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All full-time tenured, tenure track, and visiting faculty are subject to this policy. The tenure decision, however, does not apply to visiting faculty.

The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty (approved 13 May 2011) (hereafter called “TU ART document”), establishes overall guidelines and is the basis for the interpretation of these procedures. Additional guides for interpretive questions are the AAUP Professional and Ethical Standards and AACSB Personnel Standards. The TU ART document, along with the College of Business and Economics Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Procedures and Standards (hereafter called “CBE PTRM document”) shall guide decisions relative to promotion, tenure/reappointment and merit and shall serve as the source for determining and interpretation of faculty conduct.

Revisions to the MKTG PTRM document are to be approved by the CBE PTRM Committee and the Dean of the College prior to submission to the University PTRM Committee. Revisions shall be submitted to the CBE PTRM Committee by the first Friday in December. 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.

This document describes the detailed standards, procedures, and processes used by the Department of Marketing in all activities of the Merit, Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure Process.

Any changes to the MKTG PTRM document shall only be effective if approved in writing by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department.

I. STATEMENT OF MISSION

The Tenure Committee has as its mission the guiding and nurturing of tenured and tenure-track faculty in their professional growth and in the accomplishment of their promotion and tenure goals while at the same time enhancing the reputation and stature of both the faculty member and the department within the College of Business and Economics (CBE), the University community, and profession. To fulfill that mission, the Tenure Committee shall apply standards that encourage long-term faculty growth and development and shall apply procedures consistent with the TU ART and CBE PTRM documents, which provide guidance to colleagues as they seek to accomplish their individual and the Department’s promotion and tenure goals.

II. COMPOSITION AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMITTEES

A. TENURE COMMITTEE

1) All tenured members of the faculty are members of the Tenure Committee, including those in the final year of their probationary period and who have been approved by the University for tenure effective the following fall semester.
2) The function of Tenure Committee is to decide whether an eligible member of the departmental faculty will be recommended for tenure, reappointment and/or merit.

3) At the beginning of each school year, the Tenure Committee will elect a chairperson. The chairperson will organize and schedule deliberations related to tenure, reappointment, first/third/fifth year review and merit in accordance with the published PTRM schedule published in the TU ART document.

4) The Marketing Department Chair will serve as a non-voting member of the Tenure Committee.

5) A quorum will consist of 2/3rds of members of the Tenure Committee who are present on campus that semester. Committee members on sabbatical or other leave will have full voting rights at meetings they can and choose to attend.

B. RANK COMMITTEES

1) Rank Committees are composed of the tenured and tenure track members of the department who hold rank higher than the person to be evaluated and who have served at least three (3) years at the university regardless of tenure status.

2) The function of Rank Committee(s) is to decide whether an eligible member of the department faculty will be recommended for rank advancement. Rank Committees are also responsible for fifth-year review.

3) The Tenure Committee shall supervise the formation of rank committees as required.

4) Each Rank Committee shall select a chairperson who will schedule proceedings, conduct the meeting, and prepare recommendations to the CBE PTRM committee in accordance with the TU ART document and CBE PTRM document and the published PTRM schedule.

5) The Marketing Department Chair will serve as a non-voting member of Rank Committee(s).

6) A quorum will consist of 2/3rds of the members of the Rank Committee who are present on campus that semester. Committee members on sabbatical or other leave will have full voting rights at meetings they can and choose to attend.

C. ALTERNATES AND VACANCIES

1) If three qualified faculty are not available in the department, as required by University regulations and specified in the TU ART document, the CBE
PTRM Committee will appoint faculty from outside the department to serve as Tenure and/or Rank Committee members.

2) If necessary, 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 tenure and/or promotion. 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.

D. VOTING PROCEDURES

1) During meetings of the Tenure and Rank Committees, subject to the quorum conditions above, a vote shall be taken. This vote shall be considered final if a majority of the members present for the deliberations agree. There will be no tie votes.

2) All votes shall follow the procedures specified in the CBE PTRM document. 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.

3) Tenure and Rank Committee members are called to a meeting which does not conflict with any university obligations. When a faculty member is eligible for tenure, the tenure decision will be made prior to any rank deliberations.

