in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, college, university or system levels, or serving various campus student organizations.
- Examples of additional contributions that strengthen an application are:

---

<sup>2</sup> A determination of whether three or four published or forthcoming peer-reviewed journal articles are expected shall be made on the basis of the level of quality of the journals. Quality of journals shall be determined by a published ranking of journals within the discipline.

- Sustained involvement in the work of practitioners in one's field (e.g. presentations at various events in the community, state, regional and other markets; maintaining civic duties by serving various community needs; creating additional opportunities through personal initiatives such as internships or networking venues).
- Contributions to practitioners and community that draw upon one's professional expertise (e.g. professional consulting).
- Sustained involvement in professional organizations and associations in one's field at local, state, regional and national and/or international levels (e.g. committee membership in professional organizations; participation in regional and national academic societies as paper reviewers or discussants, session or track chairs; and membership on the editorial boards of a peer reviewed journal).

**Standard for Rank Advancement to Professor:**

- **Leadership** positions and **distinction in the quality** of one's services to the institution at the program, department, college, university or system levels (e.g., Faculty Senate; chairperson positions on faculty or ad hoc committees and in the university governance structure; chairperson for new faculty searches). Membership on a committee(s) is not sufficient evidence.
- **Sustained involvement** in professional organizations and associations in one's field at the state, regional and/or national levels (e.g., leadership in professional organizations, societies, and associations; committee membership in professional organizations; academic conference program chairs; significant editorial responsibilities of a peer-reviewed journal; service to licensure, certification or accreditation boards).
- **Contributions to practitioners and community** that draws upon one's professional expertise (e.g., professional consulting; provisions of in-service professional development or technical assistance, executive board memberships, certification panels, standards committees, presentations to practitioners, advisement to regulatory and/or government policy groups, etc.)

**d. Collegiality**

A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship.

**Confidentiality**

All matters considered by the CBE PTRM Committee pertaining to the individual faculty member shall be held in strict confidence, and all outgoing correspondence shall be approved by the CBE PTRM Committee.

## Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Notification

Promotion and/or tenure recommendations and decisions on merit appeals by the CBE PTRM Committee shall be summarized in a letter from the chair of the Committee to each of the faculty members involved in the decisions. Copies of each letter shall be provided to the department chairs, chairs of the respective department PTRM Committees, and the College Dean. A record of the vote count shall be forwarded with the candidate's summative dossier to the Provost's office. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent by certified mail to the candidate's last-known address.

## Standards for Merit Recommendation

As stated in the *Appointment, Retention and Tenure (ART) Policy of Towson University* document, sec. IIB1, pp.8-9, all faculty are responsible for complying with University standards and expectations.

All faculty shall meet the contractual duties of employment including meeting all classes as scheduled, preparing course syllabi, holding office hours for consultation and advising, evaluating student performance, administering course evaluations, participating in the governance of the department, college or university, attending department and college meetings, committing to collegiality and adhering to written policies.

Merit committees must evaluate all candidates for merit on each of the three elements (teaching, scholarship, service) separately, as reflected in the new ballot form.

Committee members are to provide a final composite rating (Unsatisfactory, Acceptable, Meritorious, Outstanding) for each candidate, taking into account the percentage of effort assigned to each category on the workload agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

There are four levels of performance assigned merit ratings over the faculty member's year of record.

- UNSATISFACTORY –(Developmental Plan Required, No Merit)

An unsatisfactory judgment shall be recommended when a faculty member has not met the minimum expectations for contracted duties of employment. A faculty development plan will be required and mentoring will be provided.

No merit can be awarded.

- ACCEPTABLE – (Fully meets expectations, but performance is not meritorious; No Merit Award)

An *acceptable* judgment shall be recommended when a faculty member has met the contracted duties of employment, however, is not compliant with the criteria for a meritorious recommendation.

- MERITORIOUS (Performance is noteworthy and exceeds expectations)

In addition to meeting the contractual duties of employment, a *meritorious* judgment shall be recommended when the faculty is deemed meritorious in teaching and one other category (research or service) and a judgment of acceptable in the third category.

A rating of meritorious shall mean at the minimum that (a) the faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching as acknowledged in the sources of evidence appropriate to an annual review, and in addition, (b) the faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly work through the annual report, whether that work has been published, or is pending publication, or constitutes other forms of intellectual contributions (e.g., peer-reviewed conference paper presentations, recipient of a research grant from an external agency or substantial editorial responsibilities for a quality peer-reviewed journal), or reflects evidence of significant manuscript development, and/ or (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service to either the University, the community or the profession.

*Departments shall establish meritorious standards that recognize noteworthy faculty performances in teaching, scholarship and service.*

- OUTSTANDING- (Performance is truly exceptional)

In addition to meeting the contractual duties of employment, an *outstanding* judgment shall be recommended when the faculty is deemed outstanding in teaching and one other area. The third area must be rated acceptable at a minimum.

*Departments shall establish exemplary standards that recognize superior faculty performances in teaching, scholarship and service.*

## **Materials Required for Submission by Departments and Faculty Candidates**

### **a. Materials Required from Departments**

The department should provide all working documents approved by the University PTRM Committee under which the department currently operates.

