

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND MERIT DOCUMENT
Revised February 2016**

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. PRESUMPTIONS GOVERNING DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT DECISIONS	<u>2</u>
II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, CLINICAL EVALUATION, AND MERIT COMMITTEES	<u>2</u>
A. The Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee	<u>2</u>
B. The Clinical Evaluation Committee	<u>3</u>
C. The Merit Committee	<u>3</u>
III. STANDARDS, CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES	<u>4</u>
A. Reference to University ART	<u>4</u>
B. University standards and expectations	<u>4</u>
C. Evaluation of teaching: Expectations	<u>5</u>
D. Evaluation of teaching: The Portfolio	<u>5</u>
E. Evaluation of scholarship	<u>7</u>
F. Evaluation of service	<u>8</u>
G. Evaluation of department chair	<u>8</u>
H. Annual Review for Merit	<u>9</u>
I. Reappointment of Tenure-track Faculty	<u>13</u>
J. Third-Year Review of Tenure-track Faculty	<u>15</u>
K. Tenure and/or Promotion of Tenure-track Faculty	<u>16</u>
L. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenure-Track faculty	<u>18</u>
M. Reappointment and Promotion of Clinical Faculty	<u>19</u>
IV. CALENDAR	<u>24</u>
Appendix: Peer Teaching Evaluations	<u>25</u>

Note to Faculty: For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) of Towson University and its appendices (in particular, Appendix 3, "Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluations: Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review"), as well as the PTRM Policies and Procedures document of the College of Liberal Arts (CLA).

I. PRESUMPTIONS GOVERNING DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT DECISIONS.

- A. The promotion and tenure policies and procedures of the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Department follow those established in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) of Faculty (02-01.00) and are in accordance with the Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit (PTRM) Committee.
- B. Faculty members are responsible for providing the departmental Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment Committee and the Merit Committee with any and all required forms and other materials in support of their candidacy for promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit in a timely and professional manner. Failure to do so is sufficient cause for the Committee to deny promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit.
- C. Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice faculty are defined as those holding full-time tenured, tenure-track, or clinical appointments in the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Department, or joint tenured or tenure-track appointments with another department or in an administrative position.
- D. Review and Changes to Document: Every three years after the first approval of this document, the Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice Department as a whole will review this document. Any changes must be approved by a majority of the tenure line faculty and forwarded to the college PTRM committee for approval.

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, CLINICAL EVALUATION, AND MERIT COMMITTEES

- A. The Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee** shall consist of all faculty members in the department with tenure at the time of committee deliberations, and membership on this committee is restricted to tenured faculty members. The Departmental Chair serves ex officio and does not vote.
 - 1. Each year, by the first Friday in May, the PTR Committee must vote on a Chair of the committee. Whenever the Chair of the PTR Committee is absent, the most senior member of the remaining committee serves in his or her place.

The Chair of the PTR Committee will have the following responsibilities:

- a. To call and conduct meetings of the PTR Committee. The Chair will participate in all deliberations of the Committee, except when one's own record is being reviewed. The Chair will vote on all tenure decisions. The Chair will vote on promotion decisions for colleagues of academic rank junior to one's own.
 - b. To provide reasonable counsel to faculty members in gathering materials, preparing forms, and assembling dossiers for use in promotion, tenure, merit, and review deliberations.
 - c. To give formal written notice of reappointment, promotion, tenure decisions to the department chairperson and to the proper College and University authorities and committees.
 - d. To participate with the department chair in the presentation of the written recommendations deriving from promotion and tenure decisions.
 - e. To participate with the department chair in the presentation of the written recommendations deriving from Third-Year and Comprehensive Reviews.
 - f. To participate with the department chair in the presentation of written reasons in cases of non-reappointment or non-recommendation for tenure.
- B. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will review clinical faculty for reappointment and promotion. This committee will be the same as the PTR Committee with the addition of a clinical faculty member who has been in the role of clinical faculty for more than three years. (02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit V.D.5.b.)
- C. **The Merit Committee** The Merit Committee evaluates tenure-track, tenured, and clinical faculty in regards to merit. The merit committee each year shall consist of at least half of the qualified tenured and clinical associate/full clinical faculty members. The Department Chairperson serves on the Merit Committee in an ex officio capacity and does not vote. Committee members serve two-year staggered terms. If possible, at least one of the voting members should be an Associate Professor and one should be a Full Professor. In addition, if possible, the committee should have at least one tenured faculty member from each of the three concentrations in the department. Faculty in their terminal year are not eligible to serve on the committee. All votes require a quorum of 75% of the membership. Motions require a majority vote to be passed. Eligibility to serve on this committee is restricted to faculty members with at least three consecutive years of prior service in the department at Towson University. Faculty members who are on sabbatical may be on the committee, provided that they have reviewed the material and are present for deliberations.
- D. Selection of the Merit Committee. The Department Chair will solicit nominations for committee members, and by the first Friday in May, the tenured, tenure-track and clinical faculty members will vote on the makeup of the committee for the subsequent academic year. In the event that membership falls below 50% one year, the department would hold an additional election to select additional member(s) to bring the committee to 50%.

