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POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEES

Note to Faculty: For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy of Towson University and its appendices and the Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee.

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT

A. Psychology Department PTRM Coordinator

During a meeting to occur by the second Friday in May, the Psychology Department shall elect a Department PTRM Coordinator by simple majority vote. A faculty member must be tenured and have served at least three years at Towson University in order to be eligible to serve as Department PTRM Coordinator. The coordinator shall be responsible for coordinating and overseeing all aspects of the Psychology Department PTRM process, ensuring that the various departmental PTRM committees properly adhere to all policies and procedures. The Department PTRM Coordinator shall begin assuming his or her duties on June 1 and shall serve a three-year term.

B. Composition and Roles of Committees

1. Reappointment and Tenure Committee

The Reappointment and Tenure Committee is responsible for reappointment, third year review, and tenure decisions and shall consist of all tenured members of the Psychology department and the Department Chairperson, who shall serve as a non-voting ex officio member. Faculty members on leave, sabbatical, or faculty exchanges are eligible to vote on issues of reappointment and tenure provided that they attend all Reappointment and Tenure Committee meetings related to the candidate(s) under review.
2. Promotion Committee

The Promotion Committee is responsible for decisions about promotion and comprehensive five year reviews. Psychology Department tenured faculty who have completed at least three academic years at Towson University are eligible to serve on the Promotion Committee. The Promotion Committee shall be fixed at six members (including the Committee Chairperson), five of whom shall be elected by majority vote of the department, and the Department Chairperson, who shall serve as a non-voting ex officio member. In addition, there shall be one elected alternate member for the Promotion Committee, who shall attend all meetings and vote in place of an absent Promotion Committee member. The Promotion Committee shall have at least one voting member from the ranks of Associate professor and Full professor. A faculty member may not serve on the Promotion Committee (a) if that committee is evaluating him or her or a member of his or her immediate family, including his or her domestic partner, for Promotion or (b) if he or she will be on leave, sabbatical, or faculty exchange during the fall semester (when evaluations for promotion and Comprehensive Review occur). However, a faculty member is eligible to serve on the Promotion Committee if that committee is evaluating him or her or a member of his or her immediate family, including a domestic partner, for Comprehensive Review.

3. Clinical Evaluation Committee

The Clinical Evaluation Committee is responsible for reviewing clinical faculty. This committee will be the same as the Promotion Committee with the addition of a clinical faculty member who has been in the role of clinical faculty for more than three years (as specified in the University Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit) and who will not be evaluated by the Clinical Evaluation
Committee for that year. In the event that no clinical faculty member in
the Department of Psychology meets those requirements, a clinical faculty
member from another department (with recommendation from the
Chairperson of the other department) will be recruited by the PTRM
Coordinator.

4. Merit Committee

The Merit Committee is responsible for annual decisions about merit.
Psychology Department tenured, tenure-track, or clinical faculty who have
completed at least three academic years at Towson University are eligible
to serve on the Merit Committee. The Merit Committee shall be fixed at
six members (including the Committee Chairperson), five of whom are
voting members elected by majority vote of the department and the
Department Chairperson, who shall serve in a non-voting ex officio
capacity. Members of the Merit and Promotion Committees are typically
not the same individuals. In addition, there shall be one elected alternate
member who shall attend all meetings and vote in place of an absent Merit
Committee member. The Merit Committee shall have at least one voting
member from each of the the faculty ranks of Assistant professor,
Associate professor, and Full professor, if there are eligible faculty from
each rank.

C. Elections

All tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty in the Psychology
Department are eligible to vote for the officers and members of all PTRM
committees. Elections of PTRM Committees shall be held by the second
Friday in May. First, the tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty elect
by simple majority vote the Reappointment and Tenure Committee
Chairperson from amongst all tenured faculty.
Following the election of the Reappointment and Tenure Committee Chairperson, the tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty of the Psychology Department shall elect the Merit Committee Chairperson and Secretary from among the members of that committee from the preceding year by simple majority vote. Election of the three remaining voting members and one alternate member of the Merit Committee shall occur immediately following election of the Merit Committee Chairperson and Secretary. The persons receiving the three highest number of votes shall become voting members of the Merit Committee (insuring one person at the Associate rank, one person at the Full professor rank, and, if possible, one person at the Assistant rank), while the person receiving the fourth most votes shall serve as the alternate member of the Merit Committee. In the case of any ties, a run-off vote shall be conducted to select that (those) person(s) with the highest number of votes. The committee members shall begin assuming their duties June 1 and shall serve a one-year term. In the event that an alternate member permanently replaces a voting member of the Merit Committee at a later time (when that individual is unable to carry out his or her duties), the Psychology Department shall elect a new alternate member of that committee at the earliest possible time.