4) The Chair of the Tenure Committee should provide the CBE PTRM Chair with a summary spreadsheet report that includes the following information:

   a) A list of names of all faculty candidates recommended for tenure
   b) A list of names of all faculty candidates recommended for promotion by professorial rank
   c) A list of all faculty members recommended for non-reappointment
   d) A list of all faculty members recommended for merit
   e) A list of all faculty members subject to comprehensive five year reviews
   f) Vote counts for all the above recommendations

E. CONFIDENTIALITY AND SECURITY

1) All matters considered by the Tenure and Rank Committees pertaining to the individual faculty member shall be held in strict confidence and may only be discussed among those members who were present. All outgoing correspondence shall be approved by that Committee.
The security of all files and for the inclusion of all documents necessary for a just decision by appellate authority is the responsibility of the chairpersons of the Tenure and Rank Committees.

III. STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL FACULTY

The Department of Marketing, in accordance with the TU ART and CBE PTRM documents, expects each faculty member to be guided by the following standards and expectations. Performance is measured in each of these areas and is the basis for all merit, promotion, reappointment, and tenure deliberations. Faculty performance in the department is evaluated on four separate, but related areas:

- Teaching Effectiveness
- Scholarly Growth
- Service to the Department, College of Business and Economics, the University, the profession, and the general community.
- Collegiality

A. TEACHING AND ADVISING

By far, the most important criterion for excellence is teaching performance. The department is committed to the goal of providing the highest quality education possible. Teaching effectiveness is measured in part by student evaluations and peer visitations. In addition, each faculty member must:

- Meet classes regularly and on time
- Hold regular office hours for the convenience of students
- Understand academic requirements of both the university and department for:
  - advising and counseling students
  - using course syllabi
  - adhering to catalog descriptions for course content
- Participate in academic advising of students
- Develop new courses and curricula as needed

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 purpose of faculty academic advising is 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).
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. Faculty shall be evaluated by students every semester, inclusive of the summer semester according to procedures established by the University and CBE.

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 third-year review, rank advancement, tenure, comprehensive fifth year review, or reappointment (see Section III.F of this document).

Remediation plan: in the event that a faculty member has consistently unsatisfactory student or peer evaluations of instruction, the Department Chair shall develop a remediation 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.

1) Standards for Tenure and Rank Advancement to Associate Professor: Faculty applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should meet as a minimum:

a) Outstanding instruction as measured by student evaluations. Such evaluations should be commensurate with both the aggregate mean scores for the department’s full-time, tenure and tenure track faculty and among those teaching different sections of the same course. Normally, annual mean evaluation scores should be at least 4.0 for overall teaching performance in four of the most recent five-years.2

b) Effective instruction as measured by exemplary peer evaluations for each year of the most recent five-year period.

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

d) The following additional evidence may be submitted to support the application:

1 Decisions regarding tenure and rank advancement to Associate Professor will normally be made concurrently; i.e., they are mutually inclusive and no favorable recommendation will normally go forward without having satisfied both decisions.

2 Overall teaching performance ratings shall be computed as the combined weighted average of responses to all questions asked on the University’s Course and Instructor student evaluation instrument. Exceptions to the numerical criteria may be made for faculty experimenting with new or innovative teaching methods or teaching new courses.
2) **Standards for Rank Advancement to Professor:** Faculty applying for promotion to Associate Professor should meet as a minimum:

a) Excellent instruction as measured by student evaluations. Such evaluations should be commensurate with both the aggregate mean scores for the department’s full-time, tenure and tenure track faculty and among those teaching different sections of the same course. Normally, annual mean evaluation scores should be at least 4.0 for overall teaching performance in each year of the most recent five-years.

b) Effective instruction as measured by exemplary peer evaluation for the most current year of rank consideration.

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

d) The following additional evidence may be submitted to support the application:

- 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**

Growth in the university environment can take many forms including increasing knowledge in one’s field, scholarly research, and participating in professional organizations. It also includes the exercise of the methodology of one’s chosen
field of expertise that should yield tangible evidence in the form of publications and other products. The department encourages these endeavors.

Completion of an appropriate doctorate relevant to a college of business is expected. The standards for relevance are those of the AACSB as applied by the CBE PTRM Committee.