- E. After the election (and by the first Friday in May), the voting members of next academic year's Merit Committee will elect a Chair of the Merit Committee for the following academic year. The Chair's term will be one-year. The committee chair has the following responsibilities:
 - a. To call and conduct meetings of the Merit Committee.
 - b. To give formal written notice of merit to the department chairperson to be passed on to the individual concerned and to the proper College and University authorities and committees.
2. Whenever the Chair of the Merit Committee is absent, the most senior member (as determined first by rank, and then by years of service) of the remaining committee serves in the Merit Committee chair's place.

III. **STANDARDS, CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

A. As specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy, the standards and expectations in this 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 for their rank, 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. Faculty members shall fulfill their workload agreements 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. Faculty members shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
3. Faculty members shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.
4. Faculty members 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.

5. Faculty members shall share the responsibility of university, college, and 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.
 6. Faculty members shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of annual review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTRM calendar.
- C. The evaluation of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal advising. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom. Teaching as a sphere of evaluation includes the use of technology, the development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, attention to pedagogy connected with the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It includes as assigned academic advising, advising through student groups, and informal advising of departmental majors or students in any professional context.
- D. The evaluation of teaching shall be based on materials provided in the evaluation portfolio. The assessment of teaching effectiveness will give close attention to (1) the faculty member's self-evaluation in the reflective statements included in the portfolio, (2) syllabi and other teaching materials presented by the faculty member, (3) student evaluations, (4) peer evaluations, and (5) the evaluation of student learning outcomes for the faculty member's courses where possible.
1. Self-evaluation and course materials
 - a. Faculty members' evaluation of their 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. This narrative statement should also address the faculty members' self-evaluation of their advising.
 - b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are parts of the required Annual Review reports and are included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey to students a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and should contain those elements specified for course syllabi in university policy.

- c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios assessment outcomes related directly to the faculty member's work or copies of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations, community engagement, effective educational practices, or other qualities the faculty member wishes to place in consideration.
 - d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, shall be made available to faculty members for review and shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio. These reports should be considered in relation to standards expressed in departmental and college objectives, the faculty member's self-evaluation, course syllabi, and the evaluations of students and peers.
2. Evaluation of teaching by students
 - a. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.
 - b. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.
3. Evaluation of teaching by peers
 - a. Classroom or teaching site visits are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the person is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, or tenure.
 - b. Prior to tenure, tenure-track faculty require one peer review per year. After tenure, two peer reviews of teaching are required per 5-year period. One peer review is required per reappointment period for clinical faculty and lecturers.
 - c. Advance notice of at least one (1) week shall be given to the faculty member being observed.
 - d. Reviewers are expected to include observations and assessments about the following aspects of instruction in their written evaluation of a specific course: (a) the course syllabus; (b) the quality of the instructor's presentation of course content; and (c) the quality of the instructor's interaction with students. Syllabus reviews may include comments about assigned texts or readings and course assignments. Comments about other aspects of teaching, such as the use of technology and special class activities or methods of encouraging student class participation, can also be included in reports of peer evaluation of teaching.
4. Evaluation of advising
 - a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic

- or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.
- b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class-teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate research committee, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.
 - c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included in the evaluation portfolio.
- 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, faculty members shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in their academic fields, as affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly materials in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
1. The major forms of scholarship may be defined as follows:
 - a. **Scholarship of Application** – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and professional arts
 - b. **Scholarship of Discovery** – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and professional arts
 - c. **Scholarship of Integration** – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
 - d. **Scholarship of Teaching** – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning.
 2. In presenting their scholarship for review or in evaluating the work of others, faculty shall be guided by the definitions of scholarship noted above and further articulated by merit guidelines below.
 3. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental

colleagues. A faculty member's portfolio sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion should demonstrate a pattern of completed work consistent with the nature of the faculty member's appointment.