Following the election of the Merit Committee, the tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty of the Psychology Department shall elect the Promotion Committee Chairperson and Secretary from among the members of that committee from the preceding year by simple majority vote. Election of the three remaining voting members and one alternate member of the Promotion Committee shall occur immediately following election of the Promotion Committee Chairperson and Secretary. The persons receiving the three highest number of votes shall become voting members of the Promotion Committee (insuring one person at the Associate rank and one person at the Full professor rank while the person receiving the fourth most votes shall serve as the alternate member of the
Promotion Committee. In the case of any ties, a run-off vote shall be conducted to select that (those) person(s) with the highest number of votes. The committee members shall begin assuming their duties June 1 and shall serve a one year term. In the event that an alternate member permanently replaces a voting member of the Promotion Committee at a later time (when that individual is unable to carry out his or her duties), the Psychology Department shall elect a new alternate member of that committee at the earliest possible time.

II. POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEES

A. The Psychology Department PTRM committees shall evaluate candidate files in relation to the standards and expectations established by the Towson University ART policy, the criteria of the College of Liberal Arts, and the criteria of the Psychology Department.

B. Quorum: A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members.

C. Voting Procedures

Upon completion of the discussion of each candidate all votes regarding tenure or promotion shall be by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The confidential ballots shall be placed separately in a sealed envelope on which the committee chair enters the name of the faculty member being evaluated, the department name or college name, the date, and the committee chair’s signature. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Dean, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university. Separately, the results of voting shall be entered on a single sheet of paper labeled with the name of the faculty
member being evaluated, the department name or college name, and the date. Members of the committee will each sign the report to confirm their participation and the result as recorded. The committee chair shall forward this signed, dated report of the results of the vote and committee’s recommendations to the Dean. Faculty who are absent may not vote by proxy (e.g., on sabbatical, at a conference, sick). (Faculty on sabbatical may vote if they have reviewed the material and are present at the meeting). 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.

Upon completion of discussion of each candidate, all votes regarding reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive reviews shall be by confidential ballot and tallied by the committee chair. The results shall be entered on a single sheet of paper labeled with the name of the faculty member being evaluated, the department name or college name, and the date. Members of the committee will each sign the report to confirm their participation and the result as recorded. The record of the vote will be forwarded to the Dean who shall maintain these documents for three years. Faculty who are absent may not vote by proxy (e.g., on sabbatical, at a conference, sick). (Faculty on sabbatical may vote if they have reviewed material and are present at the meeting).

For the various PTRM committees to reach a favorable decision, a majority of those voting must support the granting of tenure, promotion, approval of the comprehensive review, reappointment, or merit. Because a tie vote does not constitute a majority decision, any proposal met with a tie vote fails.

D. Confidentiality

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

E. Notification of Candidates

1. Follow-up Written Notification of Positive Decision

Within seven days following any PTRM Committee’s decision, the
appropriate committee chairperson shall send the faculty member
evaluated a letter including:

(a) a statement of the relevant recommendation or decision;

(b) the committee’s final evaluation of her or him in each of the
three areas of performance (teaching, scholarship, service).

2. The faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read,
but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation.

3. Immediate Written Notification of Negative Decision

Negative decisions should be delivered in a letter in person by the
Department Chairperson (or designee) or sent by certified mail to the
faculty member’s last known address, the postmark to be within seven
business days of the decision. The letter shall include:

(a) a statement of the committee’s decision not to recommend the
candidate;

(b) the committee’s final evaluation of her or him in each of the
three areas of performance (teaching, scholarship, service): does
not meet, meets, or exceeds department expectations;

(c) a statement identifying the area(s) the committee believed was
(were) deficient enough to lead to negative decision.

The faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read,
but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation.

F. Appeal Procedures

Faculty members may appeal to the college PTRM committee negative judgments
made at the department level on questions of tenure, promotion, comprehensive
review, reappointment, and merit (“not meritorious” – see section II.H.2.i -- being the only merit judgment considered to be a negative judgment), if the appeal is on substantive grounds. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by the department committee or chair in evaluating the faculty member's performance.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The faculty member shall have 21 calendar days from the date that a negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of a certified letter to file an appeal. The appeal must clearly state in writing the grounds for the appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under consideration with any statement, evidence, or other documents believed to present a more valid perspective on performance. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the chair of the appropriate PTRM committee.