The department should provide the CBE PTRM Chair with a summary spreadsheet report that includes the following information:

- A list of names of all faculty candidates recommended for promotion by professorial rank.
- A list of names of all faculty candidates recommended for tenure.
- A list of all faculty members recommended for non-reappointment

- A list of all faculty members recommended for merit
- A list of all faculty members subject to comprehensive five year reviews.
- Vote counts for all the above recommendations

**b. Materials Required from Faculty for Promotion and/or Tenure**

Faculty candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure shall provide the materials listed below arranged specifically in the following sequence and placed in two three-ring binders. Each section must be separated and indexed with tabs. The tabs shall be labeled using the bolded titles below.

It is the responsibility of faculty to ensure that the documentation they provide in the two binders is complete and in full compliance with the requirements of the CBE PTRM Committee and the University as outlined below. In the event, incomplete documentation is submitted, the CBE PTRM Committee may choose not to consider the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure for the academic year.

The first dossier in a three- ring binder should include the following:

- 1) **Narrative** A narrative statement in which the candidate a) describes her or his goals and plans for the next 4-5 years, b) explains how these goals and plans connect to what she or he accomplished in the past 5 years, and c) delineates how these goals and plans align with and support the departmental, college, and university strategic objectives and where the she or he expects to make a contribution at each level.
- 2) **Department Letter** Departmental recommendation letter, which must include a written report on the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
- 3) **Curriculum Vitae** Candidate shall provide a CV that represents their entire academic career, not just the evaluation period.
- 4) **Annual Review** Current AR (Annual Report) or CAR (Chairpersons' Annual Report) form.
- 5) **Syllabi** At least one syllabus for each course taught during the evaluation period.
- 6) **Student Evaluations** Evaluation of teaching for the most recent five-year period. Copies of evaluations for each class shall be provided and summary statistics for evaluations shall be presented in tabular form. Candidates shall clearly state which items were used to calculate course evaluation averages and the same items shall be used for all course evaluation calculations. The department chair will either tabulate or oversee the tabulation of student evaluations by an administrative entity other than the faculty member under evaluation.
- 7) **Grade Distributions** Grade distributions by course and in tabular form for all courses taught in the most recent five-year period.
- 8) **Peer Evaluations** Reference standards for promotion and tenure for required number.

- 9) **Journal Articles** Full-text copies of peer-reviewed scholarship for the most recent five-year period. For forthcoming articles, a letter of acceptance from the editor of the journal should be included along with a copy of the article.
- 10) **Journal Quality** Documentation supporting the determination of sufficiency of quality of scholarship of all peer reviewed journal articles in tabular form.
- 11) **Service Activities** Evidence of service activities to the university, academy and the greater metropolitan community for the most recent five-year period. As appropriate, the submission should also include information regarding leadership for these service activities.

A second dossier, approximately one inch in thickness, should also be submitted and arranged in the following sequence and placed in a three-ring binder with each section labeled and indexed with tabs. *The order or the materials in each section should be for the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire.* This dossier will be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **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 and II) forms arranged from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

### **Section III.**

- Summary of Student Evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using the new university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using departmental or college forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time.
- Include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations
- For tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review, peer teaching evaluations shall be included.

### **Section IV.**

- 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)
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Department Summary Recommendation form,
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson,
- Written recommendation of the CBE Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee, and
- Written recommendation of the academic Dean.

**c. Materials Required for Comprehensive Five-Year Review**

Sections I-IV of the Comprehensive Five-Year review binders will be identical to those of the promotion and tenure binders and will cover the five years under review but should also include a statement outlining goals and expected career development plans for the upcoming 5 year period. Section V must include the following:

- Final evaluation of the departmental Comprehensive Review Committee.
- Letter of evaluation from department chair
- Letter of evaluation from academic Dean
- Statement outlining goals and expected career development plans for the upcoming 5 year period

**d. Materials Required for Merit Reviews**

Faculty compiling their department merit dossier should include the following:

- Current *Curriculum Vitae*
- Completed and signed Annual Reports (AR I and II) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR I and II).
- Syllabi of courses during the year under review
- Evaluation of teaching and advising as appropriate including student evaluations and grade distributions for courses taught during the year of review
- Documentation of scholarship and service.

**e. Appended Material to the Dossier**

During the course of the evaluative process, the faculty member or an administrator participating in the process may add to the dossier information that became available after the deadline stipulated in the *Towson University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit* calendar. The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in her/his dossier or in the administrators' evaluation of the faculty member's performance.

Additive material from either the faculty member or administrators shall be included in a special section noted *Information Added*. All documentation used as part of the review process must be included in the dossier no later than the third Friday in September.

If an administrator participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's dossier, 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.

If at any level 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.

### **Appeal Procedures**

All appeals shall be made in writing. The time frame for appeals at all levels is twenty one calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter. The procedure for appeals is to be in accordance with section V of the University Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) document.

**TOWSON UNIVERSITY ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, THIRD-YEAR REVIEW, MERIT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW CALENDAR (ALL DEADLINES ARE FINAL DEADLINES)**

**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.

**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 30<sup>th</sup>**

- 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 CBE 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 15<sup>th</sup> (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 CBE 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