Publications are an important part of scholarly growth. They are evaluated with all other factors in merit, promotion, reappointment, and tenure decisions. Faculty with non-AACSB approved degrees may be required to publish more than usual for tenure.

All members of the department, tenured and tenure-track, are expected, at a minimum, to achieve and maintain their status of being scholarly academics (SA), as specified under AACSB Guidelines.

Consistent with the Department’s Workload Agreement only the following types of refereed publications\(^3\) (all are not of equal value) are deemed acceptable evidence of scholarly research for merit, promotion, reappointment, and tenure:

- Refereed journal article published (or forthcoming) in an academic or practitioner journal
- Refereed academic or professional conference proceedings and presentations
- Being the PI of a successful award of a substantial external grant
- Scholarly book or monograph published by a major press
- Textbook or its first revision in faculty member’s teaching discipline
- Chapter in an edited, refereed volume
- Published cases (mini-cases, i.e., cases with a limited focus that typically are 3 pages or less are excluded)
- Major editorial responsibilities for a refereed journal or book of readings
- Award of a nationally recognized Fellowship

Expected scholarship standards include the following:

1) **Standards for 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:
   
   a) Three to four published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed articles in quality journals as recognized by published reputable sources\(^4\). It is the faculty

\(^3\) Consistent with AACSB guidelines, a refereed publication is defined as an intellectual contribution that is *both* peer-reviewed and publicly disseminated.

\(^4\) 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.
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 may be used to 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.

b) 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.

1) **Standards for Rank Advancement from Associate Professor to Professor:**

Faculty applying for promotion to Professor from Associate Professor should have a sustained record of conducting and reporting research with a distinction in the quality of 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:

a) Three to four published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed articles in quality journals as recognized by published reputable sources. 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 may be used to 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.

b) Other evidence of scholarship, including, but not limited to peer-reviewed published proceedings or paper presentations at academic conferences, 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 TO THE DEPARTMENT, CBE, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONS, AND GENERAL COMMUNITY**

It is expected that each faculty member will take an active role in the administration and governance of the department. It is the personal responsibility of each member of the faculty to make continuous contributions to the development of the department. It is the joint chair/faculty member responsibility to determine which areas the faculty member can most serve the department.
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.

Attendance at committee and department meetings is expected of all faculty. Committee service is defined as contributing, not merely attending meetings.

Service to the College of Business and Economics, the university, and the broader community is also expected of each faculty member. Interest and active participation on CBE committees is expected of all faculty. Interest and active participation on University committees, special University programs, and activities which promote the educational function and mission of the University, the College of Business and Economics and the Department is encouraged of all faculty.

It is expected that each faculty member will take an active role in professional activities within the discipline. The following are acceptable evidence of professional activities for merit, promotion, reappointment and tenure:

- Article reviewer for journals
- Conference discussant or session chair
- Consulting reports
- Editing cases of others
- Op-ed letters and general press pieces
- Paper reviewer for conferences
- Textbook review for publisher
- Text material – study guide, instructor’s manual
- Print, radio or television interviews relative to the faculty member’s area of expertise.

1) Standards for 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:

a) Involvement in the institution’s faculty governance structure at program, department, college, university or system levels, or serving various campus student organizations.

b) Examples of additional contributions that strengthen an application are:

- 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).

2) Standards for Rank Advancement to Professor: Faculty applying for tenure and promotion to Professor should meet as a minimum for the most recent five-year period:

a) Leadership positions and distinction in the quality of one’s services to the institution at 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).

b) Sustained involvement in the work of practitioners in one’s field (e.g. participation in regional and national societies as officers and committee members)

c) 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)

d) 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 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).

D. COLLEGIALITY

All faculty members 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.

E. OVERALL PROCEDURES

1) All procedures will be followed according to the Towson University ART Calendar.

2) The department chairperson will submit a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the committee’s recommendation.
In all decisions, the appropriate committee will review the Agreements on Faculty Workload, which are developed with the college and department missions in mind, and which reflect expectations by rank consistent with the Towson University Faculty Handbook.

As part of the yearly materials, faculty members will prepare a statement – no shorter than one-half page and no longer than one page – on their teaching effectiveness during the year under evaluation. This paragraph may contain a teaching philosophy but must include evidence of (1) teaching effectiveness and (2) orientation towards our mission as an applied business college.