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

G. Evaluation Procedures

1. General Policies and Procedures

a. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure or comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.

b. The full evaluation portfolio shall be assembled by the individual being considered for annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review according to the guidelines described in the “Documentation & Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of the Towson University ART policy.
c. For every type of evaluation, including annual review, the faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read, but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation. However, failure to sign shall not prevent the documentation from being forwarded to the next evaluation level.

2. Annual Review for Merit

a. The Merit Committee shall annually review clinical, tenured, and tenure-track faculty for merit.

b. The department chair shall be responsible for presenting to the Merit Committee all the evaluation portfolios for all faculty members in the department.

c. The department chair shall not be a voting member of the Merit Committee.

d. The Merit Committee shall evaluate the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each candidate. The report shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The report shall be submitted to the department chair no later than the second Friday of October.

e. The department chair may prepare an independent recommendation and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

f. The merit recommendation and statement shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of the department’s chairperson statement, record of the vote count, no later than the fourth Friday of October.
g. The department chairperson shall meet with that faculty member to discuss the faculty member's annual report, the student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the department PTRM recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.

h. The Psychology Department PTRM coordinator shall forward the evaluation portfolios, the Merit Committee recommendations, and the Merit Committee vote count record to the CLA dean’s office by the second Friday in November.

i. Terminology Used in Evaluation of Faculty Performance. There are three (3) categories of merit:

   (i) **Not Meritorious**: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.

   (ii) **Satisfactory** (Base Merit): Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.

   (iii) **Excellent** (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.

3. Reappointment: First Year Faculty

   a. The Reappointment and Tenure Committee shall evaluate each new faculty member’s (tenure-track and clinical faculty) first semester performance and make a recommendation for reappointment.

   b. This evaluation shall be conducted and completed by the third Friday in January.
c. Each faculty member shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during his/her first semester. The evaluation portfolio must include the Standards and Expectations of New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form, which must be finalized with the department chairperson by the third Friday in September. In addition, the evaluation portfolio must include peer evaluations of teaching, documentation of scholarship and service activities, syllabi of current courses, and a reflective summary of teaching, scholarship, and service.

d. The faculty member shall submit the evaluation portfolio to the department chair no later than the second Friday of December.

e. The Reappointment and Tenure committee shall review the evaluation portfolio and shall prepare a written report, with vote count. The recommendation for reappointment shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The recommendation shall be submitted to the department chair by the first Friday in January.

f. The department chair may prepare an independent recommendation on reappointment and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the third Friday in January.

g. The recommendation shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member and to the CLA Dean, inclusive of the department chairperson’s recommendation and a record of the vote count no later than the third Friday in January. Communication of negative recommendations shall follow the procedures outlined in section II.F.3 of this document.
4. Reappointment: Second Year Faculty and Annual Reappointment of Clinical Faculty

   a. The Psychology Department follows the procedures for the reappointment of second-year faculty laid out in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, section III.D.3.a-g.

   b. Evaluation procedures for annual reappointment for Clinical Faculty after their first-year of appointment shall be the same as the evaluation procedures for reappointment of second-year faculty set forth in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, section III.D.3.a-g., except that the Clinical Evaluation Committee shall be substituted for the Reappointment and Tenure Committee. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will follow the Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit.

5. Reappointment of third through fifth year faculty

   a. USM Policy II-1.00 Section I.C.3. provides that the appointments of faculty entering the third through fifth years of service will automatically renew for one additional year unless notice of non-reappointment is provided by August 1 prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service as applicable.

6. Third-Year Review

   a. 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 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. Reappointment and 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 CLA dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the Provost.

b. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the Reappointment and Tenure committee as outlined in the section “Documentation and Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of The Towson University ART policy.

c. The Reappointment and 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:

(i) must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is likely to lead towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and

(ii) must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:

(i) **Superior** progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.

(ii) **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 may be needed.
(iii) Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuation on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

e. All documentation is due to the chair of the department by the third Friday in January.

f. Feedback shall be in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the Psychology Department PTRM Coordinator or designee no later than the first Friday in March. The faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read, but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation. The written report will be shared with the dean.