4. Scholarly papers accepted for delivery at conferences external to the University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions whether domestic or international, and similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers may all provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development. Scholarly papers may mark progress toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may not substitute for the pattern of completed work required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
 5. Faculty reviews of all types, including annual reviews, merit reviews, third-year reviews, and comprehensive reviews, should give due attention to evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and to evidence of the faculty member's continuing professional development. Although some faculty may emphasize teaching or service more heavily in their workload assignments, all faculty are responsible for continuing to develop disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and for providing evidence of professional growth in their annual reviews or review portfolios. Reports on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, papers presented to colleagues, systematic preparation for teaching topics new to the faculty member, collection and analysis of data or information for a community purpose, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the department, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews, although they may not substitute for the evidence required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
- F. The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions consistent with the proportion of time allocated for service in the faculty member's workload agreements. To the extent possible, evaluation should consider the extent and quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a position held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for judgment of its extent and its relation to the mission of the university.
1. University service involves substantive participation in the shared governance activities of the department, college and university.
 2. Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university's mission.
 3. Professional service includes activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national

or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance the university's mission.

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

H. Annual Review for Merit

1. The Merit Committee shall annually review lecturers, clinical, tenured, and tenure-track faculty for merit.
2. The department chair shall be responsible for presenting to the Merit Committee all the evaluation portfolios for all faculty members in the department.
3. A quorum shall consist of 75% of voting members.
4. All voting shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. A simple majority will determine the outcome of Merit deliberations. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of the Merit Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
5. Members of the Merit Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.
6. 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.

7. The department chair may prepare an independent recommendation and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
8. 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. A vote of no merit shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.
9. The department chairperson and the Chair of the Merit Committee shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the faculty member's department Merit recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.
10. The chair of the Merit Committee shall forward the evaluation portfolios, chair recommendations, and the department vote count record to the CLA Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
11. The Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Department follows the appeals procedures laid out in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, V, B, 1-3. Faculty members may appeal to the college PTRM committee negative judgments made at the department level on questions of merit, if the appeal is on substantive grounds. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by the department committee or chair in evaluating the faculty member's performance.
12. 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 Merit Committee.
13. 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.
14. There are three (3) categories of merit as follows:
 - a. Not Meritorious – Performance that does not meet the Satisfactory standard in any of the basic areas of the faculty role of teaching and advising or research and scholarship or service. Faculty members who do

not meet the stated standards of Satisfactory performance will not be awarded Merit.

- b. Satisfactory (Base Merit) – Performance that is competent in all basic areas of the faculty role and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department. Satisfactory performance means that faculty members: (i) has fulfilled their workload agreements in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service; (ii) have been available to students for consultation and advising during office hours; (iii) have met all classes as scheduled; (iv) have demonstrated a commitment to collegiality and citizenship; (v) have participated in governance at the department level; (vi) have provided evidence of a strong teaching commitment; (vii) have provided evidence of ongoing research and scholarly work; and (viii) have provided evidence of a commitment to service, which may include activities at the department, college, and/or university level. Service to the community and/or the profession, which is consistent with the mission of the university, is also valued.

The Department recognizes that there are many ways faculty members may demonstrate Satisfactory performance. What follows are examples designed to guide both faculty and the Merit Committee, rather than an exclusive list.

Examples of performance that may indicate a Strong Teaching Commitment may include but are not limited to:

- development or refinement of course materials and syllabi;
- student evaluations and/ or peer reviews that reflect a perception of competence and a strong commitment to teaching and to student performance;
- active, demonstrable involvement in student advising.
- innovations in instruction or instructional technology;

Examples of performance that may indicate Ongoing Research and Scholarly Work include but are not limited to:

- documented progress on a publishable writing project;
- a presentation of a scholarly paper or other scholarly work at a professional conference;
- a submission of a grant or fellowship application in one's field of professional expertise.
- The publication of a technical or consulting report for a professional or community organization

Examples that may indicate a Commitment to Service to the University include but are not limited to:

- active participation in a department committee;
- active participation on a college or university committee to which the faculty member has been appointed or elected; service as a peer reviewer for a scholarly journal;

- application of professional expertise in the community in a way that serves the mission of the university.

Excellent (Base Merit Plus) – Performance that meets the Satisfactory standard in all of the basic areas of the faculty role: teaching and advising; and research and scholarship; and service. In addition, to be Excellent, performance must substantially exceed the Satisfactory standard in one or more of these areas of the faculty role.

The Department recognizes that there are many ways faculty members may demonstrate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance. What follows are examples designed to guide both the faculty and the Merit Committee, rather than an exclusive list.

Examples of Teaching and Advising that may indicate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance include, but are not limited to:

- achievement of a significant internal or external instructional grant or fellowship;
- supervision of a student research project that earns distinction outside the department.