The annual faculty vote on the MKTG PTRM document will be completed in time to send it to the University PTRM Committee by the date determined on the University Calendar (the second Friday in February).

Department standards will take into account the specific standards by rank as listed in the Faculty Handbook.

F. PEER VISITATION PROCEDURE

1) Who Performs

All faculty shall be visited regularly. Peer evaluations are made individually and are announced.

Non-tenured faculty are to be visited every semester by rotating members of the Tenure Committee. All tenured faculty are to be visited at least twice in the period prior to the five-year review by members of their respective rank committees. The visitation assignments are made by Tenure Committee Chairperson in consultation with the Department Chair.

2) Documentation

The evaluator must obtain, prior to the visit, any documentation deemed necessary for the evaluation. The syllabus, course outline, and any other material can be obtained from the department file or from the faculty member and be evaluated as part of the visitation process.

A one-week notification of the specified date of the impending visit is mandatory, unless mutually waived.

The evaluator observes the evaluated faculty member for a reasonable portion of the time of the class session. The evaluator completes a standard peer evaluation form, duplicates the completed form, and submits one copy to the evaluated faculty member, one copy to the MKTG PTRM file, and one copy to the department chairperson. The evaluation report
must be distributed within a reasonable time, not to exceed two weeks, after the visitation. The evaluated faculty member, at his/her option, may review these evaluations with the evaluator. The evaluation is a permanent part of the PTRM file.

3) Rebuttal

The evaluated faculty member may write a rebuttal to be included in the faculty dossier, given to the evaluator, and sent to the departmental PTRM file and department chairperson. This rebuttal may present arguments and additional information relevant to the evaluation.

IV. STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR FIRST-YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

The department chair will provide each new faculty member by the 15th of September of the academic year of initial appointment, a Statement of Standards and Expectations that will include:

1) Departmental expectations statement including any responsibilities peculiar to the new member’s particular position

2) A copy of this policy/procedure document

3) A copy of the current Towson University Faculty Handbook

4) A copy of the current College of Business and Economics’ Policy of Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit

5) A copy of the department expectations statement, signed by the faculty member, the chair person and the dean will be retained in departmental personnel files

B. MATERIALS

By the Third Friday in September, a new faculty member will turn in a PTRM dossier that includes:

1) the departmental expectation statement

2) Self-Assessment of Merit (since joining Towson University)

3) documentation of submissions, acceptances, and/or actual publications/presentations since joining Towson University

4) current resume
5) syllabi for Towson University courses
6) classroom peer evaluation (if available)
7) other information deemed relevant by the faculty member and/or committee

V. TENURE/REAPPOINTMENT

A. NOTIFICATION

By the 3rd Friday in September of the academic year preceding the academic year in which a faculty member intends to submit material for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member shall notify the Chair of the Department of his/her intention.

No more than five (5) working days following the 3rd Friday in September of the academic year in which a faculty member is to undergo tenure, promotion or a comprehensive review, the Department Chair shall notify all members of the department of those intentions and shall confirm those intentions to the Dean and the Provost.

B. CRITERIA

Tenure/reappointment decisions are made using criteria of teaching, scholarship, service and collegiality described in Section I of this document and in accordance with the TU ART and CBE PTRM documents.

C. MATERIALS

Faculty candidates applying for tenure and/or reappointment should provide the materials listed below arranged in the following sequence and placed in two three-ring binders with each section separated and indexed with tabs. 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 TU ART document 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) Current curriculum vitae.

2) Current AR (Annual Report) or CAR (Chairpersons’ Annual Report) forms for the most recent five year period or since time hired.

3) Syllabi of current courses for the most recent five-year period.

4) Evaluation, as appropriate, of teaching for the most recent five-year period.
5) Grade distributions by course for the most recent five-year period

6) Peer Evaluations.

7) 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.

8) Documentation supporting determination of sufficiency of quality of scholarship of all peer reviewed journal articles.

9) Evidence of service activities to the university, academy and the greater metropolitan community for the most recent five-year period.

10) Departmental recommendation letter, which must include a written report on the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

11) A narrative statement in which the candidate describes how he or she has met the teaching, research, and service expectations required for promotion and/or tenure as outlined in the CBE PTRM document for the most recent five-year period.