7. Tenure

a. The Reappointment and Tenure Committee shall review evaluation portfolios for tenure and shall prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. Recommendations should be submitted to the department chair by the second Friday in October. In cases where: 1) an evaluation portfolio is reviewed for both tenure and promotion during the same year, and 2) the Reappointment and Tenure Committee and the Promotion Committee both reach positive decisions, the written report can be prepared in collaboration with the Promotion Committee.

b. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for tenure and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
8. Promotion

a. The Promotion Committee shall review evaluation portfolios for promotion and shall prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. Recommendations should be submitted to the department chair by the second Friday in October. In cases where: 1) an evaluation portfolio is reviewed for both tenure and promotion during the same year, and 2) the Reappointment and Tenure Committee and the Promotion Committee both reach positive decisions, the written report can be prepared in collaboration with the Reappointment and Tenure Committee.

b. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will review portfolios for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor. The Committee shall prepare a written report with recommendations and vote count. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching, advising, scholarship, administrative accomplishment, and service. Recommendations should be submitted to the department chair by the second Friday in October.
c. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for promotion and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

d. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson’s statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October. Communication of negative recommendations shall follow the procedures outlined in section II.F.3 of this document.

e. The Psychology Department PTRM Coordinator shall forward the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record to the dean’s office by the second Friday in November.

9. Three Year Appointment for Clinical Faculty

a. Upon request by the Clinical Faculty member, Clinical Faculty at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and higher may be considered for a three-year contract. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will follow procedures set forth in the Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit.

10. Comprehensive Five-Year Review (Post-tenure Review)

a. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years.

b. The Promotion Committee shall review the evaluation portfolios of faculty members standing for their Comprehensive Five-Year Review and prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count.
There are two options for the voting: meets expectations or does not meet expectations. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service, and should be submitted to the department chairperson by the second Friday in October.

c. The chair of the department, in consultation with the CLA dean shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the department. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of his/her comprehensive review cycle with an intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the CLA dean.

d. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

e. The faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Promotion Committee, the written evaluation of the department chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the PTRM Coordinator to the CLA dean’s office by the second Friday in November. Communication of negative recommendations shall follow the procedures outlined in section II.F.3 of this document.

f. A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member’s failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by
the faculty member and approved by the chair and the dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair and dean. The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following its approval.

H. Review and Changes to Document.

Every three years after the first approval of this document, the Psychology Department as a whole will review this document. Any changes will be approved by a majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty and forwarded to the college PTRM committee for approval.

III. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.

B. Guided by the chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as s/he deems appropriate in her/his narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

C. All material and documentation used in making recommendations for the annual review process (which includes the Annual Review, reappointment, third-year review, merit consideration, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review) shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role and expectations of faculty in the university, as well as the faculty member’s college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process.
D. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder (or submitted as an electronic portfolio if the University creates an approved format for doing so). Binders should be organized using dividers with tabs to identify the sections (electronic portfolios should be organized with similar clarity, based on University standards once developed and using the technologies available). Although the faculty member has freedom to include materials deemed pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
   a. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson’s Annual Report I & II) forms.
   b. current curriculum vitae. The curriculum vitae should summarize the candidate's education, teaching, and professional employment; specific courses taught at Towson; honors and grants; scholarly publications; professional presentations, associations, and activities; and record of service to the university, the profession, and the community.
   c. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review.
   d. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
      (i) student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.
grade distributions for courses tabulated by the
office of the department chairperson or an
administrative entity other than the faculty member.

documentation of scholarship (Clinical Faculty:
scholarship/administrative ability) and service. This
documentation should include a copy of any publication,
review, presentation, grant application, or other item
identified by the faculty member as part of the faculty
member's scholarly activity.

Large items, such as books that cannot be secured in
a binder, may be submitted separately. If there is more than
one such item for a faculty member, all such items
pertaining to that faculty member should be enclosed in a
manila envelope or a box of suitable size and the envelope
or box labeled with the name of the faculty member and a
list of its contents. All such items submitted shall be
considered part of the evaluation portfolio.

Faculty who wish to submit work created digitally
as part of their portfolio should, whenever possible, include
in their file in printed form all of the work product or
substantial examples conveying its substance and quality.
Digital addresses of web pages, blogs, sites, or other
locations may be included but there can be no expectation
that reviewers will visit these sites as a required part of the
process. Materials that cannot be printed, such as films,
may be included on a DVD in the portfolio within a
protective binder sleeve or as an accompanying item
comparable to books as above.

Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track
and clinical faculty must include the following documents:
3. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
   a. all materials listed above in D.1 and D.2 from the faculty member’s date of hire or last promotion.
   b. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.

4. If confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

5. If the faculty member or the chairperson participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to his/her file rebutting or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled —Information Added. All documentation used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than November 30.