Examples of Research or Scholarship that may indicate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance include, but are not limited to:

- publication of an article or chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or book in one's field of professional expertise;
- publication of a book in one's field of professional expertise;
- publication of a significant applied work of scholarship in one's field of expertise;
- publication and dissemination of a significant media production;
- award of a significant external grant or fellowship.

Examples of Service that may indicate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance include but are not limited to:

- development or significant revision of an academic or institutional program;
- lead responsibility for the organization of major professional conference or a major conference related to one's field of professional expertise;
- assuming the leadership of a major university or college committee or task force;
- assuming the uncompensated leadership of a non-profit community organization;

The determination of Excellent performance will involve an assessment of overall performance in each of the areas of the faculty role, and all assessments will take into account the percentages accorded to each area in a faculty

member's annual workload agreement.

Note that the Chairperson must meet the previously stated standards for Base Merit or Merit Plus and also provide evidence of effectiveness in departmental leadership and management to be awarded Base Merit or Merit Plus.

I. Reappointment of Tenure-track Faculty

1. The PTR Committee votes on reappointment decisions for tenure-track faculty. With regard to reappointment votes, eligible voters include tenured faculty with rank equal to or superior to the person under review. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members.
2. All voting shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. Favorable decisions require a majority vote of eligible voters supporting a motion to reappoint. A motion to reappoint will fail in the case of a tie vote.
3. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of the PTR Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
4. Members of the PTR Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

Reappointment: First-Year Tenure-track Faculty

- a. The PTR Committee shall evaluate each new faculty member's first semester performance and make a recommendation for reappointment.
- b. This evaluation shall be conducted and completed by the third Friday in January.
- c. Faculty members shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during their 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 PTR 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 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. A negative recommendation shall be delivered in person by the department chair or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

h. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, III, D, 2, g-j.

Reappointment: Second-Year Tenure-track Faculty a. The department PTR committee shall evaluate second year tenure-track faculty and make a recommendation regarding reappointment.

b. The department chairperson may prepare an independent recommendation for each faculty member reviewed for reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by no later than the fourth Friday in October.

c. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count ("Evaluation Record") no later than the fourth Friday in October. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

d. The faculty member's Evaluation Record, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department chairperson should be forwarded by the department PTR committee chairperson to the CLA Dean's office by no later than the second Friday in November.

e. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation for reappointment at any point in the process following procedures outlined in the Appeals section (Section V) of this document; however, an appeal shall not stay the reappointment evaluation process.

3. Reappointment: Third- through Fifth-Year Tenure-track Faculty

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.

J. Third-Year Review of Tenure-track Faculty

1. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the PTR 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. The PTR Committee evaluation of a candidate's interim progress will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and will be shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM Committee or the Provost.

2. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the PTR Committee as outlined in the section "Documentation and Material Inclusion" (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of The Towson University ART policy.

3. The PTR 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:

a. must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading to a positive promotion and tenure decision, and

b. must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

4. 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.

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

6. The 3rd year review portfolio from the faculty member is due to the chair of the department by the third Friday in January.

7. Feedback shall be in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the chair of the PTR Committee no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the dean.

K. Tenure and/or Promotion of Tenure-track/Tenured Faculty

1. The PTR Committee votes on tenure and promotion decisions. For tenure decisions, all tenured faculty vote. With regard to promotion, eligible voters include tenured faculty with rank superior to the person under review. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members.

2. All voting shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. Favorable decisions require a majority vote of eligible voters supporting a motion. A motion for tenure and/ or promotion will fail in the case of a tie vote.

3. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded by the chair of the Department in accordance with ART policy. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of the PTR Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such

abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

4. Members of the PTR Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.
5. The department chair shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for tenure and/or promotion and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
6. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chair's statement and a record of the vote count, no later than the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.
7. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, III, D, 2, g-j.
8. The chair of the PTR Committee shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record, to the CLA Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
9. The expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice shall include the following.
 - a. The faculty member recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University's mission. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards of dissemination and validation, and shown competence to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research when applicable. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service, as defined in section F above.
 - b. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. The

faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher during the period since promotion to Associate Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Professor at least equivalent to the pattern of completed work meeting the standards of dissemination and validation expected for the prior rank. The scholarly work as a whole should reflect a degree of cohesion consistent with establishing a sound scholarly reputation. The faculty member shall have presented evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession in the period after promotion to Associate professor.

10. 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.

L. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-tenure Review)

1. 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. The criteria for the Comprehensive Review are drawn from APPENDIX 3 TO THE TOWSON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK, AND TENURE OF FACULTY. The chair of the department, in consultation with the dean of the college shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the department. Faculty members who have submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of their 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 dean of the college.
2. The PTR 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. Eligible voters include tenured faculty with rank superior to the person under review, with the exception of full professors, who also vote on those with equal rank to their own. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/ advising, scholarship and service, and should be submitted to the department chairperson by the second Friday in October.
3. All voting shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. Favorable decisions require a majority vote of eligible voters supporting a motion. A

motion will fail in the case of a tie vote.

4. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of the PTR Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
5. Members of the PTR Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.
6. 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.
7. The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department committee, the written evaluation of the department chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the chair of the PTR Committee to the CLA Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
8. 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.

M. Reappointment and Promotion of Clinical Faculty

1. The Clinical Evaluation Committee votes on reappointment decisions for clinical faculty. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members.
2. All voting shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. Favorable decisions require a majority vote of eligible voters supporting a motion to reappoint. A motion to reappoint will fail in the case of a tie vote.
3. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of Clinical Evaluation Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
4. Members of the Clinical Evaluation Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the

exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

5. Reappointment: First-year Clinical Faculty

- a. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will evaluate the reappointment of Clinical Faculty during the first year.
- b. This evaluation shall be conducted and completed by the third Friday in January.
- c. Faculty members shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during their first semester. 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 Clinical Evaluation 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 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. A negative recommendation shall be delivered in person by the department chair or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.
- h. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, III, D, 2, g-j.

6. Reappointment: Annual Reappointment of Clinical Faculty after the First Year

- a. The department Clinical Evaluation Committee shall evaluate Clinical Faculty regarding reappointment after their first year of appointment. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will follow 02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit V.C. & D.
- b. The department chairperson may prepare an independent recommendation for each faculty member reviewed for reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by no later than the fourth Friday in October.
- c. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count ("Evaluation Record") no later than the fourth Friday in October. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.
- d. The faculty member's Evaluation Record, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department chairperson should be forwarded by the department PTR committee chairperson to the CLA Dean's office by no later than the second Friday in November.
- e. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation for reappointment at any point in the process following procedures outlined in the Appeals section (Section V) of this document; however, an appeal shall not stay the reappointment evaluation process.

7. Promotion of Clinical Faculty

- a. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will review portfolios for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and 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.
- b. All voting shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied by the committee chair. Favorable decisions require a majority vote of eligible voters supporting a motion. A motion for tenure and/ or promotion will fail in the case of a tie vote.
- c. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded by the chair of the Department in accordance with ART policy. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of the

Clinical Evaluation Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

- d. Members of the Clinical Evaluation Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.
- e. The Department Chair shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for tenure and/or promotion and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
- f. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chair's statement and a record of the vote count, no later than the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.
- g. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, III, D, 2, g-j.
- h. The chair of the Clinical Evaluation Committee shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record, to the CLA Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
- i. The expectations for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice shall include the following.
 - 1. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical 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.
 - 2. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college.
 - 3. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service.

4. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor shall have had extensive successful experience in clinical or professional practice in a field of specialization, or in a subdivision of the department field, and in working with and/or directing others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate, and/or undergraduate students) in applied clinical activities in the field. The appointee must also have demonstrated superior teaching ability and scholarly or administrative accomplishments, which may include (but not be limited to) the writing and dissemination of reports and other forms of alternative scholarship, demonstrable engagement with and outreach to the community, continued professional development and maintenance of professional credentials, where applicable.
- b. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Clinical Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Clinical Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. The faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher during the period since promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Clinical Professor at least equivalent to the pattern of completed work meeting the standards expected for the prior rank. 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 Clinical Associate professor.
8. 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.
9. Three Year Appointment for Clinical Faculty

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 02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Section: V.D. 12.

IV. CALENDAR

The Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice 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, VI, of the ART Policy, with the understanding that if the published university calendar changes, the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice PTRM calendar may change without formal amendment of the departmental document.

Appendix: Peer Teaching Evaluations

Towson's ART, section IIC2iiB, requires that departments "develop discipline-specific criteria or guidelines for performing and reporting classroom/clinical observations," and that these be included in the department PTRM document.

In completing written peer teaching evaluations, reviewers observe and comment on the following aspects of their observation.

- a. the course syllabus
Syllabus reviews may include comments about assigned texts or readings and course assignments
- b. the quality of the instructor's presentation of course content;
- c. the quality of the instructor's interaction with students.

Comments about other aspects of teaching, such as the use of technology and special class activities or methods of encouraging student class participation, can also be included in reports of peer evaluation of teaching.

Copies of written peer evaluations must be submitted to both the faculty member and the department chair, as soon as possible after the peer observation.

Faculty members are responsible for making sure they have the required number and frequency of peer evaluations for each type of review, as outlined in the Department PTRM document (IIC3b).