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.**

- Current 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 and 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 should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office.
- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations
1. Peer teaching evaluations

Section IV.

2. Summary statement describing the correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

Section V.

3. Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

4. Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Department Summary Recommendation form

5. Written recommendation of the academic chairperson,

6. Written recommendation of the CBE Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee, and

7. Written recommendation of the academic Dean.

8) 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.
D. PROCEDURES

1) All tenure decisions are to be properly documented. The Tenure Committee prepares the form which the faculty member signs as acknowledgment of notification of the tenure decision.

2) The candidate for tenure shall receive a letter in accordance with the TU ART Calendar from the Tenure Committee chairperson which shall state:

   a) The candidate received a positive departmental recommendation for tenure, or
   b) The candidate did not receive a positive recommendation for tenure and a detailed enumeration of the deficiencies in teaching, research, and/or service.

3) Tenure committee decision must be communicated in writing to the candidate within a reasonable time.

4) The candidate not receiving a positive recommendation for tenure shall be informed of his/her right to appeal in accordance with the processes described in the TU ART document. Candidates not recommended for tenure may also request a hearing before the entire tenure committee and a second vote.

5) The chairperson of the tenure committee is responsible for the security of all files and for the inclusion of all documents necessary for a just decision by appellate authority.

6) The tenure committee chairperson as well as chairpersons of other departmental committees shall originate letters of service for committee members when requested by the department chair. Copies of the letters must be given to the candidate and the letters are part of the evaluation of department members for merit, promotion, reappointment, and tenure.

7) Attendance at meetings of the tenure committees is necessary for prompt and just decisions. Absence, though sometimes unavoidable, taints the importance of the faculty member’s comments.

VI. RANK ADVANCEMENT

A. NOTIFICATION

By the 3rd Friday in September of the academic year preceding the academic year in which a faculty member intends to submit material for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member shall notify the Chair of the Department of his/her intention.

No more than five (5) working days following the 3rd Friday in September of the academic year proceeding the academic year in which a faculty member is to undergo tenure, promotion or a comprehensive review, the Department Chair shall notify all
members of the department of those intentions and shall confirm those intentions to the Dean and the Provost.

B. CRITERIA

Every faculty member who has satisfied the requirements of the current rank will be evaluated for promotion in accordance with the TU ART and CBE PTRM documents. Exemplary performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and collegiality as outlined in Section II of this document is expected of candidates for promotion.

C. MATERIALS

Materials Required for Promotion will be identical to those required for tenure/reappointment (see Section V.C. of this document).

D. PROCEDURES

1) The candidate not receiving a positive recommendation for promotion shall be informed of his/her right to appeal in accordance with the processes described in the TU ART document. Candidates may also request a hearing before the entire committee and a second vote.

2) The chairperson of the Rank Committees is responsible for the security of all files and for the inclusion of all documents necessary for a just decision by appellate authority. A detailed summary of tenure and rank decisions with complete justification must be included in the materials transmitted to the CBE PTRM committee.

3) Attendance at meetings of the rank committees is necessary for prompt and just decisions. Absence, though sometimes unavoidable, taints the importance of the faculty member comments.

VII. THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

A. CRITERIA

At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate’s third year at Towson University, the Tenure Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate’s profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary.

Department Tenure Committee evaluations of a candidate’s interim progress will become part of the faculty member’s file at the department level and shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the Provost.
B. MATERIALS

Faculty compiling their third-year review dossier should include the following materials in the following order:

1) Current Curriculum Vitae

2) Completed and signed Annual Reports (AR I and II) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR I and II).

3) Syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years

4) Evaluation of teaching and advising as appropriate including student evaluations and grade distributions for the previous two (2) years

5) Documentation of scholarship and service.

6) Peer/chairperson’s evaluation(s) of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year, signed by faculty member and evaluator.

7) 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

C. PROCEDURES

1) The Third Review will follow the dates of an Annual Review in the TU ART document. All documentation is due to the chair of the department by the third Friday in January

2) The Tenure Committee will evaluate the materials and prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service and other relevant criteria. This statement must:

   a) include an indication of whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and
   b) must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

3) The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:

   a) Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
   b) Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by
the department. This ranking indicates that the department has determined that
progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements are needed.

c) **Not satisfactory progress.** This evaluation requires change by the faculty
across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on
this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

4) Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the
department chair and the department Tenure Committee chair no later than the
first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the dean.