6. If the chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, other
than his/her evaluation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but will be forwarded under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member’s notification shall be maintained. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

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

Section I

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

Section II

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

Section III
Faculty using university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using departmental forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time.

- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- Peer teaching evaluations.

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

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

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

F. Student evaluation forms used in the College of Liberal Arts shall ordinarily be the University evaluation forms tabulated by the Office of Assessment.
G. Peer evaluations are a required part of the review process. The procedures and guidelines to be utilized when evaluating the teaching of Psychology Faculty are presented in Appendix B.

H. Upon request of the faculty member, external evaluations may be conducted as part of a Psychology faculty member's tenure and/or promotion evaluation. The evaluation must comply with University policy on external evaluations. Faculty must submit such requests in writing to both the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the Psychology Department PTRM Committee by no later than February 1st of the calendar year in which the tenure and/or promotion evaluation will occur.

IV. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

A. As specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy, the standards and expectations in this Psychology Department PTRM document pertain to the evaluation processes associated with annual reviews, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review.

B. All faculty are responsible for meeting University standards and expectations, including but not limited to those listed in this section. Meeting the general expectations specified below is essential for a faculty member's performance to be judged satisfactory in an annual review or, cumulatively, across a longer period of evaluation.

1. A faculty member shall fulfill his/her workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service; shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours; and shall meet all classes as scheduled.
2. A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship. —Collegiality and academic citizenship refer to the role and responsibility of faculty in shared decision making through open and fair processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on matters that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background, expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and administrators.

3. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance. Faculty members must make themselves available to participate in the work of the department, of assigned committees, or of college and university processes in which faculty play an essential part (admissions activities and graduation could stand as examples of such wider processes).

4. A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of the Annual Review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTRLM calendar.
C. The evaluation of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal advising. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom. Teaching as a sphere of evaluation includes the use of technology, the development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, attention to pedagogy connected with the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It includes as well service as an assigned academic advisor, advising through student groups, and informal advising of departmental majors or students in any professional context.

D. The evaluation of teaching and advising shall be based on materials provided in the evaluation portfolio. The assessment of teaching and advising effectiveness will give close attention to (1) the faculty member's self-evaluation in the reflective statements included in the portfolio, (2) syllabi and other teaching materials presented by the faculty member, (3) student evaluations, (4) peer evaluations, (5) the evaluation of student learning outcomes for the faculty member’s courses where possible, (6) the faculty member’s presentation of evidence of effective advising, , and (7) the judgment of faculty teaching performance made by prior evaluating bodies (e.g. Reappointment & Tenure Committee).

1. Self-evaluation and course materials

   a. The faculty member’s evaluation of his/her own teaching effectiveness will include a narrative statement covering teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching strategies and efficacy. This statement should
highlight any evidence in the materials of the portfolio to
which the faculty member wishes to call attention and
should contain an interpretation of student, peer, and chair
evaluations as appropriate.

b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are
parts of the required Annual Review reports and are
included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey
to students a clear overview of course objectives,
requirements, and expectations and should contain those
elements as specified for course syllabi in university policy.

c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios
assessment outcomes related directly to the faculty
member’s work or copies of assignments that demonstrate
creativity, high expectations, community engagement,
effective educational practices, or other qualities the faculty
member wishes to place in consideration.

d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental
averages, shall be made available to faculty members for
review and shall be included in the faculty member’s
portfolio. These reports should be considered in relation to
standards expressed in departmental or college objectives,
the faculty member’s self-evaluation, course syllabi, and
the evaluations of students and peers.

2. Evaluation of teaching by students
a. Student evaluations of instruction, both the quantitative
summaries and the qualitative statements by students, are a
required part of the evaluation of faculty.
b. Student evaluation reports shall be tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.

c. Tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, online, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms. However, it does not include individual-level instruction like thesis, independent investigations, and proctoring courses.

3. Evaluation of teaching by peers

a. Classroom or teaching site visits are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the faculty member is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, tenure, and five-year comprehensive review.

b. The procedures and guidelines to be utilized when evaluating the teaching of tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty in the Psychology Department are presented in Appendix B.

c. The department PTRM Coordinator in conjunction with the Assistant Chair of the Psychology Department will arrange the peer evaluations to ensure that all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty have the required number of peer evaluations.

d. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.

4. Evaluation of advising
a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.

b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one’s class-teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, serving on graduate research committees, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.

c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member’s presentation of evidence of effective advising could include logs of advising appointments, notable instances of advising contributions or innovations, a list of the number of letters of recommendation written on behalf of students, research mentoring beyond the expectations of course supervision, or student evaluations of advising.

E. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and of continuing professional development and demonstrated scholarly growth. Scholarship may take many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration, or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field, as
affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly materials in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

For Clinical Faculty, instead of traditional scholarship, the Clinical Faculty evaluation will be based on demonstrated administrative ability/accomplishments including such things as proficiency in enhancing/developing administrative procedures to advance the department, leadership associated with departmental initiatives, and community engagement and collaboration.

1. The major forms of scholarship may be defined as follows:
   a) Scholarship of Application – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university,
   b) Scholarship of Discovery – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake,
   c) Scholarship of Integration – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines,
   d) Scholarship of Teaching – the systematic examination of strategies used to facilitate and evaluate student learning.

2. The quality and value of the scholarship shall be subject to the professional judgment of the members of the Psychology PTRM committees, who may consider such things as the audience of the journals or conferences, the rigor of the peer review process, reviews, scholarly accomplishment, or other outside evidence of the quality of the work.

3. Whatever type(s) of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or
promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member’s completed work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues. A faculty member’s portfolio sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion should demonstrate a pattern of completed work consistent with the nature of the faculty member’s appointment.

4. Scholarly work accepted for delivery at conferences external to the University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions, and similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers may all provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development. Such scholarly work may mark progress toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may not substitute for the pattern of completed work required in section 3 above in the evaluation for tenure or promotion.

5. Reports on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, papers presented to colleagues, collection and analysis of data or information for a community purpose, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the Psychology PTRM committees, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews, although they may not substitute for the evidence required in section 3 above in the evaluation for tenure or promotion.
The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions consistent with the proportion of time allocated for service in the faculty member's workload agreements. To the extent possible, evaluation should consider the extent and quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a position held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for judgment of its extent and its relation to the mission of the university.

1. University service involves substantive participation in the shared governance activities of the department, college, and university.

2. Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local, regional, national, or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one’s academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university’s mission.

3. Professional service includes activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national, or global) in which one’s expertise is applied and which advance the university’s mission.

G. Chairs, who are responsible for supervising faculty, shall be evaluated in the additional category of leadership. Chair activities are reported as part of their annual review on the CAR form and constitute a minimum of fifty percent of the chair's workload by university policy. Departments shall recognize in their evaluation of chairs a distribution of responsibilities and expectations consistent with the chair's workload agreements. Evaluators will recognize that chair responsibilities may involve personnel matters or
dealings with students governed by confidentiality, as well as other activities not readily visible to colleagues; such matters may not be reported or documented in detail. Evaluators will nevertheless make judgments about the consistency, creativity, and fairness with which a chair has carried out the responsibilities of leadership, consistent with university policies and the responsibilities defined for the chair. Program directors who supervise faculty and who prepare annual reports on their activities may also be evaluated for leadership consistent with the proportion of their time committed to such work under their workload agreements.

H. The expectations for reappointment are as follows:

1. The tenure-track or clinical faculty member meets departmental standards and expectations or shows potential for future improvement.

2. If the tenure-track faculty member does not show satisfactory progress towards tenure or the clinical faculty member does not meet departmental standards and expectations or show potential for future improvement, he or she shall be given the reasons in writing.

I. The expectations for advancement to tenure are as follows:

1. The tenure-track faculty member must, in the judgment of the members of the Reappointment and Tenure Committee, have met the Psychology Department’s standards and expectations (IV above), including teaching and advising effectiveness consistent with department norms, sustained and substantial scholarly
activity, and service to the University and the department in appropriate ways.

J. The expectations for promotion to Associate Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, Professor, or Clinical Professor in the Psychology Department shall include the following.

1. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University's mission. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching and effectiveness in advising, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards of dissemination and validation, and shown competence to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research when applicable. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service, as defined in section F above.

2. Assistant and Associate Clinical Professors are eligible for review for promotion. The minimum number of years in rank is six years full-time University teaching for Associate Clinical Professors and 10 years full-time University teaching for Clinical Professors. Evaluation procedures for promotion are the same as those set forth in section III.D.6.a-c, g-o, q-r of Appendix 3 to the ART Policy, with the following exceptions: a.) References to tenure shall not apply, b.) The Clinical Evaluation Committee shall be
3. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. The faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher and advisor during the period since promotion to Associate Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching and advising included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Professor at least equivalent to the pattern of completed work meeting the standards of dissemination and validation expected for the prior rank. The scholarly work as a whole should reflect a degree of cohesion consistent with establishing a sound scholarly reputation. The faculty member shall have presented evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession in the period after promotion to Associate professor.

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

K. Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. This evaluation includes consideration of the allocation of time in each area (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service) designated on a faculty member’s Annual Review document.

There are three (3) categories of merit.

1. Satisfactory (Base Merit) – meeting all of these standards will normally be considered justification for the award of Satisfactory (Base Merit).

   a. Teaching and advising.

      i. The faculty member’s evaluation of his/her own teaching and advising effectiveness will include a narrative statement indicating the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching and advising strategies and efficacy. The statement should contain an interpretation of student and peer evaluations, especially in cases where ratings are below departmental averages.

      ii. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation should include a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and contain all elements specified for course syllabi in university policy.
iii. Grade distribution reports shall be included.

iv. Student evaluations of teaching, including on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms that indicate acceptable evaluations considering the nature and characteristics of the course, the grade distribution reports for the course, and the narrative comments of the faculty member regarding the course. Narrative statements should include reflection on ratings, including consideration of strategies to improve teaching when ratings suggest such improvement is warranted.

v. A minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching shall be conducted every five years that indicate satisfactory performance in teaching.

iv. The faculty academic advisor should be available to assist students with academic and/or professional questions and provide students with information about programs, policies and procedures. Advising may also include advising student groups, student research not considered a part of the normal course load, or advising in other professional contexts. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included.

b. Scholarship

i. The faculty member’s performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
ii. The faculty member’s portfolio provides evidence of scholarship that meets the standards for satisfactory performance as indicated by any of the following:

1. submitting a professional article to a refereed journal, book chapter or book proposal;

2. submitting a significant external grant or contract;

3. conducting a presentation at a refereed conference;

4. presenting an invited professional talk in one’s area of expertise that is based on a synthesis of research,

5. publishing a paper in a newsletter, magazine or other edited periodical in one’s area of expertise that is based on a synthesis of research,

6. serving as a reviewer for a journal (this may alternatively be considered as service);

7. demonstrating evidence of a pattern of conscientious reading of the research in psychology

c. Service may include the following:

i. Demonstration of involvement in faculty governance through active membership on one or more committees at the departmental, college, and/or University level. The faculty member should clarify in the appropriate narrative the responsibilities of the committee service both in
ii. Service as Program Director of either a graduate or undergraduate program. The faculty member should indicate the degree to which assigned time is granted for this service.

iii. Active supervision of student thesis committees.

iv. Service as either a reviewer or editor for a peer-reviewed publication in the discipline of Psychology (alternatively, these activities may be used as evidence of scholarly activity).

v. Service as the principal investigator on a grant in the absence of assigned time or compensation for this service.

vi. Civic service including participation in the larger community (local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university's mission.

vii. Professional service including activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance the university's mission.

2. Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit) – Performance merit may be given to faculty evaluated as exhibiting excellence in one or more areas of evaluation (i.e. teaching and advising, scholarship, service, and, in the case of the Chair, leadership), consistent with the limitations on the percentages of faculty within
a department who can receive Base Merit plus one Performance Merit. Faculty who are evaluated as Excellent are characterized by the following:

a. Teaching and advising.

i. The faculty member’s evaluation of his/her own teaching and advising effectiveness will include a narrative statement indicating the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching and advising strategies and efficacy. This narrative should also include the development of new courses, as appropriate, that serve the needs of the department, college and/or university.

ii. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation should include a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and contain all elements specified for course syllabi in university policy. Faculty should include evidence in the form of assessment outcomes related to the faculty members’ work or copies of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations, community engagement, or effective educational practices.

iii. Grade distribution reports are considered in relation to the faculty member’s self-evaluation, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations.

iv. Student evaluations of teaching, including on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms that indicate superior evaluations considering the nature and
characteristics of the course, the grade distribution reports for the course, and the narrative comments of the faculty member regarding the course. The narrative statements might describe development and implementation of specific strategies for continual enhancement of courses to reflect current knowledge related to those courses.

v. Peer evaluations of teaching indicate excellent classroom performance; comprehensive syllabi; and incorporation of instructional technology, appropriate and effective testing, and evaluation and grading of students.

vi. The faculty academic advisor should be available to assist students with academic and/or professional questions and provide students with information about programs, policies and procedures. Advising should also include advising student groups, student research not a part of the normal course load, and/or advising in other professional contexts. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included.