5) If a faculty member’s mandatory tenure-review year is prior to the sixth year of
continuous, full-time service, the standard Annual Review by the department may
be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide
more extensive feedback to the candidate.

VIII. **FIVE-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

A. **CALENDAR**

The Five-Year Comprehensive Review will follow the dates of an Annual Review in
the TU ART document.

B. **PROCEDURES**

Each tenured faculty member will have a Five-Year Comprehensive Review
conducted by the Rank Committee and subject to the procedures specified in the TU
ART Document and the CBE PTRM Document.

C. **MATERIALS**

Sections I-IV of the Comprehensive Five-Year review binders will be identical to
those of the promotion and tenure binders (see Section V.C.) and will cover the
five years under review. In addition, Section V must include the following:

a) Final evaluation of the departmental Comprehensive Review Committee.
b) Letter of evaluation from department chair
c) Letter of evaluation from academic dean
IX. MERIT

A. CRITERIA

Satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and collegiality, as described in Section I of this procedure and in accordance with the TU ART document are necessary for merit. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

1) Merit is recommended by the Tenure Committee based upon faculty performance up to the established cut-off date specified in the TU ART document. All full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty are eligible for Merit. A new tenure-track faculty member is eligible for Merit, based on the contributions made since joining Towson University. Committee members may not vote on their own merit decision. A new faculty member does not vote on the Merit decisions within the department until the faculty member has become tenured.

2) Materials Required for Merit Reviews

Faculty compiling their department merit dossier should include the following materials in the following order:

a) Current Curriculum Vitae
b) Completed and signed Annual Reports (AR I and II) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR I and II).
c) Syllabi of courses during the year under review
d) Evaluation of teaching and advising as appropriate including student evaluations and grade distributions for courses taught during the year of review
e) Documentation of scholarship and service.
f) For tenure track faculty, peer and/or chairperson’s evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

C. PROCEDURE FOR MERIT RECOMMENDATION

1) Merit decisions will be made by the Tenure Committee. Members are called to a meeting which does not conflict with any university obligations. All discussion and votes of this committee are confidential and may only be discussed among those members who were present.

2) Attending members are notified of the qualified candidates. Committee members individually review the teaching, scholarship and service for each
candidate. Committee members review the accomplishments of each
candidate, in compliance with the Guidelines for Merit Awards.

3) Subject to the quorum conditions above, a vote shall be taken. This vote shall
be considered final if a majority of the members present for the deliberations
agree. There will be no tie votes. The committee members vote for each
candidate, precluding themselves, based upon:

- Unsatisfactory
- Acceptable
- Meritorious
- Outstanding

4) All votes regarding merit taken by the Tenure Committee shall follow the
procedures specified in the CBE PTRM document.

5) All merit decisions are to be properly documented using forms specified in the
TU ART Document. The PTRM committee prepares the form which the
faculty member signs as acknowledgment of notification of the merit decision.

6) Merit recommendations are forwarded to the CBE PTRM committee for
review.

7) Challenges to the veracity of the claims and authenticity of documentation
provided by candidates should be made prior to the week of the date set for
the merit committee meeting.

D. GUIDELINES FOR MERIT AWARDS

The criteria generally promote and recognize excellence in pedagogy, scholarship
and service. The four levels of performance assign merit or no merit ratings over
the faculty member’s year-of-record. Allowances are permitted for faculty
serving in absentia and faculty with extenuating circumstances.

1) LEVEL 1: UNSATISFACTORY – (Developmental Plan Required)

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.

2) LEVEL 2: ACCEPTABLE (Performance meets expectations, but
performance is not meritorious)

A faculty member shall be deemed acceptable but shall receive no merit
award, if the faculty member is not compliant with the criteria for a
meritorious recommendation. even though the faculty member has met all
the contractual duties of employment, including:
meeting classes
preparing course syllabi
evaluating student performance through an acceptable measurable instrument
administering course evaluations
holding office hours
advising and counseling students
attending departmental meetings
adhering to written policies but has not met the criteria for a merit award

3) LEVEL 3: 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 as specified below 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.