b. Scholarship

i. The faculty member’s portfolio provides evidence of excellence in scholarship as evidenced by:

1. publishing a scholarly book in the year under merit review;

2. publishing multiple articles in peer reviewed journals;
3. publishing a significant article in a peer-reviewed journal;
4. obtaining a significant external grant or contract; and/or serving as editor or associate editor of a journal (alternatively this may be considered as service)

ii. Faculty are encouraged to provide data on the significance of their research such as the impact factor or acceptance rate of journals in which they have been published, or other data that would substantiate the significance of their scholarship.

c. Service
i. Demonstration of involvement in faculty governance either through a leadership role on an active committee or through membership on a variety of committees at the departmental, college, University and/or profession/civic level.

ii. The faculty member should clarify in the appropriate narrative the responsibilities of the service both in terms of frequency of meetings as well as number of hours of required work.

3. Not Meritorious – Faculty member’s failure to meet any of the standards noted in I.1. may be a basis for not meeting expectations.

V. CALENDAR

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

Approved by the Psychology Department 12/15/2015
Appendix A

Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar

The first Friday in May
Department and college PTRM committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.
A. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chairperson and dean.
B. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.

August 1 (USM mandated)
Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member’s appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a of Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

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

The Second Friday in September
University PTRM committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee’s Member-at-large of the committee members and chairperson for the academic year.

The Third Friday in September
A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
B. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department’s PTRM committee (if necessary).
C. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in September
Department chairperson notifies department faculty, dean, and Provost of any department faculty member’s intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year. The Second Friday in October
Department PTRM committee’s reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.
B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.
The Fourth Friday in October
A. Department chairperson’s written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
B. The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
C. The department PTRM committee’s report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson’s evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

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

November 30th
A. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.
B. The dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s home.

The First Friday in December
Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have been made.

The Second Friday in December
First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson.

December 15th (USM mandated date)
Tenure-track faculty in the second academic year of service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

The First Friday in January
A. The department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
B. The college PTRM committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

The Third Friday in January
A. The dean’s written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.
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.
Appendix B – Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Psychology Department Policies and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit

I. This appendix is likely to undergo revision so faculty should be advised to use the most recent form available on our department website. The following procedures and guidelines will be utilized when evaluating the teaching of Psychology Faculty:

A. Tenured members of the department will be observed in class while teaching two times every five years, and the observations will be conducted by other tenured or tenure-track members of the department who have completed at least three full academic years of teaching in the Psychology Department.

B. Untenured tenure-track members of the department will be observed in class while teaching twice each year for years one and two and once each year for years three through five. These observations will be completed by tenured faculty. In year three the observation will take place in the fall semester so that the peer review can be included in the third year review materials.

C. Each observing faculty member will provide a Written Summary of his/her observations to the faculty member. The summary will address the following (not all areas necessarily will be applicable):

1. Classroom Evaluation

   a. Content

   Assess the degree to which the instructor successfully presented the content of the class. This analysis might address the extent to which the faculty presented ideas and concepts clearly and with specificity, encouraged critical thinking, bridged theory and application, etc.

   b. Methods of Instruction

   Assess the instructor’s methods of instruction. This analysis might address how well the instructor described the organization of the class, included
examples to illustrate key concepts, made use of visual aids that could be
understood, effectively utilized technology such as Blackboard, provided
outlines and/or handouts, presented informative videos or computerized
instruction, concluded by summarizing main ideas, etc.

c. Classroom Environment

Assess the quality of the classroom environment. This analysis might
address the extent to which the instructor encouraged student engagement,
incorporated student responses in the class discussions, maintained good
rapport with students, etc.

2. Strengths and Constructive Feedback

Describe the instructor’s strengths and provide any constructive feedback.
Peer evaluations should include both strengths and at least one suggestion
for course enhancement. Provide evidence with examples.

3. Course Planning and Assignment Evaluation

a. Evaluate the syllabi, textbook and/or readings, assignments, and/or
special projects, examinations, student feedback and grading methods.

b. On-line courses are assessed in reference to the Quality Matters
document from OTS.

II. The Written Summary will be sent to the observed faculty, and the observer and the
observed will review and discuss the summary. The observed faculty member will sign
the Written Summary indicating the observed has read the summary. The observed
faculty member may write a response to be attached to the observation.

III. The Written Summary will be taken into consideration in the evaluation of teaching
by the appropriate PTRM committees during deliberations.

IV. Any tenured faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion to full professor
must request to be observed in the previous academic year.