Specific criteria are:

a) Teaching

An aggregate overall teaching performance rating of 3.85 or higher on student evaluations AND any one of the following:

- developing a new or revised teaching pedagogy
- revising course content to reflect the timeliness and appropriateness of the subject (e.g., adopted new text, introduced new cases or computer exercises, projects)
- sponsor of extracurricular programs or activities for students (e.g., independently-directed readings & research)
• presentations/seminars for continuing studies program
• teaching a new course
• attendance at a professional development workshop (e.g., new teaching methodologies, use of information technology, etc.)

b) Scholarship

Progress toward the development of a programmatic research agenda, demonstrated by one of the following:

• Receipt of an internally-funded grant or award (e.g., faculty exchange, faculty development/departmental enhancement, summer mini-grants, faculty research grants, assigned time, summer stipends).
• Receiving notice of acceptance OR having published (can count an item only one time) a peer-reviewed:
  • monograph
  • report derived from an externally funded grant or contract
  • case or casebook
  • trade-book
  • textbook revision
  • book of reading
  • one or more textbook chapters
  • conference proceedings of regional stature
  • editorially reviewed journal article
  • teaching exercises and computer software
  • book review in refereed journals
  • unpublished peer-reviewed conference presentation
• Significant manuscript development, such as:
  • revision of a working paper
  • submission of a working paper to a peer-reviewed outlet
  • collection of new data
  • development of a substantive literature review
  • presentation of a conceptual framework or methodological findings at a departmental or college workshop
  • making verifiable progress towards the doctoral degree

c) Service

• serving on two active departmental or one CBE or University committee(s)
• chairing an active departmental or CBE active committee
• publishing Op-ed letters, general press releases, newsletters, etc.
• providing service to the discipline or the larger academic community, such as serving as an ad hoc reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal or conference, being a conference session chair or discussant
• providing a public service activity in the community
• mentoring new faculty

4) LEVEL 4: 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.

a) Teaching

An aggregate overall teaching performance rating of 4.25 or higher on student evaluations OR an aggregate course evaluation of 4.125 AND one of the following:

• recipient of a department, college, or university teaching award
• teaching a graduate level course
• development of a new online course or initial conversion of a class to an online format
• submission of evidence of quality teaching. This information may be (but is not limited to):
  • evidence of student learning (student comments, projects, etc.)
  • introduction of an innovative teaching technique
  • integration of technology in the classroom

b) Scholarship

• Receiving notice of acceptance OR having published (can count an item only one time) a peer-reviewed:

  • scholarly research book published by a major international or national publisher
  • textbooks in discipline published by a major international or national publisher
  • original chapter in research/textbook within the discipline published by a major international or national publisher
  • journal articles of regional/national/international stature
  • conference proceedings of international or national stature
27

- Principal or co-investigator of an externally funded grant or contract.
- Major editorial responsibilities for a refereed journal or book of readings

c) Service

- Service on either three active department committees or two College or University Committees (inclusive of ad hoc assignments)
- Chairing either two active department committees or one College or University committee (inclusive of ad hoc assignments)
- Advising student clubs and organizations
- Engaging in activities designed to produce external support for the College University and its programs (both financial and non-financial)
- Serving on two committees at the department, college, or university level (inclusive of ad-hoc assignments) and one or more of the following:
  - working with civic or social organizations in the community
  - providing free consulting activities with local organizations/groups
  - interviewing with print, radio or television station
  - disseminating research/consulting reports to the business community
  - conducting seminars, presentations, colloquia for cohorts
  - conducting professional development seminars
  - serving as a track or session chair, discussant, or reviewer for a professional conference
  - serving as a textbook reviewer
  - serving as a reviewer for a regional/national/international journal
  - preparing text study guides, instructors manual and test banks

X. APPEALS PROCESS

Appeals of committee decisions related to Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit will be in accordance with the TU ART document and CBE PTRM document.

XI. FORMS

Forms used by the department are consistent with the requirements of the TU ART document and CBE PTRM document.
XII. SCHEDULE

The schedule used by the department is consistent with the requirements of the TU ART document and CBE PTRM 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 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 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 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 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.